NISEI, SANSEI, AND YONSEI: ACCULTURATION, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AMONG THREE GENERATIONS

OF JAPANESE AMERICANS

By

MICHELE ELIZABETH ISHIKAWA

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Educational Leadership & Counseling Psychology

JULY 2013

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the dissertation of MICHELE ELIZABETH ISHIKAWA find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

_____
Laurie D. McCubbin, Ph.D., Chair

_____
A. Timothy Church, Ph.D.

_____
Phyllis Erdman, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I wish to express my most sincere appreciation to my amazing academic advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Laurie "Lali" McCubbin, who patiently encouraged, supported, and guided me throughout the doctoral program and dissertation process. Thank you for acting as an advocate, mentor, and teacher all these years. I would also like to extend my utmost gratitude to the past and present members of the dissertation committee, including Drs. Tina Anctil, Tim Church, Brian McNeill and Phyllis Erdman. While serving on my dissertation committee, Dr. Anctil offered important assistance during the topic selection process. At my dissertation proposal, Drs. McCubbin, Church, and McNeill provided much guidance for my research. Dr. Church has presented valuable feedback regarding every aspect of my dissertation, but I am especially grateful for his aid during the discovery of my dissertation errors and his suggestions regarding statistical analyses. I am particularly obliged to Dr. Erdman for her willingness to join my dissertation committee at such a late date. To all the members of my dissertation committee, I appreciate your gifts of time, constructive criticism, encouragement, and incredible support.

I am grateful to the members of the Buddhist Churches of America and the Japanese American Citizens League who participated in this study, particularly those leaders who assisted in participant recruitment and survey distribution at their local temples and offices, as well as at the Arizona Obon Festival. Special thanks are owed to Sensei Koho Takata and President Chuck Matsumoto of the Arizona Buddhist Temple, and to member David Yamamoto. I also owe a debt of gratitude to every board member of the local JACL chapter of Arizona.

Thanks to the Washington State University faculty and staff at both the College of Education as well as at Counseling & Testing Services, including Dr. Jason Sievers and Nick

iv

NISEI, SANSEI, AND YONSEI: ACCULTURATION, ETHNIC IDENTITY, AND

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AMONG THREE GENERATIONS

OF JAPANESE AMERICANS

Abstract

By Michele Elizabeth Ishikawa, Ph.D.
Washington State University
July 2013

Chair: Laurie D. McCubbin

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of acculturation and ethnic identity on subjective well-being across three generations of Japanese Americans. Data were collected in 2012 from 175 female and male Japanese Americans, ages 18 through 90, who represented second (Nisei), third (Sansei), and fourth (Yonsei) generations, recruited from chapters of the Buddhist Churches of America (BCA) and the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL). Data were collected via an online survey hosted by Skylight Matrix, a program of Washington State University, as well as via paper and pencil survey mailed to chapters of the BCA and the JACL, and distributed in person at the annual Obon Festival at the Arizona Buddhist Temple, a member of the BCA.

Each participant was administered an adapted version of the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale, the Asian Values Scale-Revised, an adapted version of the European American Values Scale for Asian Americans, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule, the Satisfaction With Life Scale, and the Meaning in Life Questionnaire and asked to complete a demographic information sheet. Data were analyzed

using analyses of variance, multivariate analyses of variance, and hierarchical regression analyses.

Based upon the findings of Kim, Atkinson, and Yang (1999), it was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences in the levels of acculturated values of Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei Japanese Americans, though differences in acculturated behaviors might exist. Furthermore, based on the work of Ohata (2002) it was expected that there would be no difference on ethnic identity between the Nisei and the Sansei, but a significant increase in the Yonsei. Finally, it was predicted that greater endorsement of Asian values and a stronger ethnic identity would positively predict subjective well-being. Results of this study supported the work of Kim, et al. with Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei generations exhibiting no significant differences in acculturated values. The work of Ohata was not supported, with no significant differences on ethnic identity detected between generations. Asian values failed to predict subjective well-being. Ethnic identity positively predicted subjective well-being.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my loving father, Paul Ishikawa, Jr.,

my late friend Melissa Waller, and my loyal dog, Alice Dingo

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Research in the field of psychology has increasingly focused on the mental health needs of Asian Americans as a pan-ethnic population (Kim, Yang, Atkinson, Wolfe, & Hong, 2001). However, while attention to this general group has grown, consideration of the needs of individual Asian ethnic groups has decreased. In order for psychologists to determine how best to address the mental health needs of Asian Americans, researchers must make efforts to continue – or return to – an investigative agenda that acknowledges the distinctions as well as similarities among Asian ethnic groups (Hong & Domokos-Cheng Ham, 2001; Kim et al., 2001; Uba, 2003).

Many researchers have conducted studies examining acculturation and ethnic identity among Asian Americans, but few have focused on specific Asian ethnic groups (Hong & Domokos-Cheng Ham, 2001; Kim et al., 2001; Uba, 2003). In addition, studies investigating how these variables affect well-being in Asian Americans or particular Asian ethnic groups are missing in the literature.

Acculturation is a salient factor in the lives of Asian Americans, as it is associated with multiple psychological variables (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999). These include attitudes regarding professional mental health care services, therapist preference, and willingness to see a therapist. Furthermore, it has been linked to psychological health, and therefore must be included in any conceptualization of mental healthcare treatment for this population. Likewise, ethnic identity is also a significant factor for Asian Americans, as it is an important part of self-concept and also has been positively linked to increased well-being, and positively related to self esteem (Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001; Roberts et al., 1999). Acculturation and ethnic

1

identity may change across time and will differ for each individual due to a variety of reasons, including country of origin, immigration status, opportunity to engage in cultural practices, and availability of social networks. Subjective well-being is also an important factor for understanding the mental health of Asian Americans, as it can be used as a measure of success in achieving positive mental health. Subjective well-being defines happiness and life satisfaction as central aspects of life quality, including one's domain satisfaction, affective responses, and global evaluation of life satisfaction (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). As research has pointed to initially low scores on life satisfaction in clinical populations with a tendency for scores to increase during treatment, this construct may be a useful indicator for clinicians to assess baseline and progress in therapy (Pavot & Diener, 1993).

Atkinson and Matsushita (1991) assert that Asian Americans use mental health services at a much lower rate than do European Americans, and that when Asian Americans do utilize such services, their rate of attrition is significantly higher than that of European Americans. Root (1985) posits that Asian Americans may have an aversion to counseling due to cultural conflicts regarding the expectation that one can resolve psychological problems on one's own by stoicism, and the belief that obtaining help from a professional and engaging in emotional expression brings shame to one's family. Atkinson and Gim (1989) suggest that the high attrition rate of Asian Americans seeking mental health services is due to lack of availability of ethnically similar counselors and inadequate cultural sensitivity in standard approaches to therapy.

Atkinson, Maruyama, and Matsui (1978) found that college students who were active in an Asian American activist group reported Asian American counselors as more approachable and

credible in comparison to European American counselors. However, when these researchers

conducted a replication study of Japanese American members of the Young Buddhist

Association, these results were not supported (Atkinson, Maruyama, and Matsui, 1978).

Atkinson and Matsushita (1991) found that Japanese Americans were more willing to see a

directive Japanese American counselor than a nondirective one, or a European American

counselor regardless of directive or nondirective stance. Findings on preference for counseling

styles have been mixed (Atkinson & Matsushita, 1991). While Atkinson, Maruyama, and Matsui

(1978) found that Asian Americans considered a directive counselor as more credible than a

nondirective one, Mokuau (1987) found that Asian Americans respond more positively to a

nondirective style of counseling. Other researchers have offered results suggesting that Asian

Americans prefer a more structured counseling experience. For example, in a review of the

literature, Leong (1986) found that compared to European Americans, Asian Americans were

more likely to desire structured counseling, exhibit respect for counselors as authority figures,

expect quick solutions to presenting problems, and limit emotional or verbal expression.

Because of this and similar research studies, it is important for counseling psychologists to

consider the effects of acculturation and ethnic identity on well-being among Asian Americans

as a group and as ethnic subgroups, as well as how this impacts the therapeutic process.

  The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effects of acculturation and ethnic identity

on subjective well-being across three generations of Japanese Americans. This is an important

contribution to the literature because Japanese Americans as an ethnic group have experienced a

unique history, in spite of some common experiences shared with other Asian ethnic groups. As

such, the acculturation and ethnic identity patterns of this group may differ from that of other

groups. Furthermore, generation is a relevant factor in this study, not only because of the

lifespan developmental nature of ethnic identity, but also due to historical events affecting each generation (e.g., internment of Japanese Americans during World War II).

The Issei, or first generation, immigrated to the United States and were confronted with xenophobia and barriers to obtaining citizenship while building Japanese American communities and enduring difficult labor conditions. The Nisei, or second generation, were the first Japanese American citizens by birthright, and experienced internment at the same time that their highly decorated 442nd Regimental Combat Team served the U.S. during WWII; the Nisei later founded the Japanese American Citizens League. The Sansei, or third generation, were born during WWII, sometimes within the confines of internment camps, and now are the leaders of the Japanese American community, including the Buddhist Churches of America and JACL. The Yonsei, or fourth generation, grew up in an environment that, while not free of experiences with discrimination and prejudice, has been relatively calm compared to the experiences of previous generations, including the historical unrest of past immigration laws and WWII.

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences in the levels of acculturated values across generations, although differences in acculturated behaviors may exist. It was also expected that Japanese American ethnic identity would remain constant between the Nisei (second) and the Sansei (third) generations, but increase in the Yonsei (fourth) generation. It was predicted that greater endorsement of Asian values and stronger ethnic identity would positively predict subjective well-being.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, a brief history of the Japanese American community will be provided, followed by an overview of Asian American diversity, and a review of the literature on the concepts of acculturation, ethnic identity, and subjective well-being as they relate to the Japanese American population. In addition, instruments designed to measure the constructs of acculturation, ethnic identity, and subjective well-being will be reviewed.

As with other immigrant groups newly arrived to the United States, Japanese immigrants (Issei) experienced discrimination and prejudice based upon both ethnic and racial factors (Hoobler & Hoobler, 1996; O'Brien & Fugita, 1991; Takaki, 1994). However, unlike groups of white European immigrants, the Japanese were not welcomed more easily by Anglicizing or shortening their names, or losing their accents and mastering perfect English speaking skills. Furthermore, their American-born children (Nisei) continued to be the objects of racism, and even their grandchildren (Sansei) and great grandchildren (Yonsei) have not escaped experiences with discrimination and prejudice based upon ethnic identity, race, and an ironic xenophobia. Indeed, despite their status as citizens of the U.S., Japanese Americans – and Asian Americans in general – have yet to be fully accepted as rightful citizens of the United States. Discrimination and racism continue to be perpetuated against Asian Americans, ranging in form from cultural (e.g., media portrayals of Asian women as concubines or dragon ladies, and men as asexual or martial arts experts, as in Charlie Chan and Madame Butterfly) to economic (e.g., unfair treatment of and wages for Chinese garment workers and sex trafficking) to violence (e.g., the murder of Vincent Chin; Wei, 1993). Because of the hardships faced by Japanese Americans across generations, and the apparent overall success of the community as a whole, this paper

focuses on acculturation, ethnic identity, and psychological well-being in Japanese Americans. In order to understand the current Japanese American community, it is important to understand the history of the Japanese immigrants and the experiences of each subsequent generation.

History of Japanese Americans

Under Japan's restored Meiji empire (circa 1868), land taxes were imposed on farmers in order to fund factories and military equipment, and many farmers could no longer afford to keep their land (Takaki, 1994). Subsequently, Japanese immigrants began to arrive in the U.S. – particularly Hawaii and California – around 1885, in response to a need for agricultural laborers. Initially, most Japanese laborers were cannery workers, migratory farm workers, and railroad workers. Women commonly worked as housekeepers, nannies, or seamstresses.

Japanese immigrants initially came to the U.S. as temporary laborers aiming to quickly earn and save money in order to pay expensive land taxes on farmland, or settle family debts (Takaki, 1994). However, many Japanese immigrants found themselves remaining longer in the U.S. than originally planned, and Japanese communities began to appear. A Japanese economy developed within the U.S., featuring boarding houses, hotels, pool halls, restaurants, shops, and stores in city districts, each named Little Tokyo. Japanese communities included not only Issei, or first generation Japanese immigrants, but also their Nisei children, the second generation.

Japanese immigrants in the U.S. faced much discrimination due to racism against non-white immigrants, particularly those from Asia (Takaki, 1994). Japanese immigrants were aware of the hostility that led to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, and thus attempted to avoid being seen as a threat to the white labor force. Many Japanese farmers transformed unused desert lands with harsh weather conditions into fertile, productive farmland, something that European Americans did not want to work to accomplish. In fact, Japanese immigrants were so eager to

earn and save money that they did much of the labor that European Americans shunned. In spite of the Japanese immigrants' efforts to avoid being seen as a threat to European Americans' job prospects or security, organizations such as the Asiatic Exclusion League, Native Sons of the Golden West, and San Francisco Chronicle appealed for bans on or minimization of immigrants from Asia. Competition for employment was not the only area in which Japanese immigrants were viewed as a threat.

In 1906, the San Francisco Board of Education ordered school principals to direct all Chinese, Japanese, and Korean children to the "Oriental School" (Takaki, 1994). The Japanese government informed the U.S. that the San Francisco Board of Education's decision was a violation of the equal education opportunity treaty between the two countries, and segregation in schools was prohibited.

As European Americans continued to fear an invasion of Asian laborers, in 1908, the Gentlemen's Agreement barred Japanese laborers from emigrating to the U.S. (O'Brien & Fugita, 1991; Takaki, 1994). In 1913, under the Alien Land Act, it became illegal for anyone who was not a U.S. citizen to own land, and Japanese immigrants could not become citizens because they were not white. This law was covertly yet obviously aimed at Japanese immigrants. Issei farmers leased and purchased land under corporations founded by Japanese communities, or in the names of their American-born Nisei children, who were U.S. citizens by birthright. In 1920, a second Alien Land Act prevented immigrants from leasing or purchasing land in the names of corporations or children, and many Japanese farmers were forced to change occupations.

Even under the Gentlemen's Agreement, Japanese citizens were permitted to emigrate if they were the children, parents, or spouses of those immigrants already in the U.S. (O'Brien &

Fugita, 1991; Takaki, 1994). Japanese men often were married to picture brides residing in

Japan, with marriages arranged by parents and a "go between." The Ladies' Agreement was

made into law in 1921, banning immigration of picture brides.

Discrimination and prejudice towards Japanese immigrants did not soon decline. When

attempting to gain citizenship, they were faced with strong opposition. In 1922, the U.S.

Supreme Court denied citizenship to Takao Ozawa, due to his race (Takaki, 1994). All

immigrants from Asia were banned in 1924. Many Issei settlers returned to Japan, while others

remained in the U.S. with the realization that they would never be citizens, but nurturing the

hope that their children one day would. In *Toyota v. United States*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled

Asian immigrants ineligible for citizenship, thereby stripping Hidemitsu Toyota of the

citizenship granted for his military service (Hoobler & Hoobler, 1996). In hopes of bettering the

lives of Japanese immigrants and their descendants, the Nisei formed the Japanese American

Citizens League (JACL), a national organization, in 1930, hosting its first meeting in Seattle,

Washington. The JACL encouraged acculturation in order to be recognized as Americans and

awarded citizenship.

Following the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, the Federal Bureau of

Intelligence (FBI) immediately began to locate Issei leaders of Japanese American communities

on the mainland and in 1942, Japanese Americans were imprisoned in "internment" camps until

the end of the war in 1945 (Hoobler & Hoobler, 1996; O'Brien & Fugita, 1991). This dark

chapter in U.S. history has been downplayed by accounts of American concentration camps as

"internment camps," where in fact Japanese Americans were imprisoned in bleak settings

surrounded by barbed wire and armed guards. On more than one occasion, internees were

wounded and even killed by gunshot wounds inflicted by European American guards who

judged the distance between the victims and the perimeter of the camp to be too small for security. In addition, many Japanese American families lost real property, forced to sell assets at below value due to circumstances beyond their control. In spite of the imprisonment of Japanese Americans in the concentration camps, Nisei from Hawaii comprised the 100th Infantry Battalion, while Nisei from the mainland formed the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, and later both were combined into the 442nd, earning the highest honor for an outfit of its size.

It was not until twenty years after World War II that conditions would improve for Japanese citizens hoping to emigrate to the U.S., or for those already residing stateside (Hoobler & Hoobler, 1996; O'Brien & Fugita, 1991). The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act outlined quotas for Asian immigrants equaling those for Europeans, and the doors of the country were once again open to Japanese immigrants. Justice – albeit late and grievously insufficient – became possible when the National Committee for Redress was organized by the JACL in 1976, ordering study of proper compensation for Japanese Americans interned during WW II. In 1988, Congress allowed payments of $20,000 to each *surviving* internee, with payments – accompanied by a letter of apology – beginning in 1990. For many, this arrived too late. For others, this was inadequate compensation for the loss of property, the loss of wages, but most of all the loss of civil rights and freedom guaranteed to all U.S. citizens.

Today Japanese immigrants are permitted to be citizens, along with Japanese Americans born in the U.S. However, Japanese America still exists as a subculture in the mainstream western culture of the U.S. As noted in the brief overview of Japanese American history, the community has overcome much adversity (Hoobler & Hoobler, 1996; O'Brien & Fugita, 1991; Takaki, 1994). In spite of the difficulties encountered by the Japanese immigrants and their descendents, it appears that the Japanese American community as a whole has succeeded in

overcoming obstacles time and time again, through sheer perseverance. It is possible that the close knit community survived and eventually thrived due to adaptability through a degree of acculturation at the same time that Asian values were embraced, and that shared ethnic identity allowed them to remain determined to hold on to their supportive cultural practices. Perhaps Asian values and ethnic identity functioned as protective factors and helped to sustain them as they fought against injustice merely to survive.

Due to the long history of Asian immigration in the U.S. – spanning over 150 years and continuing today – there are a variety of experiences within the Asian American population, considering that some are recent immigrants and others are descendants of ancestors who arrived many generations ago (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999). In addition, some arrived as willing immigrants while others fled war-torn countries as refugees who were forced to leave behind any financial resources or possessions. Furthermore, cultural differences of each country of origin must also be considered, including the effects of different governments, economies, and philosophies and religions (e.g., Confucianism, Buddhism, Shintoism, and Taoism). In Asia, there exist subgroups of ethnic groups within each country, such that there is not just one dialect of a language spoken or one vein of cultural practices in any one region. In addition, various philosophical, political, religious, and social influences have affected each country and region in a unique manner. A similar pattern may be found in those who have immigrated to the U.S., as well as their descendents. Furthermore, each Asian American ethnic group has experienced different challenges in the U.S., with some groups arriving mostly as immigrants and others as refugees, in addition to the impact of various historical events such as the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, antimiscegnation laws, Japanese American internment during WWI, and the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965.

Asian American Diversity

It is worth noting that Japanese Americans as a group warrant examination as a unique and separate ethnic group, rather than being collapsed into a broad general category of Asian Americans (Hong & Domokos-Cheng Ham, 2001). The latter practice has been utilized in previous research studies without adequate attention to differences in the culture and history of individual Asian American ethnic groups. While there are commonalities between such groups, there are also significant differences. It is important to acknowledge the unique cultural beliefs, practices, and histories of each Asian American ethnic group, rather than engaging in overgeneralization.

Asian Americans are the fastest growing ethnic minority group in the United States (Kim, Yang, Atkinson, Wolfe, & Hong, 2001). Kim and associates (2001) assert that due to the continuing and rapid increase in the Asian American population, psychologists have responded with attention to this group by offering a growing number of relevant research publications in books and journals. Despite these efforts by psychologists, research on Asian Americans continues to primarily focus on the population as one community, rather than addressing the distinct differences between the various ethnic groups within the population. In fact, Kim and colleagues (2001) found that publications addressing individual Asian American ethnic groups appear to be on the decline, instead creating a general or "homogenized" perspective of Asian Americans, to the detriment of the 25 plus ethnic groups of Asian descent within the U.S. Due to different cultural factors and immigration histories, each group deserves to be recognized as distinct.

Of particular interest is the discrepancy between socioeconomic status between Asian American ethnic groups, with Japanese Americans, Asian Indian Americans, and Filipino

Americans typically enjoying higher incomes than other Asian ethnic groups such as Hmong

Americans (Hong & Domokos-Cheng Ham, 2001; Kim et al., 2001). According to the 2000

census data (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004), the median family income of Japanese Americans is

higher than that of all other ethnic groups, resulting in this group being classified as the most

affluent Asian American ethnic group, and only 9.7% of Japanese Americans are considered to

be living at poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). In contrast, while Chinese Americans

also have a median family income that is higher than that of white Americans and some members

of this group can be classified as affluent, this population has 13.5% of members living at

poverty level (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Such differences may be due to different immigration

patterns and rates, including different economies in countries of origin for recent immigrants.

Another discrepancy among Asian American ethnic groups is the level of education

attained by members of each population (Kim, Yang, Atkinson, Wolfe, & Hong, 2001). In the

1980s, while 24.4% of Japanese Americans and 21.7% of Chinese Americans had reportedly

earned bachelor's degrees, only 4.6% of Laotian Americans and 2.2% of Hmong Americans had

done so. This may contribute to the differences in median family income across ethnic groups.

Finally, a major difference among Asian American ethnic groups that is particularly

important for psychologists to understand is the varying mental health needs reported by each

population. For example, Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans commonly report

academic and career concerns as serious, while Filipino Americans, Korean Americans, and

Southeast Asian Americans report financial problems as more serious (Kim et al., 2001). This

may be due in part to the majority of Chinese and Japanese Americans being descendants of

immigrants, whereas recent immigration patterns indicate that much of the growth in the Asian

American population is due to the recent immigration of Southeast Asians. The former group

may be focusing on academic and career achievements, while the latter group may be occupied with adjustment to the host society.

For these reasons, it is important for researchers to focus on conducting studies that acknowledge the commonalities and differences between each Asian ethnic group, as well as recognize the growing population of Asian Americans as a whole.

Acculturation

According to Tsai, Chentsova-Dutton, and Wong (2002), acculturation is the process of adjustment to a new culture. Graves (1967) describes acculturation as the progression of changing behaviors and values as one adapts to the cultural values of the majority culture. Some researchers differentiate between enculturation and acculturation (Kim, Atkinson, & Umemoto, 1999). Enculturation describes one's retention of indigenous cultural values, while acculturation refers to one's adherence to the values of the dominant culture. There are four modes of acculturation: assimilation, integration, marginalization, and separation (Phinney et al., 2001). Research has pointed to the integrated acculturation style as the most beneficial in terms of adjustment to the host culture. The alternatives – assimilation, marginalization, and separation – lead to decreased well-being in comparison to integration. In addition, these styles of acculturation have been linked to anger and depression (Phinney et al., 2001).

Researchers investigating acculturation have found that retaining ethnic group customs (enculturation) while adapting to the host culture of a new country (acculturation) may be the healthiest mode, and that such integration contributes to well-being (Berry, 1997). Integrated acculturation is linked to higher levels of psychological adjustment in comparison to other acculturation tactics (Tsai et al., 2002). Berry (1995) contended that macro-level variables affect

acculturation such that if the host culture offers resources and tolerance of cultural diversity, then immigrants will enjoy a smoother adjustment to the host culture.

The concept of acculturation is important to psychologists working with Asian Americans, as this construct has been linked to several psychological variables. Researchers have found biculturalism to be predictive of psychological health in Asian Americans (Smith, 1985; Wong-Rieger & Quintana, 1987). Furthermore, other investigators have discovered that attitudes regarding professional psychological services (Atkinson & Gim, 1989; Tata & Leong, 1994), attitudes regarding types of treatment (Leong, Wagner, & Kim, 1995), preference for counselor ethnicity (Atkinson & Matsushita, 1991; Korsgaard, 1990), and willingness to see a therapist (Gim, Atkinson, & Whiteley, 1990) are all related to acculturation.

A distinction between behavior- and value-focused acculturation is worth noting, since researchers have found evidence that behavioral acculturation occurs more rapidly than value acculturation (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). Such investigators assert that because of a need to survive economically within the majority culture, behavioral acculturation occurs more quickly than value acculturation. Indeed, no reason truly exists, based on necessity, for adopting the values of the majority culture and shedding one's own, such as Asian values.

Kim and associates (1999) contend that acculturation is comprised of two separate components – behavior and values – and that these change at different rates in the process of acculturation. These researchers found that although Asian acculturated behaviors may differ significantly across generations since immigration, Asian values do not. More specifically, across three generations of Asian Americans, there was a significant difference between the scores on a behavioral measure of acculturation, but no such difference between the scores on a

14

values measure of acculturation. These findings underscore the importance of focusing on both the cultural value aspect as well as the behavioral component of acculturation (Kim, Atkinson, & Umemoto, 2001).

Kim and colleagues (1999) have identified fourteen values posited to be common across Asian cultures. These were determined through review of the literature and studies on Asian cultural values, a national survey of Asian American psychologists, and three focus-group discussions with Asian American participants. The values are: ability to resolve psychological problems, avoidance of family shame, collectivism, conformity to family and social norms and expectations, deference to authority figures, educational and occupational achievement, filial piety, importance of family, maintenance of personal harmony, placing others' needs ahead of one's own, reciprocity, respect for elders and ancestors, self-control and restraint, and self-effacement. Understanding of Asian American values is crucial in meeting the mental health needs of this population, as researchers have found that conflicts from cultural differences in values is a common reason why these clients refrain from seeking mental health services or terminate such services early (Atkinson, Lowe, & Matthews, 1995).

The most commonly used models of acculturation are the unidimensional and bidimensional models (Tsai et al., 2002). Gordon (1964) developed the unidimensional model originally to describe the process of Americanization of European immigrants in the 1800s and 1900s. In the unidimensional model, one cultural orientation is inversely related to the other one, such that the more one is oriented to Culture A, the less oriented one is to Culture B. The bidimensional model resulted from increased ethnic consciousness due to the civil rights movement, which emphasized multiculturalism. In this model, cultural orientations are independent, such that the degree to which one is oriented to Culture A is unrelated to the degree

to which one is oriented to Culture B. While Berry's (1990) model of acculturation posits a bilinear approach offering an account of the general course of cultural adaptation, there is a progression toward developing the theory in order to incorporate a multilinear conceptualization. As with the bilinear model, the multilinear model includes two continua, reflecting both the indigenous culture (enculturation) and the dominant culture (acculturation). However, the multilinear model includes additional continua representing influences such as other cultures and settings.

Researchers (Tsai, 2001; Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000) have examined the unidimensional and bidimensional models by exploring reported orientation to culture of origin (enculturation) in comparison to reported orientation to the host or majority culture (acculturation). Tsai et al. (2000) investigated reported orientation to Chinese culture as opposed to reported orientation to American culture, among Chinese Americans residing on the West coast. Participants included Chinese American college students who were classified into three groups: (1) American-born, (2) Immigrants arriving in the U.S. at or before age 12, and (3) Immigrants arriving in the U.S. after age 12. These investigators administered the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (American and Chinese versions, GEQA and GEQC) created for the purpose of this study. The instrument was created in two versions that differed by reference culture, thus allowing respondents to report orientation to American and Chinese cultures independently. The results of this study indicated that being American (acculturation) and being Chinese (enculturation) are independent constructs for the American-born Chinese group, and dependent constructs for the two immigrant groups.

Tsai (2001) conducted a similar study by examining reported orientation to Hmong culture in comparison to reported orientation to American culture among Hmong Americans

residing in the Midwest. The results of these studies suggested that place of birth, which is associated with exposure to and experience with culture, may be a determining factor in which model best captures self-reported cultural orientation. While the foreign-born Asian Americans had a unidimensional model of cultural orientation, the U.S.-born Asian Americans had a bidimensional model of cultural orientation.

Ryder, Alden, and Paulhus (2000) investigated the unidimensional and bidimensional models by collecting self-reports of Chinese Canadians on both unidimensional and bidimensional orientation-acculturation and measures of psychological and social well-being. The results of the study (consisting of three parts: Study I, Study II, and Study III) showed that among first generation Chinese Canadians, orientations to native and host cultures were negatively correlated. However, among later generations, these were not correlated.

The results of these studies offer support for a bidimensional approach to enculturation and acculturation, suggesting that this model offers a more extensive and valid way of conceptualizing enculturation and acculturation, and the unidimensional approach may in fact be too simplistic to fully capture the enculturation and acculturation process (Ryder et al., 2000). The analyses showed that the two dimensions of heritage and mainstream culture identification could be reliably measured, displayed concurrent and factorial validity, were independent, and exhibited clear and differential patterns of correlations with relevant external variables. Also, the effect sizes shown by the bidimensional model were equal to those of the unidimensional model for most of the criterion variables examined. There was scarce support for the unidimensional model, which forecast that heritage and mainstream cultural identification would be highly negatively correlated and inversely related to other variables of interest. Ryder et al. pointed out that the relationships between the two models of enculturation and acculturation and basic

demographics were worth noting, as the value in any measure of enculturation and acculturation relies on its capacity to secure information not otherwise obtained in demographic indicators. The research data also indicate that the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA; Ryder, Lynn, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000) is a useful measure for evaluating the bidimensional model in ethnic Chinese, with the possibility of being applied to other ethnic groups as well. It is important for future research to assess the generalizability of the bidimensional model and instruments across other samples of individuals who are not students or immigrants to North America, such as those who are new to the continent as the children of immigrant parents, refugees, or sojourners. Particularly, it is key for future attempts to replicate these findings to include other Asian American ethnic subgroups, including Japanese American samples.

Abe-Kim, Okazaki, and Goto (2002) examined acculturation in a pan-ethnic Asian American sample of 355 undergraduate students that included ethnic subgroups such as Japanese Americans. Of these participants, 127 were U.S.-born and 228 were foreign-born. Foreign-born Asian American participants scored significantly lower in socioeconomic status than U.S.-born Asian American participants. Acculturation levels differed by ethnic subgroups, with the Japanese American group having significantly higher Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculuration scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew & Vigil, 1987) scores than the Korean American and Chinese American subgroups. This was not surprising given that the Japanese American subgroup reported the lowest proportion of foreign-born persons (24%) when compared to any other group. In subsequent analyses, these subgroups were collapsed due to the small sample sizes of ethnic subgroups and the pan-ethnic nature of the study. Data were collected using the SL-ASIA (Suinn et al., 1987), the Individualism-Collectivism scale (ICS; Hui & Villareal, 1989), the Impression Management subscale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable

Responding (BIDR-6; Paulhus & Reid, 1991), Self-construal scale (SCS; Takata, 1993), and the Loss of Face Scale (LFS; Zane, 1991).

U.S.-born Asian Americans had significantly higher total SL-ASIA scores in comparison to foreign-born Asian Americans. This group difference was maintained for all five SL-ASIA subscales. When using the SL-ASIA, both a single summary score in a unidimensional approach and acculturation domain scores in a multidimensional approach yielded support for generational status as a useful proxy for acculturation level. In addition, the dominant cultural orientations of participants were determined with a bidirectional scoring strategy, with 160 (46.8%) being classified as assimilated (Anglo), 101 (29.5%) as traditional (Asian), and 81 (23.7%) as bicultural. Cross-tabulation of dominant cultural orientation by generational status showed that among foreign-born participants, 94 (42.3%) were classified as traditional, 68 (30.6%) as assimilated, and 60 (27.2%) as bicultural in orientation. Among U.S.-born participants, 7 (5.8%) were classified as traditional, 92 (76.7%) as assimilated, and 21 (17.5%) as bicultural in orientation. There were significant differences in the cultural orientations of both foreign- and U.S.-born participants, indicating that generational status per se may not paint a complete picture of cultural orientations.

Participants were grouped by generational status (foreign- or U.S.-born) and compared on the cultural indicator variables used for each data set. For all data sets, significant generational group differences existed on several variables. With college students, employment of a multidimensional model was useful for investigating the relationships between acculturation and cultural variables (e.g., individualism-collectivism and loss of face). While generational status was found to be meaningful as an acculturation proxy when acculturation is considered in unidimensional terms, it is not as relevant when viewed from a multidimensional perspective.

For future research, it would be interesting to replicate the results of this study for individual Asian American ethnic subgroups, rather than simply using a pan-ethnic approach.

In addition, Lieber, Chin, Nihira, and Mink (2001) found bidimensional models superior to unidimensional models when used to predict satisfaction of life with Chinese immigrants. Their findings back the contention that acculturation and ethnic identity aid in understanding the issues related to immigration and adjustment for Chinese Americans, particularly since these variables successfully predicted satisfaction with life. This research has further implications for understanding the experiences of other Asian immigrant groups, and particularly the Japanese Americans who, similar to many Chinese Americans, came to the U.S. as immigrants rather than refugees or sojourners.

All of the above studies point to a possibility of failing to understand the associations between acculturation, enculturation, and psychological and social well-being if researchers and theorists do not include a bidimensional model. In addition, the work of Lieber and colleagues (2001) highlights the effects of acculturation and ethnic identity on psychological well-being. More research is needed to explore these relationships, as there is some data to suggest that this will inform mental health practices with Asian American clients. Given the traditional pan-ethnic approach to studying Asian Americans, it is critical that future research directions include studies addressing the unique ways that acculturation impacts psychological well-being of specific Asian American subgroups. In addition, the various immigration histories and population demographics of each Asian American subgroup must be considered in the research, with attention to such particulars as the generation levels and SES of each group and how these factors affect acculturation patterns and in turn psychological well-being.

Measures of acculturation. Many of the existing instruments for measuring acculturation in Asian Americans and other ethnic minorities have been criticized for representing a unidimensional model of acculturation (Kim et al., 2001). Traditionally, adopting the behaviors or values of the dominant group was considered contrary and opposite to maintaining the behaviors or values of one's indigenous group. Current theory considers these phenomena as occurring on two separate dimensions, requiring an orthogonal model to be utilized in measures of acculturation (Kim et al., 2001). Another criticism of previous measures of acculturation is the emphasis placed upon behavioral acculturation, to the neglect of values acculturation, which prevents drawing relationships between culture and outcomes (Kim et al., 1999). Recent studies of acculturation have utilized instruments of an orthogonal nature.

The Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale. The Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS; Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004) is one such measure. This instrument employs a multidimensional approach, including orthogonal assessments of acculturation to the culture of origin (AAMAS-CO), European American culture (AAMAS-EA), and pan-ethnic Asian American culture (AAMAS-AA; Gim Chung, 2006). Items on the SL-ASIA (Suinn et al., 1987) were adapted to a multidimensional design for the AAMAS by asking respondents to rate each item according to three groups: (a) their Asian culture of origin, (b) the mainstream European American or host culture, and (c) other Asian American cultures.

Using a sample of 342 (223 females, 118 males, 1 not indicated) Asian American undergraduate university students, concurrent validity of the AAMAS scales was determined with correlation coefficients between the scores for the AAMAS scales and scores for the SL-ASIA (Suinn, et al., 1987). Coefficient alphas obtained for the AAMAS scales were .87 for the

AAMAS-CO, .78 for the AAMAS-AA, and .81 for the AAMAS-EA, supporting reliability of the instrument (Chung et al., 2004). Criterion-related validity was ascertained by correlating the AAMAS scales with participants' generational status. As predicted, the correlation between AAMAS-CO and generational status showed an inverse relationship at -.36, while the correlations between the other AAMAS scales and generational status were not significant. Exploratory factor analysis determined that the AAMAS scales all have a similar four-factor structure representing association with people (Cultural Identity), language proficiency (Language), information about culture (Cultural Knowledge), and food consumption (Food Consumption).

The creators of the AAMAS further tested the scale in another study of 138 Asian American undergraduate students at a west coast university. Participants completed the AAMAS, the Asian Values Scale (AVS; Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999), and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1968, as cited in Chung et al., 2004). Internal reliability of the AAMAS was assessed via computation of coefficient alphas for the AAMAS-CO, AAMAS-AA, and AAMAS-EA, which showed alphas of .89, .83, and .81, respectively. Criterion-related validity was explored by correlating AAMAS scores with generational status. Analyses revealed a significant negative correlation between AAMAS-CO and generational status, while there were no other significant correlations. The original AVS is a 36-item measure assessing adherence to several dimensions of Asian cultural values such as collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition through achievement, filial piety, and humility. For concurrent validity, the scales of the AAMAS were compared with the AVS ratings, yielding correlation coefficients for the AVS and AAMAS-CO, AAMAS-AA, and AAMAS-EA of .37, .18, and -.25, respectively. Confirmatory factor analysis was run on each AAMAS scale to test the validity of

a factor structure obtained from exploratory analysis. The results seem to signify construct validity of the AAMAS scales.

In a third study, the creators of the scale examined test-retest reliability and internal consistency. Participants were 44 Korean Americans living in Southern California. They completed the AAMAS and a demographic section two weeks apart. Coefficient alphas obtained for the AAMAS scales were .87 for the AAMAS-CO, .78 for the AAMAS-AA, and .81 for the AAMAS-EA, supporting reliability of the instrument (Chung, et al., 2004). Criterion-related validity was ascertained by correlation of the AAMAS scales with participants' generational status. As predicted, the correlation between AAMAS-CO and generational status showed a significant inverse relationship, while the correlations between the other AAMAS scales and generational status were not significant. Exploratory factor analysis determined that the AAMAS scales all have a similar four-factor structure representing association with people (Cultural Identity), language proficiency (Language), information about culture (Cultural Knowledge), and food consumption (Food Consumption).

These studies of the AAMAS offered strong evidence in support of the reliability and validity of the AAMAS (Chung et al., 2004). Internal consistency and test-retest coefficients for the subscales showed adequate reliability, while the alpha coefficients were stable across four independent administrations, with a range of .87 to .91 for the AAMAS-CO, .78 to .83 for the AAMAS-AA, and .76 to .81 for the AAMAS-EA. The AAMAS-CO was the most reliable subscale. Criterion-related validity was also acceptable, as evidenced in the predicted pattern of correlations between AAMAS-CO and generational status. Increases in generational status were associated with decreased adherence to culture of origin, while generational status was not linked

to the Asian American or European American cultural elements. Results of examination of concurrent validity and divergent validity were as expected.

While Chung et al. (2004) make the case for a pan-ethnic approach to studying Asian American identity based on the supposition that there is a level of common cultures between ethnic subgroups, they also acknowledge that a certain length of residence in the U.S. is necessary for connectedness and communality of experience with other Asian communities within the host nation to contribute to the development of a pan-ethnic identity. These three studies of the AAMAS surveyed Asian American pan-ethnic subgroups, with the exception of one Korean American subgroup. In future research, larger sample sizes including adequate subgroups of Asian American ethnic groups would better inform the literature on the AAMAS.

Recently, Kim and Omizo (2006) employed the AAMAS in research examining acculturation, enculturation, and psychological functioning among Asian American college students. Specifically, the researchers investigated behavioral acculturation to U.S. cultural norms and behavioral enculturation to Asian cultural norms in relation to acculturative stress, attitudes toward seeking professional psychological help, cognitive flexibility, collective self-esteem, and general self-efficacy. The results of this study showed that acculturation and enculturation were both positively related to collective self-esteem, and that acculturation was positively related to cognitive flexibility, collective self-esteem, and general self-efficacy. Further research exploring acculturation and psychological functioning among Asian Americans is needed, as well as studies expanding on prior use of instruments such as the AAMAS and SL-ASIA.

In summary, the authors reported reliability of the AAMAS with coefficient alphas of .87 for the AAMAS-CO, .78 for the AAMAS-AA, and .81 for the AAMAS-EA, in a sample of

university students (Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004). In the same study they also found criterion-related validity with the correlation between AAMAS-CO and generational status indicating an inverse relationship at -.36, and the correlations between the other AAMAS scales and generational status were not significant. Other studies of the AAMAS have suggested additional support for the reliability and validity of the AAMAS (Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004). Reliability has been demonstrated by internal consistency and test-retest coefficients. The alpha coefficients were constant across four independent administrations, ranging from .87 to .91 for the AAMAS-CO, .78 to .83 for the AAMAS-AA, and .76 to .81 for the AAMAS-EA. Findings have shown the AAMAS-CO to be the most reliable subscale.

The Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale. The Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS; Stephenson, 2000) is a 32-item measure developed to assess acculturation, applicable for use across a variety of ethnic groups, using a bidimensional model. The SMAS was designed to explore both immersion into a dominant society as well as retention of an ethnic society, and yields both Dominant Society Immersion (DSI) and Ethnic Society Immersion (ESI) scores. The DSI scale has 15 items and the ESI scale 17 items, with both scales measuring the areas of language, interaction, media and food, with items within each area reflecting knowledge, behaviors, and attitudes (Huynh, Howell, & Benet-Martinez, 2009). The 32 items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale from 1 (false) through 4 (true). Three studies were conducted in the development of the SMAS (Stephenson, 2000). In the initial study, an item pool was developed from a review of acculturation literature, acculturation instruments already in existence, expert consultant reviews, multiethnic research team reviews, and field tests with two samples. This resulted in a preliminary version of the SMAS with 95 items, 47 reflecting immersion in dominant society and 48 reflecting immersion in one's ethnic society. Items were

meant to measure the areas of language, interaction, media, and food. In the second study, the factor structure, internal consistency, and construct validity of the SMAS was studied. Using exploratory factor analysis, 32 items from the initial 95-item SMAS were retained, including the 15 items related to DSI and the 17 items related to ESI. Coefficient alphas were .86 for the entire SMAS, .97 for Factor 1 (17 items related to ESI) and .90 for Factor 2 (15 items related to DSI). For Factor 1, item total correlations ranged from .51 to .87 while for Factor 2 these ranged from .57 to .83. Means were computed by generation for each item, with DSI increasing and ESI decreasing for the first three successive generations. Two analyses of variance found significant differences between generations on DSI and ESI means. In the third study, the factor structure of the second study was examined across samples and the convergent and discriminant validity of the SMAS were evaluated. Confirmatory factor analysis showed consistency with the exploratory factor analysis results in the second study, and proved robust across samples. Coefficient alphas were .94 for Factor 1 and .75 for Factor 2. In order to assess validity, the SMAS was correlated with two acculturation scales, with the DSI and ESI positively correlated with several scales.

The SMAS was the first acculturation instrument designed to be applicable across ethnic groups (Stephenson, 2000). While the SMAS does not address all possible domains related to acculturation, nor specifically measure beliefs or values, it does measure degree of immersion in both dominant and ethnic societies. It is a reliable and valid scale, as judged by preliminary studies. Some limitations in the development of the SMAS include the small sample sizes, data based on nonrandom sampling, and all participants being administered the scale in English. While the test author expected third- and fourth-generation participants to be more immersed in dominant society compared to first- and second-generation participants, and while this

expectation was supported by preliminary findings, it is not clear whether the DSI scores truly support this hypothesis or reflect a limitation in use of the scale with latter generations. An additional limitation is the number of items referring to country of origin and language, where many fourth-generation participants were unaware of their family's country of origin. Thus, this instrument may be more applicable for assessing acculturation in newer immigrants, specifically first- and second-generation participants.

Huynh et al. (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of several bidimensional acculturation scales, including the SMAS. These investigators found that on average, the GEQ, SMAS, and VAI resulted in alpha coefficients above .80 on dominant and non-dominant culture scales across a variety of samples, making them adequate tools for research but questionable for use in clinical settings.

Asian Values

The Asian Values Scale. The Asian Values Scale (AVS; Kim et al., 1999) addresses both behaviors and values. Four studies were conducted in the development and exploration of the psychometric properties of the original 36-item AVS. Exploratory factory analysis was employed to create six subscales: (1) Conformity to Norms, (2) Family Recognition Through Achievement, (3) Emotional Self-Control, (4) Collectivism, (5) Humility, and (6) Filial Pity. Confirmatory factor analysis offered evidence of both concurrent and discriminant validity of the AVS (Kim et al., 1999). Additional analyses revealed coefficient alphas of .77 for Conformity to Norms, .72 for Family Recognition through Achievement, .52 for Emotional Self-Control, .56 for Collectivism, .55 for Humility, and .44 for Filial Piety, indicating that the six factors cannot be employed as subscales because of the low coefficient alphas. However, a total AVS score may be utilized. In a second study with Asian Americans, the coefficient alphas for the six

subscales were .69 for Conformity to Norms, .62 for Family Recognition through Achievement, .47 for Emotional Self-Control, .54 for Collectivism, .57 for Humility, and .38 for Filial Piety (Kim et al., 1999). Again, due to the low coefficient alphas for the six factors, it was determined that these variables cannot be used as subscales. A total AVS score is utilized in order to measure observance of Asian cultural values. Analyses conducted to assess internal consistency indicated coefficient alphas of .81 and .82 for the complete AVS in two different studies. Finally, an investigation of test-retest reliability, in which the AVS was administered two weeks apart, yielded a coefficient of .83, supporting stability of this instrument.

In summary, the authors reported several studies indicating internal consistency of the AVS, with coefficient alphas for the total scale ranging from .81 to .82 (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999). In addition, the coefficient alphas for the subscales ranged from .77 to .69 for Conformity to Norms, .72 to .62 for Family Recognition Through Achievement, .52 to .47 for Emotional Self-Control, .56 to .54 for Collectivism, .55 to .57 for Humility, and .44 to .38 for Filial Piety. Test-retest reliability was established by administering the AVS two weeks apart, yielding a coefficient of .83.

A limitation in the development of the AVS was the method used to survey Asian American graduate students and professionals from diverse ethnic backgrounds in order to generate a list of values believed to be generalizable across Asian cultures. The factors differentiating between first-generation Asian American and European Americans may change according to age, education, and other attributes. Furthermore, it cannot be assumed that the AVS captures the varying degrees of adherence to the cultural values across the many Asian ethnic groups included in the broad Asian American category. Future research should address the AVS scores of different Asian ethnic groups.

The Asian Values Scale Revised. A revised form of the AVS, the Asian Values Scale

Revised (AVS-R; Kim & Hong, 2004), was developed in 2004. Eleven items from the original

scale were eliminated due to being identified as ambiguous or repetitive (AVS-R; Kim & Hong,

2004; Liu & Iwamoto, 2007). In addition, the 7-point scale was collapsed into a 4-point scale.

Thus, the AVS-R is a 25-item measure designed to examine Asian cultural values; a 4-point

Likert scale follows each item with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly

agree." Like its predecessor, the AVS-R investigates two domains of acculturation: beliefs and

values. Six factors are represented in the AVS-R: Conformity to Norms, Family Recognition

Through Achievement, Emotional Self-Control, Collectivism, Humility, and Filial Piety. A total

AVS-R score is obtained from the scale. The AVS-R exhibits acceptable reliability and validity,

with a reliability estimate of .80 and a high correlation with the original version ($r = .93$). The

AVS-R is a favorable instrument for examining Asian cultural values as well as for

differentiating between high and low levels of adherence to Asian values.

The European American Values Scale for Asian Americans. The European American

Values Scale for Asian Americans (EAVS-AA; Wolfe, Yang, Wong, & Atkinson, 2001) consists

of 18 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale and also yields a total score of values. In order to

create the Preliminary EAVS-AA, the researchers engaged in: (a) a review of empirical studies

and publications concerning Asian and European American values, (b) generation of a list of 26

values presumed to discriminate between first-generation Asian Americans and European

Americans, (c) location of pertinent items from a cross-cultural sourcebook of the World Values

Survey (WVS; Inglehart, Basanez, & Moreno, 1993), (d) elimination of items that did not

address values, (e) comparison of values from the literature review, (f) creation of value domains

reflecting values in each of the validated WVS items, (g) construction of the EAVS-AA

reflecting the 36 domains, and (h) examination of each set of 10 items to choose 5 items to best represent the value domain. This resulted in the 180-item Preliminary EAVS-AA, covering 36 value domains.

The creators of the initial measure then administered the scale, along with a demographic questionnaire, to a sample of Asian American and European American students enrolled in courses at two community colleges and two universities in California (Wolfe et al., 2001). The researchers suggested that the EAVS-AA is an initial step in measuring Asian American acculturation to European American cultural values, and that when this measure is utilized in conjunction with the AVS, the two measures can offer a bilinear assessment of Asian American enculturation and acculturation (Wolfe et al., 2001). While development of items for the AVS relied upon values identified by Asian American psychologists and student focus groups, development of the EAVS-AA relied upon values derived from the Western Values Scale (WVS; Inglehart et al., 1993, as cited in Wolfe et al., 2001). In comparing the items on the two measures, only four items on the EAVS-AA reflect the reverse wording of items on the AVS. The Asian American and European American cultures therefore cannot be viewed simply as direct opposites, despite the dichotomous thinking of individualism-collectivism often involved in conceptualization of these two cultures (Wolfe et al., 2001). It is important to note that European Americans scored significantly higher than Asian Americans on just 26 of 180 items that supposedly reflect European American values, while Asian Americans scored significantly higher than European Americans on only 36 of 112 items supposedly reflecting Asian American values (Kim et al., 1999; Wolfe et al., 2001). This raises questions regarding the distinction between Asian and European values, especially since there were no significant differences between first-generation Asian Americans and European Americans for many of the values

identified. First-generation Asian Americans reported adherence to both Asian American values on the AVS and weaker adherence to European American values on the EAVS-AA in comparison to European Americans. Neither of these scales offers values that belong exclusively to Asian American culture or European American culture. Instead, these values can be found in each of these cultures to varying degrees. Future research directions might address the relationship between generation level and Asian American scores on the EAVS-AA to validate the measure, as one limitation of this study was the use of only first- and second-generation Asian Americans. Internal consistency was determined with a coefficient alpha of .69.

Kim and Omizo (2005) employed both the AVS and EAVS-AA in a study of Asian American college students, in which Asian and European American cultural values were examined in relation to acculturative stress, collective self-esteem, cognitive flexibility, and general self-efficacy. The results indicated that adherence to Asian and European American values both positively predicted collective self-esteem, but neither was significantly related to the other variables studied. In addition, the results revealed that adherence to European American values predicted cognitive flexibility and general self-efficacy. The investigators found that adherence to European American cultural values was somewhat more predictive of collective self-esteem, than was adherence to Asian American cultural values. They hypothesized that this minute difference may be due to navigation through the majority host culture and mastery of European American values fostering greater appreciation of, and attachment to, the Asian American group. They also concluded that this explanation was speculative and that future research is required.

In summary, the research on instruments developed to measure acculturation points to benefits in conceptualizing acculturation according to a bidimensional model, rather than a unidimensional one. There is some question as to whether or not instruments containing items assessing behavioral and values acculturation do in fact tap into these constructs to differentiate between Asian values and European values. Researchers should be skeptical and continue investigations in this area, as the validity of these scales has not been established.

Ethnic Identity

While acculturation describes adjustment to a host or majority culture through behaviors and values, ethnic identity refers to the degree to which an individual identifies as a member of a particular ethnic group with a sense of belonging (Tsai et al., 2002). In addition, ethnic orientation describes an individual's feelings regarding, and level of engagement in, different cultures. As researchers have commonly employed measures such as the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (GEQ; Tsai et al., 2000), Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), and Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn et al., 1987) to study such constructs, the literature often uses these terms interchangeably. However, these constructs are in fact considered to be distinct.

Ethnic identity is defined as the degree to which one sees oneself as belonging or having membership in a particular ethnic group (Tsai et al., 2002). It is considered a key element in self-concept, and is especially important during adolescence when ego identity formation occurs (Phinney, Romero, Nava, & Huang, 2001; Roberts et al., 1999). Ethnic identity has also been positively linked to increased well-being, and poor ethnic identity is related to poor self esteem (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, &Vedder, 2001). The distinction between acculturation and ethnic identity has often appeared blurred in the literature, with these terms being used

interchangeably (Phinney, 1990). Acculturation is the process of adjusting to a different culture, involving changing attitudes, behaviors, and values due to interaction between two cultures. In contrast, the concept of ethnic identity can be considered a separate entity referring to a sense of belonging to a particular group (Phinney & Horenczyk, et al., 2001). However, while differing acculturation styles may be exhibited depending on the context (e.g., behavior in a school or work setting versus the private home), ethnic identity remains stable regardless of circumstances, according to the stage of ethnic identity development.

In the social identity perspective, researchers focus on one's sense of affirmation and belonging to a group, as well as the attitudes and emotions associated with a sense of group membership (Phinney et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 1999). In this view, group identity is a prominent factor in self-concept, with individuals typically attributing positive values to the group in which they belong, as well as obtaining self-esteem from their sense of belonging to the group. Ethnic identity is just one form of group membership contributing to the self-concept of members of ethnic minority groups, and is accompanied by ethnic attitudes and a sense of group belonging.

While ethnic identity is widely recognized as a major factor influencing the well-being of ethnic group members, there has been much variability in theories and measurement of the concept. The two major paradigms employed in ethnic identity research are the developmental theory of Erikson (1968) and social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In the developmental approach, based on the work of Erikson (1968), researchers emphasize the process in the formation of ethnic identity. Several researchers have proposed ethnic identity development models similar to Erikson's design (Roberts et al., 1999).

Erikson (1968) cited identity development as an important aspect of adolescence, describing a struggle between Identity and Identity Confusion, during which time individuals determine who they are and in what direction their future will be. A process of exploration, usually occurring during adolescence, results in commitment to identity. Erikson (1968) recognized culture as a key factor in identity development, with ethnic minorities grappling to preserve their cultural identities and merge into the dominant culture simultaneously. For minority youths, the process of exploring identity and membership in an ethnic group within a larger society will likely involve curiosity about the history and traditions of the ethnic group, as well as facing issues such as discrimination (Phinney et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 1999). Mentors may be found in parents and other ethnic group members, and increased ethnic identity is thought to contribute to positive self-evaluation.

Researchers (Atkinson, Morton, & Sue, 1993; Cross, 1991; Helms, 1990; Phinney, 1989, 1993) who have suggested developmental models of identity development similar to Erikson's (1968) describe an initial stage characterized by a lack of awareness or understanding of one's ethnicity (Roberts et al., 1999). This stage concludes when an adolescent participates in the identity formation process by exploring their group in order to increase knowledge. The second stage ideally ends when an individual has developed an informed ethnic identity and secure sense of group membership. In developmental models, ethnic identity will differ by age, with younger adolescents expected to have less developed commitment in comparison to older adolescents.

Traditionally, it has been posited that adolescence is a pivotal time in development for ethnic minorities, as they may confront their cultural and ethnic differences for the first time during this period (Markstrom-Adams & Spencer, 1994; Phinney & Rosenthal, 1992; Smith, 1994; Spencer & Dornbusch, 1990; Spencer & Markstrom-Adams, 1990). From this

perspective, adolescents have a newfound cognitive ability to analyze cultural and ethnic information that was not possible during childhood (Santrock, 1996). Researchers argue that ethnic minority adolescents may be affected in their life choices and plans due to awareness of conflicting values, negative judgments, and constrained occupational prospects in the dominant culture (Spencer & Dornbusch, 1990). Furthermore, ethnic minority youth may not be exposed to ethnic minority role models in the way that members of the dominant culture are (Santrock, 1996).

Developmental and social psychology perspectives both point to a positive link between ethnic identity and self-esteem (Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, &Vedder, 2001). Furthermore, in both the developmental and social identity views, group identity is recognized as positively affecting the psychological well-being of group members (Roberts et al., 1999).

The ethnic identity of children have been found to be strongly influenced by parental socialization, as well as other experiences with adults and other role models in the ethnic community who can foster a positive in-group experience. Children of ethnic minority immigrants contend with not only the normal developmental transition from adolescence to adulthood, but also the added issue of negotiating two potentially contrary sets of cultural values (Phinney, Ong, & Madden, 2000).

Social identity theorists assert that group identification is strongly related to self-concept, with an individual working to maintain a positive social identity that contributes to self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Such a positive social identity is formed in part by making favorable comparisons between ingroup and germane outgroups. It then follows that valuing the attributed characteristics, customs, and values of one's group would contribute positively to one's self-esteem. However, when faced with negative stereotypes of one's ingroup, individuals may be at

risk for low self-esteem due to internalization of society's devaluation of the ingroup, and might even choose to distance themselves from the ingroup in order to pursue identities based on other distinct traits. Immigrants often face derogatory stereotypes in a new country, but if awareness of devaluation of the ingroup is not internalized, then self-esteem is not necessarily in danger.

Several factors are viewed as contributing to ethnic identity formation (Phinney et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 1999). Ethnic language proficiency allows ingroup speech, thereby contributing to cultural cohesiveness and transmission of heritage. Parental attitudes regarding cultural maintenance, including participation in ethnic organizations, also contribute to increased ethnic identity in children and adolescents. Finally, ethnic social interaction also offers peer relationships that support increased ethnic identity. Phinney and Kohatsu (1997) discovered some support for the suggestion that in the earliest stage of ethnic identity development, involving an undeveloped ethnic identity, there may be a higher incidence of feelings of inadequacy or lower regard for self, in comparison to the last stage of ethnic identity achievement, where there may be an absence of psychological distress and also a positive self-concept. Phinney (1989) found that subjects classified in the initial stage of ethnic identity development suffered from the poorest self-concept, while those in the higher stage enjoyed the most positive self-concept. An achieved ethnic identity provides a secure sense of an individual's ethnicity and also puts to rest doubts about one's ethnic group. An achieved ethnic identity also is believed to contribute to positive feelings about one's ethnic group, as well as resilience and a positive view of the self (Phinney, 1989; Phinney & Kohatsu, 1997).

Phinney and Alipuria (1990) discovered that among ethnic minority college students, ethnic identity exploration is higher than among European American college students. Furthermore, these researchers found that ethnic minority college students who had explored and

resolved issues concerning their ethnic identity enjoyed higher self-esteem in comparison to their ethnic minority peers who had not done so.

Ethnic identity development in young college students might be aided by newfound autonomy from parental-cultural socialization when individuals attend college, find employment, or gain a new residence (Lee & Yoo, 2004). In addition, ethnic minority individuals may be exposed to ethnically diverse classmates or organizations, as well as coursework prompting ethnic identity engagement.

While some researchers (Lee & Yoo, 2004; Phinney, 1992) have suggested that ethnic identity peaks and sets during late adolescence and early adulthood – corresponding with Erikson's (1968) stage of Identity versus Identity Confusion – studies are now pointing to a lifespan perspective of ethnic identity development (Lee & Yoo, 2004; Ontai-Grzebik & Raffaelli, 2004). Lee and Yoo (2004) investigated ethnic identity among Asian American college students, using three published datasets with samples from large public universities. These researchers concluded that younger adolescents might not yet possess a clear sense of ethnic identity in comparison to college students who tend to have a more clearly developed ethnic identity. They also speculated that certain groups of Asian Americans might form ethnic identity differently than others, due to political and social events in history, as well as unique life experiences. Ontai-Grzebik and Rafaelli (2004) explored ethnic identity patterns by age, across late adolescence and early adulthood among samples of Latino participants aged 19-30. The results of this study pointed to ethnic identity achievement differing across Latino subgroups, but offered support for the contention that ethnic identity development is primarily developed during adolescence and early adulthood. Perhaps the most notable guide of a lifespan perspective is

Phinney's (1989) model of ethnic identity development, based upon Marcia's (1966) model of identity formation in adolescents.

In Marcia's model of identity development, adolescents progress through four stages of ideology and occupational exploration: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement. Marcia described a crisis as a period that individuals encounter during adolescence, during which time one must choose among meaningful alternatives. Other researchers have substituted Marcia's term crisis with the word exploration. Marcia used the term commitment to refer to a part of identity development where individuals make personal investments in their plans. In Marcia's model, identity diffusion characterizes a period in which an individual has not yet experienced a crisis and so has not explored meaningful alternatives. Identity foreclosure describes a phase during which an individual has made a commitment to an alternative but has not experienced a crisis. Identity moratorium is a stage where an individual is in the middle of a crisis but for whom commitments are absent or not clearly delineated. Finally, identity achievement is a time where an individual has experienced a crisis and subsequently has made a commitment. Although the work of Marcia addressed personal rather than ethnic identity, it laid the groundwork for conceptualizing ethnic identity according to a stage model.

In Phinney's (1989) original proposed model, one's exposure to life experiences and psychological maturity lead to movement from one phase of ethnic identity development to another, from the diffuse stage to the foreclosed to the moratorium, and finally to the achieved stage. During adolescence, individuals are usually in the diffuse stage, without commitment or exploration of one's ethnic identity, or the foreclosed stage, with commitment to one's ascribed ethnic identity without exploration of the significance of this identity (Phinney, 1989). Individuals who examine their ethnic identity and its significance prior to committing to it or

another one are in the moratorium stage. Finally, those who thoroughly explore and commit to an ethnic identity are said to be in the achievement stage. Later, Phinney (1993) modified this model, paring it down to three stages of ethnic identity development, including (1) unexamined identity, (2) ethnic identity search/moratorium, and (3) ethnic identity achievement. Several studies (Ying & Lee, 1999) of Asian Americans have offered support for Phinney's model of ethnic identity development.

In a study by Ohata (2002), ethnic identity in Japanese Americans appeared to increase between the Sansei to the Yonsei generation. This may be due to a renewed interest allowed by the absence of the tumultuous historical events present during the development of the Issei, Nisei, and Sansei generations, such as the denial of citizenship and land ownership, and the WW II internment of Japanese Americans. The participants in this study were third and fourth generation non-racially mixed Japanese Americans who completed the Japanese American Questionnaire, Ethnic Identity Questionnaire, Contrasting Values Opinion Survey, and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. Ohata addressed the possibility of acculturation and assimilation by Japanese Americans, thus threatening this group's culture and ethnic identity. Results of the study showed that ethnic identity was retained in both generations, and that the fourth generation in fact exhibited more ethnic identity retention than the former generation. Ohata conjectured that these findings might be attributed to renewed interest in Japanese culture by the fourth generation, and emphasized the need to include the fifth generation as well as racially mixed Japanese Americans in subsequent research.

Yoo and Lee (2005) conducted a study of ethnic identity as a moderating factor of the effects of frequent racial discrimination on the well-being of Asian Americans. Participants were 155 Asian American college students. Participants were administered the MEIM, Coping

Strategies Inventory (CSI; Tobin et al., 1984, as cited in Yoo & Lee, 2005), Asian American Perceived Discrimination Scale (P-Disc, Yoo & Lee, 2005), Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener & Emmons, 1985), and the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).

As expected, data analyses revealed that ethnic identity was significantly associated with the use of social support coping and problem solving coping in facing racial discrimination. The relationship between ethnic identity and cognitive restructuring was in line with the expectation but not statistically significant. For generation status, significant multivariate effects were found. A between-subjects test located a significant generation difference on ethnic identity, social support coping, cognitive restructuring coping, and problem solving coping. Immigrants reported higher levels of ethnic identity and greater use of social support coping, cognitive restructuring coping, and problem solving coping in dealing with racial discrimination when compared to U.S.-born Asian Americans.

The results of this study only provided partial support for the hypotheses. A strong ethnic identity was related to more frequent use of social support and problem solving coping when individuals perceived racial discrimination. Yet contrary to the hypotheses, Asian Americans with strong ethnic identity and high use of cognitive restructuring or problem solving coping were insulated from the effects of racial discrimination on well-being only when racial discrimination was perceived to be low, but not when perceived to be high. It is possible that Asian Americans with greater ethnic identity are able to deal effectively with racial discrimination until exposure becomes so frequent so as to create a sense of burnout when coping strategies lose effectiveness. It is also probable that for individuals with strong ethnic identity, attacks on one's group are greatly internalized as a personal attack on the individual. In

40

addition, it is possible that adaptive coping styles are only effective for experiences with minimal

threat and of a temporary nature. Some limitations of the study include limited significance of

the results, need for more reliability and validity testing of the employed measures, effects of the

correlational design on limiting the directionality between variables, and the effectiveness of the

coping strategies depending on the type of stressors presented. Even with these limitations, this

research sheds light on the potential for ethnic identity to preserve well-being in the face of racial

discrimination in certain limited contexts.

Measures of ethnic identity. Many ethnic identity measures have focused on unique

characteristics of specific ethnic groups rather than assessing ethnic identity as a universal

phenomenon having common characteristics across ethnic groups (Roberts et al., 1999). The

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) was developed in order to assess

ethnic identity across diverse samples, with attention to three subscales: (a) affirmation and

belonging, (b) ethnic identity achievement, and (c) ethnic behaviors. These subscales were based

upon developmental models of ethnic identity.

The MEIM was developed by sampling ethnically diverse high school and college

students across a period of five years (Lee & Yoo, 2004; Phinney, 1992). The MEIM exhibited

good internal reliability and validity in original analyses. While the scale was designed to assess

three facets of ethnic identity, exploratory factor analyses located only one general factor.

However, other investigators have distinguished a two-factor structure of the MEIM measuring

ethnic identity engagement and ethnic identity pride. Employing exploratory factor analysis with

principal-axis extraction, Roberts et al. (1999) found that the MEIM was comprised of two

components in a sample of diverse adolescents in the southwestern U.S. These findings were

replicated in a later study by Spencer, Icard, Harachi, Catalano, and Oxford (2000) using a

smaller sample of adolescents in the western U.S., with the same method of analysis. Both research groups used multigroup confirmatory factor analyses to conclude that the MEIM functions equivalently across monoracial or multiracial ethnic groups. Phinney suggested that the ethnic identity group measures be validated with consideration of particular ethnic and racial groups, gender, generation status, contextual factors, and connections with dominant culture and psychological well-being.

According to Lee and Yoo (2004), who studied the MEIM for use with Asian American college students, exploratory factor analysis identified a three-factor structure that represents Phinney's (1992) theoretical model. These factors were termed EI-Clarity (corresponding with achievement), EI-Pride (corresponding with affirmation and belonging), and EI-Engage (corresponding with behaviors) by the investigators. The derived scales showed satisfactory reliability and construct validity. Furthermore, concurrent validity was shown with measures of self-esteem and social connectedness. These researchers stated that past studies might have failed to identify a three-factor structure due to improper analyses. They concluded that the MEIM is applicable to both adolescents and young adults.

In summary, the MEIM was developed using ethnically diverse samples of high school and college students across a 5-year time period, and demonstrated good internal reliability and validity across studies. The author reported that the measure has consistently been found to have good reliability, with coefficient alphas of .80 or higher when used with a range of ages and ethnic groups.

Well-being

The literature in the field of well-being can be divided into two streams of thought: (1) subjective well-being, and (2) meaning of life (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers,

1976). The concept of subjective well-being appeared in the latter half of the twentieth century, stemming from a need to measure quality of life in order to observe social change and inform social policy (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). The subjective well-being tradition examines happiness and human potential within a framework of humanistic values.

Subjective well-being. Early writers on subjective well-being identified happiness and life satisfaction as crucial components of life quality (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell et al., 1976). According to Campbell and associates (1976), life satisfaction echoes one's perceived distance from one's aspirations. Bradburn (1969) articulated happiness as the result of a balance between positive and negative affect.

Subjective well-being is comprised of several components, including one's domain satisfactions, affective responses, and global evaluation of life satisfaction (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999). It has been defined by two principal concepts of positive functioning: (a) happiness, defined as the balance between positive and negative affect, and (b) satisfaction with life, which is the chief indicator of well-being (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Researchers studying subjective well-being focus on affective and cognitive components that factor into one's subjective judgment of well-being. Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) proposed that pleasant and unpleasant affect are separate factors, warranting separate scrutiny. Some investigators examining pleasant and unpleasant affect have indeed found that these two variables are independent and can be measured separately, especially since the two factors become increasingly unconnected across time (Diener et al., 1999).

Diener and Emmons (1984) conducted five studies on the relationship between positive and negative affect, using self-report measures of happiness with undergraduate students. In Study 1 they administered a list of positive and negative affect words, asking participants in

43

Sample A (N = 112) to rate the extent to which they had experienced each of the 24 emotions in the past 12 months, while those in Sample B (N = 346) were asked to rate the same words as well as indicate two additional emotions. Another group of 167 undergraduate students completed Bradburn's (1965) Positive Affect Scale (PAS) and Negative Affect Scale (NAS). The results of this study lend support for the suggestion offered by Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) that positive and negative affects are independent.

In Study 2, cross-cultural data were obtained from 63 undergraduate students. Participants indicated the degree to which they experienced 6 positive emotions (delighted, happy, glad, content, satisfied, and pleased) and 6 negative emotions (annoyed, frustrated, miserable, sad, and depressed) in the past year, and completed the PAS and NAS. The results of this study showed that across a year, positive and negative words were independent, but across a month they were moderately inversely related. When items were summed into overall positive and negative affect scales, the scales correlated -.18 for the year period, but correlated -.63 for the month period. Although low, the correlation between the PAS and NAS was significant. Positive and negative affect were independent across a longer time period in this cross-cultural sample of primarily black Caribbean students. One weakness of this study is its susceptibility to memory distortion, with some participants possibly having the ability to recall more of all affective experiences despite how much they truly experience, and some participants likely more apt to recall positive affect, while others might be more likely to remember negative affect. The effects of selective recall may also have been involved, given the long time period of a year.

In Study 3, Diener and Emmons (1984) addressed these issues by having 26 undergraduate students complete daily mood reports for 10 weeks consecutively. The between- and within-subject correlations between positive and negative affect were in different directions

both for the interitem correlations as well as those based on the positive and negative affect summed scores, suggesting that positive and negative affect vary inversely within days for individuals. Some problematic characteristics of this study included the small sample size (N = 26) and the single time period used in the daily rating.

In Study 4, 42 undergraduate students completed daily mood reports, and at three-week intervals. On these reports, participants were asked to rate the previous three weeks as a whole and report their overall feelings. Also, mood reports were completed when participants experienced strong emotion, whether positive or negative, but only once a day. Finally, participants reported where each of the scale numbers from zero to six would be on a continuum with positive affect words prescaled for intensity, thus allowing respondents to indicate the intensity of feeling intended by their number responses.

The alpha coefficient for positive affect was .89, and for negative affect it was .84. Temporal stability coefficients were computed two ways: an odd-even reliability by comparing odd versus even days across participants, and three-week stability coefficients by comparing the initial three weeks of the study with the latter three weeks. The positive affect coefficients were .83 and .79, and those for negative affect were .87 and .81, lending support for the reliability of the scales. Between- and within-subject correlations between summed positive and summed negative affect scores yielded the finding that these correlations differ to a certain degree depending on the time period. For the within-subject calculations, the most significant negative correlation between the two affects occurred during the strong emotion times (r = -.85), and decreased with increasing time period covered. The smallest correlation for positive and negative affect occurred in the three-week period (-.10), showing that the shorter the time period, the more negatively correlated the positive and negative affect.

These findings support the idea that individuals likely do not experience positive and negative affect concurrently, particularly at intense levels. The between-subject correlations were not significantly different from zero, as they were based on overall mean differences between subjects. The within-subject interitem correlations were akin to the within-subject correlations that were based on summed positive and negative affect scores. While the Crowne-Marlowe scale correlated with negative affect, it did not correlate with positive affect. The results of the correlations did not offer a clear explanation as to why positive and negative affect appear to be separate over longer periods of time. As with many other studies, this one sampled university students and it is questionable whether the results can be generalized to other populations.

In Study 5, participants were 34 adults ranging in age from 33 to 85 years. Participants completed mood reports daily for 30 consecutive days, using the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Again, between- and within- correlations were computed both for the interitem as well as the summed positive and negative affect scores. The within-subject correlations between summed positive and negative affect scores were similar to those found in the prior studies. The PANAS was found to be reliable and orthogonal in nature. Notably, the PANAS was applicable from early adulthood to late adulthood. Both the PA and NA scales have good internal reliability estimates (α = .87-.88; test-retest over an 8-week interval, r = .68-.71). In addition, they exhibit convergent and discriminant validity with other emotional well-being and psychological distress measures.

Diener, Smith, and Fujita (1995) examined affect among a sample of 222 university students. They collected data on participants' emotional lives with 24 emotion terms capable of being grouped to form scales for seven emotion categories. Selection of emotions was

systematic via analysis of six theories reflecting three theoretical perspectives on emotion: the cognitive tradition, the biological-evolutionary tradition, and the empirical tradition. A list of emotion categories was developed for each of the six theories, with emotions selected if they were listed by at least one theorist from each of the three theoretical perspectives. The resulting seven emotion categories were: anger-disgust, fear, shame-guilt, sadness, joy, love, and surprise, yielding four unpleasant emotion categories, two pleasant emotion categories, and one of undetermined value (surprise).

Participants completed self-reports of emotion adjectives during the fifth week of the semester, while family and friends submitted confidential reports of the same emotion adjectives for the participants. Participants also completed an emotion reporting task daily for 52 consecutive days. Across all methods, it was found that pleasant emotions were experienced more frequently than were unpleasant emotions, and that PA and NA were again interdependent.

In the well-being literature, researchers have also looked at cognitive evaluations of life satisfaction, which is also a separate factor from pleasant and unpleasant affect. Satisfaction with life is defined as an individual's global assessment of quality of life, according to that individual's own criteria and subjective judgments (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Such judgments of satisfaction with life depend upon one's situation and beliefs regarding what constitutes the appropriate standards by which to measure this construct. In this vein, the standards for judging satisfaction with life are set by each individual rather than externally imposed by researchers or theorists. While health and wealth have been identified by some as contributors to happiness, it is paramount that individuals be able to weight domains (e.g., health or wealth) when determining what comprises happiness for oneself, as values vary by culture and individual. Researchers have stated that in order to be happy, one must have total satisfaction

with life as a whole, and this involves moving beyond satisfaction in specific domains to the large picture such that individuals must report satisfaction with life as a whole (Diener et al., 1985).

The definition of well-being remains up for debate, with the meaning of this concept and the factors fostering it presenting an issue in cross-cultural research (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Researchers have yet to identify universal indicators of well-being, and any definition of this concept is arguably culturally bound rather than free of imposed values. Some have suggested the use of covariance structure analyses, allowing investigators to evaluate the extent to which psychometric properties of a construct may be comparably modeled across diverse groups. Diener and Diener (1995) have explored cross-cultural factors in subjective well-being, and found that the strength of the relationship between subjective well-being and satisfaction with family, friends, and wealth differed by nation.

Hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Current thought on well-being can also be divided into categories of hedonic and eudaimonic well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). The former perspective focuses on happiness and defines well-being in terms of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance, while the latter view focuses on meaning and self-actualization, defining well-being in terms of degree of functioning.

Psychologists who advocate the hedonic view of well-being have focused on a broad idea of hedonism that includes the pleasure of both the body and the mind (Kubovy, 1999). The principal view held by hedonic psychologists is that well-being is comprised of subjective happiness and also encompasses the experience of pleasure versus displeasure including all conclusions regarding the positive and negative aspects of life. Thus, happiness is not defined as simple physical hedonism, as it can be obtained via achievement of goals or desirable outcomes

in multiple domains (Diener, Sapyta, & Suh, 1998). Kahneman and colleagues (1999) described hedonic psychology as the study of "what makes experiences and life pleasant and unpleasant." Much of the research in the area of hedonic psychology has employed evaluation of subjective well-being (Diener & Lucas, 1999). Yet there is the question of validity of such measures in creating operational definitions of hedonism and well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Psychologists who subscribe to the eudaimonic view of well-being eschew happiness itself as the chief marker of well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Instead, the main view put forth by eudaimonic psychologists is that well-being is not synonymous with happiness, and certain goals with pleasurable outcomes do not actually lead to positive benefits to individuals, nor further their wellness. Thus, subjective happiness does not necessarily result in well-being. Waterman (1993) posited that while happiness is delineated in hedonic terms, the concept of well-being as described in eudaimonic terms requires that individuals live in congruence with their true selves; well-being is achieved when one is fully engaged in life activities that reflect congruence with one's values.

Some researchers have suggested that well-being is multidimensional and encompasses both hedonic and eudaimonic components. Compton and colleagues (1996) explored the relationship between 18 indicators of mental health and well-being, and found two factors, one reflecting personal growth and the other reflecting subjective well-being, suggesting that hedonic and eudaimonic foci are distinct but may overlap such that well-being is best measured in multiple ways. King and Napa (1998) surveyed people's ratings of features of "the good life" and discovered that both happiness and meaning were identified. McGregor and Little (1998) also examined indicators of mental health and found two factors, one reflecting happiness and the other, meaningfulness. All of these researchers found that while there may be some overlap,

49

there are different factors influencing the convergence and divergence of hedonic and eudaimonic components of well-being.

Measures of Well-being

The Satisfaction with Life Scale. The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) is a measure of global life satisfaction, or subjective well-being. A strength of the SWLS is its ability to allow respondents to subjectively weight domains (e.g., health or wealth) in order to report satisfaction with life as a whole, rather than imposing researcher values on the relative importance of each domain (Diener et al., 1985; Pavot & Diener, 1993). Thus, respondents determine the appropriate and relevant criteria by which satisfaction with life may be evaluated, as this varies by individual and culture. Depending upon the scoring system used, the instrument has a reading level that is equivalent to the 6th to 10th grades within the U.S., thus rendering it appropriate for different age groups as it is applicable to most adolescents and adults in the U.S. (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Diener et al. (1985) reported high internal consistency and high temporal reliability, with coefficient alphas of .87 for the scale and .82 for test-retest reliability. Diener et al. (1995) reported good internal consistency with item-total correlations for the five SWLS items at .81, .63, .61, .75, and .66.

Several studies of the SWLS offer support for the good psychometric properties of the instrument. In a study of undergraduate students, Diener et al. (1985) found that the SWLS has high internal consistency and high temporal reliability, with coefficient alphas of .87 for the scale and .82 for test-retest reliability. Additionally, in a study of two samples of undergraduate students, Diener et al. (1995) found the SWLS to have good convergent validity with other scales as well as with other types of measures for subjective well-being. Scores on the SWLS had a correlation score of .02 with the Marlowe-Crowne (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) scale of social

desirability, thus indicating that the SWLS does not elicit a social desirability response set. In a final study with a sample of elderly persons, Diener et al. (1995) found that the SWLS correlated .46 with the Life Satisfaction Index (LSI; Adams, 1969) and .68 with interviewer composite of global life satisfaction of subjects. The item-total correlations for the five SWLS items were indicative of good internal consistency at .81, .63, .61, .75, and .66.

Meaning in life. The research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being raises questions regarding the importance of a holistic lifestyle incorporating the individual's personal expression in selection of goals and values, and the meaning of life in terms of engagement in chosen activities. Steger and associates (Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006) contend that meaning in life is an important aspect of well-being for consideration by counseling psychologists, and that improved measurement of this construct will help in evaluating success in therapeutic treatment. Theorists have expressed varying views on what constitutes meaning in life. While some have emphasized coherence in the individual's life, others have focused on goal pursuit and purposefulness (Battista & Almond, 1973; Reker & Wong, 1988; Ryff & Singer, 1998). In addition, the way to achieve meaning in life is also a point of debate. There is no standard that is applicable to every individual, and each person must establish meaning on a personal basis through development of a coherent life narrative or the pursuit of valued goals (Battista & Almond, 1973; Frankl, 1965; Kenyon, 2000; Klinger, 1977). Baumeister (1991) stated that a sense of meaning could be achieved by fulfilling needs for efficacy, purpose, self-worth, and value. Others have identified daily action and decision-making or self-transcendence as crucial in establishing meaning. However one chooses to conceptualize meaning in life and the accomplishment of this concept, researchers are in agreement that meaning is important. For example, counseling psychologists have noted the importance of meaning in life for career

counseling, a healthy personality, health psychology, and therapy (Day & Rottinghaus, 2003; Gelso & Woodhouse, 2003; Harris & Thoresen, 2003; Savickas, 2003). It has been hypothesized that meaning may foster the establishment of general happiness for clients, considering that they may present with a wish to become actualized or find a sense of purpose, or because they often seek treatment in the face of crises that offer the chance to grow (Lent, 2004).

Steger et al. (2006) reported that the most commonly used measures of meaning are the Purpose in Life Test (PIL; Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964), the Life Regard Index (LRI; Battista & Almond, 1973), and the Sense of Coherence Scale (SCS; Antonovsky, 1987). Less frequently, the Life Attitude Profile (LAP; Reker & Peacock, 1981) and the Life Attitude Profile – Revised (LAP-R; Reker, 1992) have been utilized. Criticisms of meaning in life scales have included the confounding of items with the variables correlated in research applications. For example, some items on the PIL and LRI might tap constructs such as mood, and negative mood items will covary with neuroticism (Clark & Watson, 1995; Steger et al., 2006). Some empirical evidence exists suggesting high correlations between the PIL and negative affect (Zika & Chamberlain, 1987), positive affect (Zika & Chamberlain, 1992), and life satisfaction (Chamberlain & Zika, 1988). Furthermore, empirical studies have shown that factor structures of meaning measures such as the PIL and LRI have actually varied between studies, which may be due to the inclusion of multiple content domains (Chamberlain & Zika, 1988; McGregor & Little, 1998).

In light of these limitations of meaning measures, Steger et al. (2006) designed a new meaning in life measure, defining meaning in life as "the sense made of, and significance felt regarding, the nature of one's being and existence." This definition was intended to capture all the main definitions of meaning while allowing respondents to reference their own criteria for

meaning. This is similar to the work of Diener et al. (1999) in allowing individuals to select their own criteria for evaluation of subjective well-being.

The Meaning in Life Questionnaire. Across three studies, the Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ; Steger et al., 2006) subscales of Presence of Meaning and Search for Meaning exhibited reliability and were found to be structurally sound for measuring the presence of meaning as well as the search for meaning. The subscales were determined to be independent and had different patterns of correlations with other measures such as the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985), the Long-Term Affect Scale (LTAS; Diener, Smith, & Fujita, 1995), Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI; Derogatis & Spencer, 1992), Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religiosity Scale (IERS; Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989), and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The Presence subscale also correlated with well-being, personality, and religiosity variables, and a multitrait-multimethod matrix study showed that the MLQ-P had better discriminant validity in comparison to the popular PIL and LRI. The MLQ-S was also found to be a measure distinct from other facets of meaning and well-being. The authors concluded that the MLQ is a more precise measure of presence and search for meaning with greater structural stability. Although the MLQ subscales consist of only five items each, the psychometric properties are equal or better than those of lengthier meaning in life instruments. High convergent correlations between the MLQ-P and other meaning measures suggest that they tap the same construct.

A strength of the MLQ is the ability to measure presence of and search for meaning independently (Steger et al., 2006). For counseling psychologists, this offers the opportunity to assess client personal growth through the search and attainment of meaning and purpose, and also evaluate well-being. Limitations of the studies conducted by the authors of the MLQ

include the use of convenience samples of university students. Norms must be established on older populations for whom meaning might be more crucial. In addition, the authors state that there is a paucity of cross-cultural research in this area, and data are needed regarding meaning of life in diverse cultures. The authors also conceded a limitation in utilizing self-report methods, and added that behavioral observation, experimental conditions, and longitudinal studies would all be beneficial in studying meaning in life.

In summary, the creators of the scale conducted several studies to assess the reliability and validity of the measure and established good internal reliability for the MLQ-P and MLQ-S, which were .81 and .84 during the first assessment and .86 and .92 at a later assessment. One-month test-retest reliability coefficients were favorable with .70 for the MLQ-P and .73 for the MLQ-S. The MLQ appears to offer more accurate measurement of meaning and greater structural stability. While the MLQ subscales contain only five items, they display comparable or superior psychometric properties in comparison to those of longer measures of meaning in life, making it a beneficial instrument for longitudinal studies. High convergent correlations, ranging between .61 to .74 between the MLQ-P and other meaning measures suggest that these scales tap the same construct.

Summary

There are many limitations in the existing research on acculturation, ethnic identity, and subjective well-being. As Tsai et al. (2000) addressed in their study of Chinese American ethnic identity, the administration of instruments in the English language to the exclusion of another first language may in fact influence responses from participants when answering items related to acculturation and ethnic identity. Furthermore, developmental theorists have pointed out that acculturation and ethnic identity may change across time, so it is important for future research to

include longitudinal studies, rather than simply assessing these constructs at one point in time (Phinney, 1990; Tsai et al., 2000). Subjective well-being research has been limited by a potential ethnocentrism that assumes that the western definition of this concept may be applied across all cultures, when in fact this may be considered a culturally construed concept.

<div align="center">Overview of Present Study and Statement of Hypotheses</div>

In the present study, beliefs and values of acculturation, and ethnic identity patterns were explored across three generations of Japanese Americans. The effects of acculturation and ethnic identity on subjective well-being and meaning of life of Japanese Americans were investigated across three generations. The Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei generations each experienced different historical events that shaped them, creating distinct cohorts.

Based upon the findings of Kim, Atkinson, and Yang (1999), it was hypothesized that when controlling for age, gender, and socioeconomic status, no significant differences would be found in the levels of acculturated values of Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei Japanese Americans, although differences in acculturated behaviors might exist. Furthermore, based on the work of Ohata (2002), it was expected that ethnic identity, when controlled for age, gender, and socioeconomic status, would remain constant between the Nisei and the Sansei, but increase in the Yonsei. Finally, under the assumption that Japanese Americans benefit from enculturation and a strong ethnic identity, it was predicted that Asian values and ethnic identity would predict higher scores on subjective well-being and meaning of life.

Acculturation

H_1: No significant differences would be found between the generational statuses (Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei) in levels of acculturated values, as indicated by scores on the AVS-R and EAVS-AA, when controlling for age, gender, and income.

<div align="center">55</div>

H_2: Significant differences would be found between generational statuses in acculturated behaviors, as measured by total scores on the SMAS, with Yonsei scoring higher than Sansei, and Sansei scoring higher than Nisei, when controlling for age, gender, and income.

Ethnic Identity

H_3: No significant differences would be found between Nisei and Sansei generations on ethnic identity scores, as indicated by the MEIM, when controlling for age, gender, and income.

H_4: Ratings of ethnic identity for the Yonsei generation would be significantly higher than scores of ethnic identity for Nisei and Sansei generations, as measured by the MEIM, when controlling for age, gender, and income.

Subjective Well-being

H_5: In the total sample, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values (AVS-R) and ethnic identity (MEIM) would predict higher scores on life satisfaction, as measured by the SWLS.

H_6: In the total sample, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values (AVS-R) and ethnic identity (MEIM) would predict higher scores on positive affect, as indicated by the PA subscale of the PANAS.

H_7: In the total sample, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values (AVS-R) and ethnic identity (MEIM) would predict lower scores on negative affect, as measured by the NA subscale of the PANAS.

H_8: In the total sample, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values (AVS-R) and ethnic identity (MEIM) would predict higher scores on meaning in life, as indicated by the MLQ –P subscale.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants

Participants in this study included 175 Japanese Americans representing the first, (Issei), second (Nisei), third (Sansei), fourth (Yonsei) and fifth (Gosei) generations of the Southwest and Western U.S. Age of participants ranged from 18 to 90, with female subjects (58%) slightly more represented than male subjects (42%). Participants were recruited from chapters of the Buddhist Churches of America and the Japanese American Citizens League in the Southwest and Western U.S., as well as the annual Obon Festival in Arizona, and entered into a drawing for gift cards. A snowball method of recruitment was also employed when participants from the BCA and JACL requested additional survey packets to distribute among their Japanese American friends and family members. By their reports, these additional participants resided within the U.S., concentrated mostly in Arizona and California. Due to incomplete surveys, 10 participants were excluded from the study, leaving 175 (101 female, 74 male) surveys for data analyses. Of the 175 participants whose data were analyzed for the study, first (Issei) and fifth (Gosei) generation participants were excluded for some analyses in which status as second (Nisei $n =$ 27), third (Sansei $n = 112$) and fourth (Yonsei $n = 29$) generation were of interest. A summary of participant generational status is included in Table 3.1.

Measures

Acculturation. The Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS; Stephenson, 2000) is a measure designed to assess acculturation in Asian Americans employing a bidimensional model, pan-ethnic Asian American culture, and applicability to multiple Asian

groups.[1] The SMAS is comprised of two subscales: (a) Dominant Society Immersion (SMAS-DSI) and (b) Ethnic Society Immersion (SMAS-ESI). The DSI and ESI subscales include 15 and 17 items, respectively, and each employs a 4-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "false" to "true." With each subscale, the items address attitudes, behaviors, and knowledge about food, interaction, language, and media. SMAS scores are derived from the average rating (from 1 to 4) on each subscale across the items.

The SMAS was scored by summing the 15 items of the dominant culture scale and dividing the sum by 15 in order to obtain a Dominant Society Immersion (DSI) score, as well as summing up the 17 items of the nondominant culture scale and dividing the total by 17 to obtain an Ethnic Society Immersion score (ESI). Thus, this method yielded two separate scores for the SMAS. Cronbach's alpha for the SMAS was .75 for the SMAS DSI subscale and .93 for the SMAS ESI subscale. The SMAS is included in Appendix B.

Asian Values. The Asian Values Scale Revised (AVS-R; Kim & Hong, 2004) is a 25-item measure designed to examine Asian cultural values. Each item is followed by a 4-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The AVS-R investigates two domains of acculturation: beliefs and values. Six factors are represented in the AVS-R: Conformity to Norms, Family Recognition Through Achievement, Emotional Self-Control, Collectivism, Humility, and Filial Piety. A total AVS-R score is obtained from the scale. Cronbach's alpha for the AVS-R was .80. The AVS-R is included in Appendix C.

Western Values. The European American Values Scale for Asian Americans (EAVS-AA; Wolfe, Yang, Wong, & Atkinson, 2001) is a 25-item scale designed to measure western values in Asian Americans. The EAVS-AA employs a 7-point Likert scale with responses

---

[1] The AAMAS title, scale instructions, and 6-point Likert scale were erroneously substituted for those of the SMAS.

ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." As with the AVS-R, the EAVS-AA yields

a total score.

In order to limit the length of the survey and curtail participant fatigue, the 18 scale items

of the European American Values Scale for Asian Americans (EAVS-AA) were used rather than

the 25 scale items of the European American Values Scale for Asian Americans Revised (EAVS-

AA-R). However, the 4-point Likert scale of the EAVS-AA-R was used, rather than the 7-point

Likert scale system of the EAVS-AA. Thus, the scale included in this study was a hybrid of both

the EAVS-AA and the EAVS-AA-R. The limitations posed by these errors include the question

of validity of the instrument employed in this study, as it is not an accurate version of the EAVS-

AA as developed and validated by the creators. However, the data from this instrument were

still analyzed since the instrument developers had determined that the original 18 items of the

EAVS-AA yielded a valid and reliable scale. In the current study, the major point of contention

is the difference in the Likert scales, with the new 4-point Likert scale of the EAVS-AA-R

eliminating the neutral point offered by the 7-point Likert scale of the original EAVS-AA.

Because of this difference, the EAVS-AA scores obtained in this study might be affected by

forcing respondents to choose to agree or disagree with a statement, rather than allowing them to

remain undecided on a particular item. This could have caused some participants to fail to

respond to some EAVS-AA items; however it should be noted that of the 10 incomplete surveys

eliminated from analyses, none of these were due to incomplete EAVS-AA responses.

Cronbach's alpha for the EAVS-AA was .79. The EAVS-AA is included in Appendix D.

Ethnic Identity. The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) is a

15-item self-report scale addressing affirmation and belonging, ethnic identity achievement, and

ethnic behaviors. A 4-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"

follows each item. A higher MEIM score indicates a more positive ethnic identity. The MEIM also includes six items rated with the same scale in order to assess other-group orientation. A higher total score on the six items is indicative of more willingness to engage with other ethnic groups.

Recently, Phinney and Ong (2007) revised the MEIM to create the MEIM-R, a 6-item self-report scale that is scored on a 5-point Likert scale and captures an overall ethnic identity score as well as subscores for the areas of exploration (items 1, 4, and 5) and commitment (items 2, 3, and 6). Lee and Yoo (2004) also reported that in addition to the original 15-item format of the MEIM, researchers have also utilized shortened forms with 3-item, 4-item, and 10-item versions. In this study, the original 15-item version of the MEIM was utilized. Cronbach's alpha for the MEIM was .85. The MEIM is included in Appendix E.

Positive and Negative Affect. The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule is a 20-item mood measure for positive and negative affect, rated on a 5-point scale (1 = very slightly or not at all, 5 = extremely), and higher scores indicate greater positive or negative affect (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The measure consists of two subscales, one for positive affect (PA) and one for negative affect (NA). Item responses within each subscale are summed in order to produce a PA and an NA score, respectively. Cronbach's alpha for the PANAS total scale was .85, with .89 for the PANAS PA subscale and .86 for the PANAS NA subscale. The PANAS is included in Appendix F.

Satisfaction with Life. The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) is a 5-item scale designed to measure global life satisfaction. Each item is followed by a 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." A total SWLS score is obtained from the scale. Each item is scored from 1 to

7, so that the range of possible total SWLS scores is 5 (low satisfaction) to 35 (high satisfaction).

Cronbach's alpha for the SWLS was .90. The SWLS is included in Appendix G.

Meaning in Life. The Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ; Steger, Frazier, Oishi, &

Kaler, 2006) is a 10-item scale measuring the presence of, and search for, meaning in life. The

instrument consists of the Presence of Meaning (MLQ-P) and Search for Meaning (MLQ-S)

subscales, each containing five items. Thus, the measure yields a MLQ-P score and a MLQ-S

score after totaling item responses within each subscale. Cronbach's alpha was .87 for the MLQ-

P subscale and .55 for the MLQ-S subscale. The MLQ is included in Appendix H.

Procedure

An application for approval of the study protocol was submitted to the Washington State

University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Due to the nature of the study, the IRB determined

that it was exempt from review. Participants for the study were recruited by contacting the BCA

temples and JACL chapters via an email containing a link to the online survey, with a request to

forward it to members of the organizations. Due to the small number of completed online

surveys, this was followed by mailing paper and pencil surveys to the BCA temples and JACL

chapters, again with a request to distribute these to members. By invitation, paper and pencil

surveys were brought to a board meeting of the JACL in Arizona, as well as to the annual Obon

Festival at the Arizona Buddhist Temple. Participant requests for additional surveys to distribute

to their family and friends were honored. Thus, each participant received either an emailed link

to an online survey hosted by WSU's Skylight Matrix, or a written consent form (see Appendix

A) with a paper and pencil survey packet (see Appendices B-I). Participants were administered a

survey packet that included the Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS; Stephenson,

2000), Asian Values Scale Revised (AVS-R; Kim & Hong, 2004), European American Values

Scale for Asian Americans (EAVS-AA; Wolfe, Yang, Wong, & Atkinson, 2001), Multigroup

Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992), Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener,

Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson,

Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), and Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ; Steger, Frazier, Oishi, &

Kaler, 2006). In addition, participants were asked to indicate age, education level, ethnicity,

gender, generation, and income on a demographic information page of the survey packet.

Participants were entered into a raffle for Visa gift cards in the amounts of $100, $75, $50, and

$25. The raffle ticket is included in Appendix J.

Analyses

Data were analyzed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Graduate Pack

(SPSS 20.0 for Windows). Descriptive statistics were computed, and alpha coefficient

reliabilities obtained for all scales. In addition, Pearson correlations were computed among all

scales. Data obtained from the SMAS (Stephenson, 2000), AVS-R (Kim & Hong, 2004),

EAVS-AA (Wolfe, Yang, Wong, & Atkinson, 2001), MEIM (Phinney, 1992), SWLS (Diener,

Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), PANAS (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), and MLQ

(Steger, Frazier, Oishi, & Kaler, 2006) were analyzed using multivariate analyses of variance,

univariate analyses of variance, and hierarchical multiple regression (Levin, 1999).

Hypotheses 1-4. To test Hypotheses 1-4, data were analyzed using multivariate analyses

of variance (MANOVAs), in which independent variables were generational status and outcome

variables were scores on the SMAS, AVS-R, EAVS-AA, and MEIM.

Hypotheses 5-8. To test Hypotheses 5-8, data were analyzed using hierarchical

regression analyses, where predictor variables were scores on the SMAS, AVS-R, EAVS-AA,

and MEIM, while outcome variables included scores on the PANAS subscales, SWL, and MLQ

subscales.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Generational Differences in Acculturated Values and Behaviors (Hypotheses 1 and 2)

Table 4.1 shows mean scores by generation for all measures included in the study. Table 4.2 shows the means and scale intercorrelations in the total sample. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted in order to determine whether any significant differences existed between Nisei, Sansei and Yonsei generations in levels of acculturated values, as indicated by scores on the AVS-R and EAVS-AA, when controlling for age, gender and income. As predicted in Hypothesis 1, results indicated that there were no significant differences between generations on AVS-R and EAVS-AA scores (Wilks' Λ = .95, $F(4, 260)$ = 1.59, p = .18). Accordingly, tests of between-subjects effects showed no significant differences between generations on AVS-R scores ($F(2, 131)$ = 1.59, p = .21) nor were there significant differences between generations on EAVS-AA scores ($F(2, 131)$ = 2.10, p = .13). These results are displayed in Table 4.3.

A multivariate analysis of variance was employed in order to examine whether any differences existed between Nisei, Sansei and Yonsei generations on acculturated behaviors, as measured by the SMAS DSI and ESI subscale scores, when controlling for age, gender and income. As predicted in Hypothesis 2, results indicated some support that there were differences between generations (Wilks' Λ = .94, $F(4, 232)$ = 1.70, p = .15). Tests of between-subjects effects showed significant differences between generations on SMAS DSI subscale scores ($F(2, 117)$ = 3.35, p < .05) but not on SMAS ESI subscale scores ($F(2, 117)$ = .16, p = .85). However, contrary to prediction, younger generations did not score higher than older generations on the

64

SMAS DSI subscale. In fact, the Nisei scored higher than the Sansei, and the Sansei scored higher than the Yonsei. These MANOVA statistics are shown in Table 4.4.

Generational Differences in Ethnic Identity (Hypotheses 3 and 4)

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in order to test whether any significant differences existed between Nisei, Sansei and Yonsei generations on ethnic identity scores, as indicated by the MEIM, when controlling for age, gender, and income. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between generations on MEIM scores ($F(1, 120) = .35$, $p = .55$). As predicted in Hypothesis 3, there was not a significant difference between Nisei ($M = 3.2$) and Sansei ($M = 3.3$) generations on MEIM scores.

Two separate ANOVAs were run in order to test whether any significant differences existed on MEIM scores between Nisei and Yonsei generations, as well as between Sansei and Yonsei generations, respectively. Contrary to Hypothesis 4, there was not a significant difference between Yonsei ($M = 3.3$) generation scores on the MEIM, in comparison to the Nisei ($M = 3.2$), ($F(1, 44) = .78$, $p = .38$). Additionally, there was not a significant difference between Yonsei and Sansei ($M = 3.3$) generation scores ($F(1, 125) = .38$, $p = .53$).

Predicting Subjective Well-being from Asian Values and Ethnic Identity (Hypotheses 5-7)

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to determine whether across all generations, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values and ethnic identity would predict higher scores on life satisfaction (Hypothesis 5). The results of the analysis indicated that age, gender and income accounted for a significant amount of variability in life satisfaction ($R^2 = .22$, $F(3, 142) = 14.50$, $p < .001$). Generational status did not predict satisfaction with life ($F(1, 141) = .13$, $p = .72$). The two variables together, Asian values and ethnic identity, accounted for a significant amount of variability in satisfaction with

life (R^2 = .26, F(2, 139) = 5.42, p < .01). Although Asian values did not significantly predict satisfaction with life (β = .11, p = .14), ethnic identity did significantly predict satisfaction with life (β = .21, p < .01). Thus, participants who had higher scores on the MEIM also had higher scores on the SWLS. Please refer to Table 4.5.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was also employed in order to examine whether across all generations, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values and ethnic identity would predict higher scores on positive affect (Hypothesis 6). The results of the analysis found that age, gender and income accounted for a significant amount of the variability in positive affect (R^2 = .08, F(3, 140) = 4.96, p < .01). Generation did not account for a significant amount of variability (ΔR^2 = .01, F(1, 139) = 1.01, p = .32). The two variables together, Asian values and ethnic identity, accounted for a significant proportion of variance in positive affect (ΔR^2 = .09, F(2, 137) = 7.91, p < .01). Asian values did not significantly predict positive affect (β = .05, p = .57), however ethnic identity significantly predicted positive affect (β = .30, p < .001). Participants who had higher scores on the MEIM had higher scores on the PANAS PA subscale. Please see Table 4.6.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used in order to test whether across all generations, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values and ethnic identity would predict lower scores on negative affect (Hypothesis 7). The results of this analysis showed that age, gender and income account for a significant amount of variance in negative affect (R^2 = .08, F(3, 142) = 5.33, p < .01). Generational status did not predict lower scores on negative affect (ΔR^2 = .00, F(1, 141) = .69, p = .41), nor did Asian values and ethnic identity (ΔR^2 = .01, F(2, 139) = .47, p = .63). These results are summarized in Table 4.7.

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted in order to determine whether across all generations, when controlling for age, gender, and income, higher scores on Asian values and ethnic identity would predict higher scores on meaning in life. The results indicated that age, gender and income accounted for a significant amount of variance in meaning in life, as measured by the MLQ Presence subscale (R^2 = .23, $F(3, 141)$ = 15.12, $p < .001$) and the MLQ Search subscale (R^2 = .07, $F(3, 141)$ = 4.81, $p < .01$). Generation did not account for a significant amount of variability in the MLQ Presence subscale (ΔR^2 = .00, $F(1, 140)$ = .69, p = .41) and the MLQ Search subscale (ΔR^2 = .00, $F(1, 140)$ = .01, p = .92). Participants with higher MEIM scores tended to have higher MLQ Presence subscale scores (ΔR^2 = .08, $F(2, 138)$ = 7.89, p = .001) but not MLQ Search subscale scores (ΔR^2 = .00, $F(2, 138)$ = .06, p =.94). The AVS-R did not significantly predict either the MLQ Presence subscale (β = .03, p = .63) or the MLQ Search subscale (β = -.01, p = .92). The MEIM was significantly correlated with the MLQ Presence subscale (β = .28, $p < .001$), but not the MLQ Search subscale (β = .03, p = .74). These results are shown in Tables 4.8 and 4.9.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of acculturation and ethnic identity on the subjective well-being of three generations of Japanese Americans. In addition, I tested hypotheses about generational differences in acculturation and ethnic identity.

Acculturation

The pattern of results is generally supportive of the acculturation notions suggested by Kim, Atkinson, and Yang (1999), who found that acculturated behaviors – but not values – differ across generations. When surveyed about their acculturated values, there were no differences across Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei generations when controlling for age, gender, and income, as evidenced by scores on the AVS-R and EAVS-AA. Despite the error of including the SMAS while excluding the AAMAS, this study examined acculturated behaviors as well as values. The hypothesis that differences in acculturated behaviors may exist across generations when controlling for age, gender, and income was partially supported, but in a pattern contrary to what was predicted. These differences on acculturated behaviors decreased with generation, such that the Nisei scored higher on acculturated behaviors than the Sansei, who had higher scores than the Yonsei, as measured by the SMAS. These findings may be due in part to the nature of the study sample, with participants recruited from chapters of the BCA and JACL. As both organizations are involved in Japanese cultural, political, and religious activities, it would seem likely that individuals who choose to obtain membership in or become leaders in these organizations would already be highly acculturated to Asian values, and possibly experience an increase as an effect of membership. Indeed, some of the members of the BCA are also members of the JACL, with many choosing to hold leadership roles. Additionally, these findings may be due to errors in

68

measurement, with the SMAS erroneously altered such that the Likert scale may have affected scores by changing the way participants were able to respond.

Ethnic Identity

The findings of this study offered partial support for the work of Ohata (2002). Based on Ohata's (2002) work, one would expect that ethnic identity, as measured by the MEIM, would remain the same across Nisei and Sansei generations, but increase in the Yonsei. However, while the results of this study indicated that there were no differences in ethnic identity across Nisei and Sansei generations when controlling for age, gender, and income, neither was there an increase in ethnic identity in the Yonsei generation. Perhaps the failure to confirm the work of Ohata (2002) is due to the use of different ethnic identity scales. In Ohata's study, ethnic identity in Japanese Americans was assessed using the Japanese American Questionnaire, Ethnic Identity Questionnaire, Contrasting Values Opinion Survey, and Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. These results were not replicated with the use of the MEIM in the current study. The effects of history may also have contributed to the failure to support the work of Ohata (2002). As data for the current study was collected ten years after Ohata's 2002 study, perhaps the effects of historical events, such as the growth of the BCA and JACL, both in membership as well as cultural activities and political activism, have maintained the steady retention of ethnic identity across generations without increasing it in younger generations. Additionally, these effects could be attributed to the nature of the measure, as it was based on adolescent theory and could conceivably create a ceiling effect when used with adults. Again, the current study relied upon data collected from chapters of the BCA and JACL, thus including Japanese Americans who have chosen to participate in organizations that foster ethnic identity. It would make sense

that any individual choosing to maintain membership in either the BCA or JACL and, in some cases, both, would have a strong sense of ethnic identity.

Subjective Well-being

There was some support for the hypothesis that Japanese Americans would benefit from a strong ethnic identity, and that this would be reflected by ethnic identity being predictors for subjective well-being. While generation and Asian values did not predict subjective well-being, ethnic identity significantly predicted positive life satisfaction, as evidenced by higher scores on the MEIM predicting higher scores on the SWLS. On this measure, respondents choose their own criteria by which to determine level of life satisfaction, with this differing according to individual and cultural values. Per Ryff and Keyes (1995), satisfaction with life is the primary marker of well-being. It is possible that ethnic identity, rather than Asian values, successfully predicted satisfaction with life due to the sense of belonging, positive self-concept, self-esteem, and social support associated with this construct (Phinney et al., 2001; Roberts et al., 1999). In contrast, Asian values alone have not been known to offer the same effects of enhancing positive self-regard and sense of camaraderie, nor have they been well-documented in the research as protective factors promoting well-being (Kim & Omizo, 2005).

The findings failed to support the hypothesis that Asian values would be predictive of positive affect for all generations when controlling for age, gender, and income. However, the findings to some degree supported the hypothesis that ethnic identity would be predictive of positive affect for all generations when controlling for age, gender, and income. Although Asian values did not predict higher positive affect, ethnic identity did, as exhibited by higher scores on the MEIM predicting higher scores on the PA subscale of the PANAS. However, the results did not support the hypothesis that Asian values and ethnic identity would predict lower negative

affect. Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) posited that positive and negative affect are distinct and best studied as separate phenomena, while Diener et al. (1999) suggested that these discrete variables grow more unrelated with time. It should be no surprise then that the significant relationship between ethnic identity and positive affect was not necessarily followed by a relationship between ethnic identity and lower negative affect. This is consistent with the literature suggesting that a strong ethnic identity is more beneficial in promoting positive affect and well-being than in acting as a protective factor against negative affect and hardships, including those experienced due to prejudice (McCoy & Major, 2003; Smith & Silva, 2011).

The findings did offer support for the hypothesis that across all generations, when controlling for age, gender, and income, ethnic identity would positively predict meaning in life. In this study, higher ethnic identity scores on the MEIM were predictive of higher scores on presence of meaning in life, as evidenced by the MLQ-P. However, Asian values and ethnic identity were not predictive of search for meaning in life, as measured by the MLQ-S. Several investigators have suggested that meaning in life is a crucial factor in the development and maintenance of well-being, as this fosters life goals and provides a sense of purpose (Battista & Almond, 1973; Reker & Wong, 1988; Ryff & Singer, 1998; Steger et al., 2006). The MLQ subscales have long been considered independent with differing correlation patterns with scales such as the SWLS with the MLQ-P subscale historically associated with well-being (Diener et al., 1985; Steger et al., 2006). Therefore this study is consistent with the current research, with presence of meaning shedding more light on well-being than the search for meaning, as the former refers to contentment with the current state and the latter to seeking such contentment.

These patterns of results may be influenced by several factors. One possible explanation for the failure to find a positive significant relationship between Asian values and subjective

well-being may be the individual nature of acculturation, enculturation, and values, in comparison to the protective sense of group belonging often associated with ethnic identity when faced with discrimination and other life stressors (McCoy & Major, 2003). Yasuda and Duan (2002) found that among Asian American university students, emotional well-being was predicted by level of ethnic identity but not by level of acculturation. Smith and Silva (2011) conducted a meta-analysis of ethnic identity and well-being among people of color in North America, and found that ethnic identity was more strongly related to positive well-being than to compromised well-being. They noted that across a number of studies, ethnic identity was consistently associated with well-being but not with mental health symptoms such as anxiety and depression. Thus, they posited that ethnic identity is more associated with promoting well-being but not as strong a buffer against mental illness as often thought.

Limitations

Limitations of this study include participant selection methods and data collection errors. Of the 185 participants who submitted surveys, 10 were excluded due to incomplete surveys. Thus, only 175 respondents were included in the study sample, all recruited from chapters of the BCA and JACL. Because of the nature of the sample, participants may have been predisposed to higher acculturation and ethnic identity. The participants were selected from chapters of the BCA and JACL, organizations that likely attract individuals who may be highly enculturated due to their affiliation and membership and identify strongly because of this association with a Japanese American ethnic identity. This has implications for the generalizability of the findings in regard to Japanese Americans who are not members of the BCA and JACL. The data collection errors were additional limitations of this study. Initially, the education and income questions were included on the demographic form in order to calculate socioeconomic status.

However, use of the income variable in determining socioeconomic status was limited due to participants expressing confusion and responding to this item in an inconsistent manner, with some reporting individual income and others reporting family or household income. Thus, the income variable was employed in statistical analyses rather than attempting to compute socioeconomic status from the education and income variables. In addition to erroneously substituting an incorrect version of the SMAS for the AAMAS, the EAVS-AA was also marred by inclusion of the incorrect Likert type scale. The AAMAS was determined to be the most desirable measure for assessing Asian values in terms of both attitudes and behaviors, but an accidentally altered version of the SMAS was instead included in the study, in addition to the EAVS-AA alterations being problematic. This raises questions regarding the reliability and validity of the measures used in the study, and the results of the study as they pertain to the SMAS and EAVS-AA should be interpreted with caution. Although the 6-point Likert scale of the AAMAS was used instead of the 4-point Likert scale of the SMAS, they are similarly ordered with 1 reflecting disagreement with an item and 4 and 6 representing agreement with an item, respectively. Because they are both even numbered scales, neither one offers a neutral point to express lack of agreement or disagreement with an item, and participant responses on the 6-point scale were likely similar to those that would have been obtained with the use of the correct 4-point scale. Thus, participant responses to the SMAS items were scored by summing the scores of the DSI and ESI items and then dividing these by 15 and 17, respectively. Again, while the 4-point Likert scale of the EAVS-AA-R was used instead of the 7-point Likert scale of the EAVS-AA, both are ordered with 1 reflecting disagreement with an item and 4 and 7 representing agreement with an item, respectively. However, one is an even numbered scale and one is an odd numbered scale, with the latter offering a neutral option to be selected in order to

reflect lack of agreement or disagreement with an item. Due to this difference, it is likely that participants answered with forced choice responses as they did not have the option to remain neutral on any items. However, the scores were summed and divided by the number of items, as per instructions for both the EAVS-AA and EAVS-AA-R. For all scales used in this study, reliability was determined with Cronbach's alpha coefficient.

Strengths

Strengths of this study include the evaluation of Japanese Americans as a unique ethnic group, rather than investigating Asian Americans as an umbrella group without regard to unique cultural backgrounds, histories, and traditions. Many research studies concerning Asian Americans have examined this population as one group within a pan-ethnic view, to the possible detriment of understanding the distinctions and needs of each subgroup (Hong & Domokos-Cheng Ham, 2001; Kim et al., 2001). A homogenized view of Asian Americans threatens to harm members of the more than 25 ethnic groups within this population, particularly in clinical settings if providers fail to attend to individual needs and to consider the varied economic and social statuses of each subgroup within this larger category. For example, Japanese Americans have historically benefited from better educational attainment and socioeconomic status in comparison to many other Asian American groups, and their primary concerns and focus of therapy may differ due to greater financial security. Thus, the current study contributes to the field of psychology by focusing on one unique ethnic group within the Asian American population. In addition, exploring generational differences provides a broader view of Japanese Americans as a whole, across age, cohort, and historical influences.

Clinical Implications

The clinical implications of this study include the benefits of increasing attention to the roles of acculturation and ethnic identity in the well-being of clients in therapy as well as among communities as a whole. Researchers have noted that celebrating ethnic group customs while successfully navigating the dominant culture tends to strengthen well-being (Berry, 1997). It follows then that increasing enculturation and ethnic identity within communities through primary and secondary intervention, as well as with counseling clients in both individual and family therapy, may be beneficial not only to Japanese Americans, but also to other ethnic minority groups. In clinical settings, assessment of level of enculturation and ethnic identity of counseling clients could inform therapy in terms of perceptions of group membership, social support, and ability to navigate the dominant culture as these relate to therapy goals and aid in the promotion of well-being. Encouraging clients to move toward enculturation and explore ethnic identity via community involvement in cultural events, and membership in ethnic group agencies, may be beneficial in meeting the goals of therapy such as self-exploration and increased social support networks, as well as aiding in increasing well-being overall. As this study highlighted the benefits of enculturation and ethnic identity in promotion of positive affect and well-being, it may be important to focus on using these constructs in a preventative manner in order to increase and maintain positive mental health, rather than as remedies in the face of mental illness when symptoms of anxiety or depression have already surfaced. This is consistent with previous research stating that these factors are best viewed as life-enhancing rather than self-protective in adverse situations.

Future Research

To extend this study, future research directions should include a wider sample of Japanese Americans beyond the two organizations associated with this current study sample,

including university students as well as other sources of participants within the general population. Participant recruitment via other agencies – including churches, community centers, online social networking sites, and public events – not specifically affiliated with the Japanese American community would likely offer a sample that is not biased in the sense of self-selected membership in organizations promoting enculturation and ethnic identity. In addition, a larger sample size and sampling across all regions of the U.S. are recommended. Ideally, a larger and more varied sample would result in greater generalizability of results to the Japanese American population as a whole, regardless of affiliations with Japanese American organizations or lack thereof, as well as location within the U.S. Counterbalancing the order of the instruments within the survey is also recommended, in order to address the effects of fatigue. Finally, the correct and most recent version of each measure should be utilized in data collection, with the AAMAS being preferred over the SMAS due to its orthogonal nature and more recent popularity in the literature.

REFERENCES

Abe-Kim, J., Okasaki, S., & Goto, S. (2001). Unidimensional versus bidimensional approaches to the assessment of acculturation for Asian American populations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*, 232-246.

Adams, D.L. (1969). Analysis of life satisfaction index. *Journal of Gerontology, 24*, 470-474.

Alden, L.E., Wiggins, J.S., & Pincus, A.L. (1991). Construction of circumplex scales for the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55*, 521-536.

Anderson, R., Manoogian, S.T., & Reznick, J.S. (1976). The undermining and enhancing of intrinsic motivation in preschool children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*, 915-922.

Antonovsky, A. (1987). *Unraveling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Atkinson, D.R., & Gim, R.H. (1989). Asian-American cultural identity and attitudes toward mental health services. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*(2), 209-212.

Atkinson, D.R., Lowe, S., & Matthews, L. (1995). Asian-American acculturation and willingness to seek counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 23*, 130-138.

Atkinson, D.R., Maruyama, M., & Matsui, S. (1978). The effects of counselor race and counseling approach on Asian Americans' perceptions of counselor credibility and utility. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 25*, 76-83.

Atkinson, D.R., & Matsushita, Y.J. (1991). Japanese-American acculturation, counseling style, counselor ethnicity, and perceived counselor credibility. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(4), 473-478.

Atkinson, D.R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. (1993). *Counseling American minorities* (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Battista, J., & Almond, R. (1973). The development of meaning in life. *Psychiatry, 36*, 409-427.

Beck, A.T., Ward, C.H., Mendelson, M., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 561-571.

Berry, J. (1995). Psychology of acculturation. In N.R. Goldberger & J.B. Veroff (Eds.), *The culture and psychology reader* (pp. 457-488). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Berry, J. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46*, 5-68.

Berry, J., & Sam, D. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. Berry, M. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and applications* (pp. 291-326). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bradburn, N.M. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chamberlain, K., & Zika, S. (1988). Religiosity, life meaning, and well-being: Some relationships in a sample of women. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27*, 411-420.

Cheek, J.M. (1983). *The Revised Cheek and Buss Shyness Scale*. Unpublished instrument, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA.

Cheek, J.M., Tropp, L.R., & Chen, L.C. (1994, August). *Identity orientations: Personal, social, and collective aspects of identity*. Poster session presented at the 102nd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Chen, C., & Stevenson, H. (1995). Culture and academic achievement: Ethnic and cross-national differences. In P. Pintrich (Ed.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: Culture, motivation, and achievement* (Vol. 9, pp. 119-151). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Chirkov, V., Ryan, R.M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 97-110.

Chung, R.H.G. (2001). Gender, ethnicity, and acculturation in intergenerational conflict of Asian American college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*, 376-386.

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

Cross, W.E. (1972). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience. *Black World, 20*, 13-27.

Cross, W.E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 24*, 349-354.

Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Crumbaugh, J.C., & Maholick, L.T. (1964). An experimental study in existentialism: The

    psychometric approach to Frankl's concept of neogenic neurosis. *Journal of Clinical*

    Psychology, 20, 200-207.

Day, S., & Rottinghaus, P. (2003). The healthy personality. In W.B. Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling*

    psychology and optimal human functioning (pp. 1-23), Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1980). The empirical exploration of intrinsic motivational processes.

    In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 39-80).

    New York, NY: Academic Press.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the

    self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268.

Derogatis, L.R. (1993). *The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI): Administration, scoring and*

    procedures manual-III. Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.

Derogatis, L.R., & Spencer, M.S. (1992). *The Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) administration,*

    scoring, and procedures manual – I. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University School

    of Medicine, Clinical Psychometrics Unit.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem.

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 653-663

Diener, E.L., & Emmons, R.A. (1985). The independence of positive and negative affect.

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47(5), 1105-1117.

Diener, E., & Lucas, R.E. (1999). Personality and subjective well-being. In D. Kahneman, E.

    Diener, & N. Schwartz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp.

    213-229). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Diener, E., Sapyta, J.J., & Suh, E. (1998). Subjective well-being is essential to well-being. *Psychological Inquiry, 9*, 33-37.

Diener, E., Smith, H., & Fujita, F. (1995). The personality structure of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*(1), 130-141.

Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R.E., & Smith, H.L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(2), 276-302.

Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York, NY: W.H. Norton.

Frankl, V.E. 1965. *The doctor and the soul: From psychotherapy to logotherapy.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Fuligni, A. (1997). The academic achievement of adolescents from immigrant families: The roles of family background, attitudes, and behavior. *Child Development, 68*, 261-273.

Fuligni, A., & Tseng, V. (1999). Family obligation and the academic motivation of adolescents from immigrant and American-born families. In T. Urdan (Ed.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (pp. 159-183). Stanford, CT: JAI Press.

Fuligni, A., & Witkow, M. (2004). The postsecondary educational progress of youth from immigrant families. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14*, 159-183.

Gelso, C.J., & Woodhouse, S. (2003). Toward a positive psychotherapy: Focus on human strength. In W.B. Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 171-197). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gim, R.H., Atkinson, D.R., & Whiteley, S. (1990). Asian-American acculturation, severity of concerns, and willingness to see a counselor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*(3), 281-285.

Gorsuch, R.L., & McPherson, S.E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E – Revised and single item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 348-354.

Graves, T.D. (1967). Acculturation, access, and alcohol in a tri-ethnic community. *American Anthropologist, 69*(3/4), 306-321.

Harris, A.H.S., & Thoresen, C.E. (2003). Strength-based health psychology: Counseling for total human health. In W.B. Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 199-227). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Holloway, S., Kashiwagi, K., Hess, R., & Azuma, H. (1986). Causal attributions by Japanese and American mothers and children about performance in mathematics. *International Journal of Psychology, 21*, 269-286.

Hong, G.K., & Domokos-Cheng Ham, M.A. (2001). Psychotherapy and counseling with Asian American clients: A practical guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoobler, D., & Hoobler, T. (1996). *The Japanese American family album*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Hayamizu, T. (1997). Between intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation: Examination of reasons for academic study based on the theory of internalization. *Japanese Psychological Research, 39*, 98-108.

Hui, C.H. (1984). *Individualism-collectivism: Theory, measurement and its relation to reward allocation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Huynh, Q.L., Howell, R.T., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2009). Reliability of bidimensional acculturation scores: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*(2), 256-274.

Inglehart, R., Basanez, M., & Moreno, A. (1993). *Human values and beliefs: A cross-cultural sourcebook: Political, religious, sexual and economic norms in 43 countries from the 1990-1993 World Values Survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Iyengar, S.S., & Lepper, M.R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 349-366.

Kagitçibasi, Ç. (2003). Autonomy, embeddedness, and adaptability in immigration contexts. *Human Development, 46*, 145-149.

Kenyon, G.M. (2000). Philosophical foundations of existential meaning. In G.T. Reker & K. Chamberlain (Eds.), *Exploring existential meaning: Optimizing human development across the life span* (pp. 7-22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keyes, C.L.M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C.D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(6), 1007-1022.

Kim, B.S.K., & Abreu, J.M. (2001). Acculturation measurement: Theory, current instruments, and future directions. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.N. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, & C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed.) (pp. 394-424). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kim, B.S.K., Atkinson, D.R., & Umemoto, D. (2001). Asian cultural values and the counseling process: Current knowledge and directions for future research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 29*(4), 573-603.

Kim, B.S.K., Atkinson, D.R., & Yang, P.H. (1999). The Asian values scale: Development, factor analysis, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*(3), 342-352.

Kim, B.S.K., & Hong, S. (2004). A psychometric revision of the Asian Values Scale using the Rasch model. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 37*, 15-27.

Kim, B.S.K., & Omizo, M.M. (2005). Asian and European American cultural values, collective self-esteem, acculturative stress, cognitive flexibility, and general self-efficacy among Asian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(3), 412-419.

Kim, B.S.K., & Omizo, M.M. (2006). Behavioral acculturation and enculturation and psychological functioning among Asian American college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*(2), 245-258.

Kleinknecht, R.A., Dinnel, D.L., & Kleinknecht, E. (1997). Cultural factors in social anxiety: A comparison of social phobia symptoms and taijin kyofusho. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 11*, 157-177.

Klinger, E. (1977). *Meaning and void.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Korsgaard, C. (1990). *Acculturation: Intragroup differences in the choice of gender and ethnicity of a counselor in an Asian American population*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego.

Kubovy, M. (1999). On the pleasures of the mind. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwartz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 134-154). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lee, R.M., & Yoo, H.C. (2004). Structure and measurement of ethnic identity for Asian American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*(2), 263-269.

Leong, F.T.L., Wagner, N.S., & Kim, H.H. (1995). Group counseling expectations among Asian American students: The role of culture-specific factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 217-222.

Levin, I.P. (1999). *Relating statistics and experimental design: An introduction*. Thousand

    Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lieber, E., Chin, D., Nihira, K., & Mink, I.R. (2001). Holding on and letting go: Identity and

    acculturation among Chinese immigrants. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority*

    Psychology, 7, 247-273.

Liu, W.M., & Iwamoto, D.K. (2007). Conformity to masculine norms, Asian values, coping

    strategies, peer group influences and substance use among Asian American men.

    Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 8(1), 25-39.

Marcia, J.E. (1966). Identity six years after: A follow-up study. *Journal of Youth and*

    Adolescence, 5, 145-160.

Marcia, J., Waterman, A., Matteson, D., Archer, S., & Orlofsky, J. (1993). *Ego identity: A*

    handbook of psychosocial research. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.

Markstrom-Adams, C., & Spencer, M.B. (1994). A model for identity intervention with minority

    adolescents. In S.A. Archer (Ed.), *Intervention for adolescent identity development* (pp.

    84-102). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion,

    and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1994). The cultural construction of self and emotion:

    Implications for social behavior. In S. Kitayama & H.R. Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and*

    culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence (pp. 89-130). Washington, DC: American

    Psychological Association.

Markus, H.R., Kitayama, S., & Heiman, R.J. (1996). Culture and basic psychological principles. In E.T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 857-913). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

McCoy, S.K., & Major, B. (2003). Group identification moderates emotional responses to perceived prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(8), 1005-1017.

McGregor, I., & Little, B.R. (1998). Personal projects, happiness, and meaning: On doing well and being yourself. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 494-512.

Mokuau, N. (1987). Social workers' perceptions of counseling effectiveness for Asian American clients. *Social Work, 32*, 331-335.

Nguyen, H., Messé, L., & Stollak, G. (1999). Toward a more complex understanding of acculturation and adjustment: Cultural involvements and psychosocial functioning in Vietnamese youth. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*, 5-31.

O'Brien, D.J., & Fugita, S.S. (1991). *The Japanese American experience*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.

Ohata, M.K. (2002). Ethnic identity of third and fourth generation Japanese Americans (Doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63, 543*.

Oishi, S. (2000). Goals as cornerstones of subjective well-being: Linking individuals and cultures. In E. Diener & E. Suh (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well-being* (pp. 87-112). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Oishi, S., & Diener, E. (2001). Goals, culture, and subjective well-being. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1674-1682.

Ontai-Grzebik, L.L., & Raffaelli, M. (2004). Individual and social influences on ethnic identity among Latino young adults. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*(5), 559-575.

Phinney, J.S. (1989). Stages of ethnic identity development in minority group adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 9*, 34-49.

Phinney, J.S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 499-514.

Phinney, J.S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*, 156-176.

Phinney, J.S. (1993). A three-stage model of ethnic identity development. In M. Bernal & G. Knight (Eds.), *Ethnic identity: Formation and transmission among Hispanics and other minorities* (pp. 61-79). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Phinney, J.S., & Alipuria, L.L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students from four ethnic groups. *Journal of Adolescence, 13*, 171-183.

Phinney, J.S., Baumann, K., & Blanton, S. (2001). Life goals and attributions for expected outcomes among adolescents from five ethnic groups. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*(4), 363-377.

Phinney, J.S., Dennis, J., & Osorio, S. (2006). Reasons to attend college among ethnically diverse college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12*(2), 347-366.

Phinney, J.S., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and well-being: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 493-510.

Phinney, J.S., & Kohatsu, E. (1997). Ethnic and racial identity development and mental health. In J. Schulenberg, J. Maggs, & K. Hurrelman (Eds.), *Health risks and developmental transitions in adolescence* (pp. 420-443). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Phinney, J.S., Ong, A., & Madden, T. (2000). Cultural values and intergenerational value discrepancies in immigrant and non-immigrant families. *Child Development, 71*(2), 528-539.

Phinney, J.S., Romero, I., Nava, M., & Huang, D. (2001). The role of language, parents, and peers in ethnic identity among adolescents in immigrant families. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 30*(2), 135-153.

Phinney, J.S., & Rosenthal, D.A. (1992). Ethnic identity in adolescence: Process, context, and outcome. In G.R. Adams, T.P. Gullota, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), *Adolescent identity formation* (pp. 145-172). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Reker, G.T. (1992). *Manual: Life Attitude Profile – Revised*. Petersborough, Ontario, Canada: Student Psychologists Press.

Reker, G.T., & Peacock, E.J. (1981). The Life Attitude Profile (LAP): A multidimensional instrument for assessing attitudes toward life. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 13*, 264-273.

Roberts, R.E., Phinney, J.S., Masse, L.C., Chen, Y.R., Roberts, C.R., & Romero, A. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 301-322.

Root, M.P.P. (1985). Guidelines for facilitating therapy with Asian American clients. *Psychotherapy, 22*, 349-356.

Rumbaut, R. (1997). *Passages to adulthood: The adaptation of children of immigrants in Southern California*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review in Psychology, 52*, 141-166.

Ryan, R.M., & Lynch, J. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescent and young adulthood. *Child Development, 60*, 340-356.

Ryder, A.G., Alden, L.E., & Paulhus, D.L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-construal, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 49-65.

Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(6), 1069-1081.

Ryff, C.D., & Keyes, C.L.M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 719-727.

Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 1-28.

Santrock, J.W. (1996). *Adolescence* (6th ed.). Chicago, IL: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.

Savickas, M.L. (2003). Toward a taxonomy of human strengths: Career counseling's contribution to positive psychology. In W.B. Walsh (Ed.), *Counseling psychology and optimal human functioning* (pp. 229-249). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sever, R. (1999). Patterns of coping with the task at schools. In T. Horowitz (Ed.), *Children of perestroika in Israel* (pp. 178-189). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Sheldon, K., & Deci, E. (1993). *The Self-Determination Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.

Sheldon, K.M., Ryan, R.M., & Reis, H. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day and in the person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 1270-1279.

Sheldon, K.M., Elliott, A.J., Ryan, R.M., Chirkov, V., Kim, Y., Wu, C., Demir, M., & Sun, Z. (2004). Self-concordance and subjective well-being in four cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*(2), 209-223.

Sheldon, K.M., Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L., & Kasser, T. (2004). The independent effects of goal contents and motives on well-being: It's both what you pursue and why you pursue it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(4), 475-486.

Singelis, T.M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 580-591.

Smith, E.M.J. (1985). Ethnic minorities: Life stress, social support, and mental health issues. *The Counseling Psychologist, 13*(4), 537-579.

Smith, T.B., & Silva, L. (2011). Ethnic identity and personal well-being of people of color: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(1), 42-60.

Spencer, M.B., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1990). Challenges in studying minority youth. In S.S. Feldman & G.R. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 123-146). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spencer, M.B., & Markstrom-Adams, C. (1990). Identity processes among racial and ethnic minority children in America. *Child Development, 61*, 290-310.

Spencer, M.S., Icard, L.D., Harachi, T.W., Catalano, R.F., & Oxford, M. (2000). Ethnic identity among monoracial and multiracial early adolescents. *Journal of Elderly Adolescence, 20*, 365-387.

Steger, M.F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The Meaning in Life Questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 80-93.

Stephenson, M. (2000). Development and validation of the Stephenson multigroup acculturation scale (SMAS). *Psychological Assessment, 12*(1), 77-88.

Suh, E.M. (2002). Culture, identity consistency, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(6), 1378-1391.

Suinn, R.M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*, 401-407.

Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. (1980). Acculturation, biculturalism, and adjustment among Cuban Americans. In A.M. Padilla (Ed.), *Psychological dimensions on the acculturation process: Theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 139-159). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M.A., Kurtines, W., & Aranalde, M.D. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology, 12*, 113-130.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Takaki, R. (1994). *Issei and Nisei: The settling of Japanese America*. New York, NY: Chelsea House Publishers.

Tata, S.P., & Leong, F.T.L. (1994). Individualism-collectivism, social-network orientation, and acculturation as predictors of attitudes toward seeking professional psychological help among Chinese Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*(3), 280-287.

Triandis, H.C., Botempo, R., Villareal, M.J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34*(2), 323-338.

Tsai, J.L. (2001). Cultural orientation of Hmong young adults. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 3-4*, 99-114.

Tsai, J.L., Chentsova-Dutton, Y., & Wong, Y. (2002). Why and how we should study ethnic identity, acculturation, and cultural orientation. In G.C. Nagayama Hall & S. Okazaki, *Asian American psychology: The science of lives in context* (pp. 41-65). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Tsai, J.L., Ying, Y., & Lee, P.A. (2000). The meaning of "being Chinese" and "being American": Variation among Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*, 302-322.

Tseng, V. (2004). Family interdependence and academic adjustment in college: Youths from immigrant and U.S.-born families. *Child Development, 75*, 966-983.

Uba, L. (2003). *Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health*. New York, NY: Guilford.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). Educational Attainment: 2000. (Census 2000 Briefs C2KBR-24). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). Educational Attainment in the United States: 2003. (Current

    Population Reports P20-550). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2004). We the people: Asians in the United States. (Census 2000 Special

    Reports CENSR-17). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Wei, W. (1993). The Asian American movement. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. *Journal of*

    Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 30, 373-392.

Wolfe, M.M., Yang, P.H., Wong, E.C., & Atkinson, D.R. (2001). Design and development of

    the European American values scale for Asian Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic*

    Minority Psychology, 7(3), 274-283.

Wong-Rieger, D., & Quintana, D. (1987). Comparative acculturation of Southeast Asian and

    Hispanic immigrants and sojourners. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*(3), 345-

    362.

Yamaguchi, H., & Tanaka, K. (1998). Relations of autonomy, self-referenced beliefs and self-

    regulated learning among Japanese children. *Psychological Reports, 82*, 803-816.

Yasuda, T., & Duan, C. (2002). Ethnic identity, acculturation, and emotional well-being among

    Asian American and Asian international students. *Asian Journal of Counseling, 9*(1-2),

    1-26.

Ying, Y., & Lee, P.A. (1999). The development of ethnic identity in Asian-American

    adolescents: Status and outcome. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 69*, 194-208.

Yoo, H.C., & Lee, R.M. (2005). Ethnic identity and approach-type coping as moderators of the

    racial discrimination/well-being relation in Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling*

    Psychology, 52(4), 497-506.

Yoo, H.C., & Lee, R.M. (2008). Does ethnic identity buffer or exacerbate the effects of frequent

    racial discrimination on situational well-being of Asian Americans? *Journal of*

    Counseling Psychology, 55(1), 63-74.

Zika, S., & Chamberlain, K. (1987). Relation of hassles and personality to subjective well-

    being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*3, 155-162.

Zika, S., & Chamberlain, K. (1992). On the relation between meaning in life and

psychological well-being. *British Journal of Psychology, 83*, 133-145

APPENDIX A

WRITTEN CONSENT FORM

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Laurie "Lali" McCubbin in the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology at Washington State University. I am conducting a research study to examine acculturation, ethnic identity, and well-being in Japanese Americans.

The information in this consent form is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in this study. It is important that you understand that your participation is completely voluntary. This means that even if you agree to participate you are free to withdraw from the experiment at any time, or decline to participate in any portion of the study, without penalty.

Involvement in this study includes completion of a survey packet. This experiment poses no known risks to your health and your name will not be associated with the findings. Your participation will take approximately 15-20 minutes for the survey. All participants will be entered into a raffle for Visa gift cards in the amounts of $100, $75, $50, and $25. Upon completion of your participation in this study you will be provided with a brief explanation of the question this study addresses. If you have any questions not addressed by this consent form, please do not hesitate to ask. You will receive a copy of this form, which you should keep for your records.

Thank you for your time.

_____
Michele E. Ishikawa, M.C.

_____
Laurie "Lali" McCubbin, Ph.D.

CONSENT STATEMENT:

I have read the above comments and agree to participate in this experiment. I understand that if I have any questions or concerns regarding this project I can contact the investigator at the above location or the WSU Institutional Review Board at (509) 335-9661.

_____   _____
Participant's Signature   Date

Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale (SMAS)

INSTRUCTIONS: Use the scale below to answer the following questions. Please circle the number that best represents your view on each item. Please note that reference to "Asians" hereafter refers to Asians in America and not Asia.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
Not very much					Very much

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I know how to speak my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I like to speak my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I speak my native language with my friends and acquaintances from my country of origin.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I know how to read and write in my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I feel comfortable speaking my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I speak my native language at home.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I like to listen to music of my ethnic group.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I speak my native language with my spouse or partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. When I pray, I use my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I have never learned to speak the language of my native country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I am informed about current affairs in my native country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I attend social functions with people from my native country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I am familiar with the history of my native country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I think in my native language.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I stay in close contact with family members and relatives in my native country.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. I regularly read magazines of my ethnic group.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I eat traditional foods from my native culture.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I attend social functions with (Anglo) American people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. I have many (Anglo) American acquaintances.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I speak English at home.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I know how to prepare (Anglo) American foods.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. I am familiar with important people in American history.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I think in English.	1	2	3	4	5	6

24. I speak English with my spouse or partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I feel totally comfortable with (Anglo) American people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. I understand English, but I'm not fluent in English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I am informed about current affairs in the United States.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I like to eat American foods.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I regularly read an American newspaper.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I feel comfortable speaking English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. I feel at home in the United States.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. I feel accepted by (Anglo) Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX C

Asian Values Scale Revised (AVS-R)

INSTRUCTIONS: Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with the value expressed in each statement.

1 Strongly Disagree	**2** Disagree	**3** Agree	**4** Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4
1. One should not deviate from familial and social norms.	1	2	3	4
2. Children should not place their parents in retirement homes.	1	2	3	4
3. One need not focus all energies on one's studies.	1	2	3	4
4. One should be discouraged from talking about one's accomplishments.	1	2	3	4
5. Younger persons should be able to confront their elders.	1	2	3	4
6. When one receives a gift, one should reciprocate with a gift of equal or greater value.	1	2	3	4
7. One need not achieve academically to make one's parents proud.	1	2	3	4
8. One need not minimize or deprecate one's own achievements.	1	2	3	4
9. One should consider the needs of others before considering one's own needs.	1	2	3	4
10. Educational and career achievements need not be one's top priority.	1	2	3	4
11. One should think about one's group before oneself.	1	2	3	4
12. One should be able to question a person in an authority position.	1	2	3	4
13. Modesty is an important quality for a person.	1	2	3	4
14. One's achievements should be viewed as family's achievements.	1	2	3	4
15. One should avoid bringing displeasure to one's ancestors.	1	2	3	4
16. One should have sufficient inner resources to resolve emotional problems.	1	2	3	4
17. The worst thing one can do is bring disgrace to one's family reputation.	1	2	3	4
18. One need not remain reserved and tranquil.	1	2	3	4
19. One should be humble and modest.	1	2	3	4
20. Family's reputation is not the primary social concern.	1	2	3	4
21. One need not be able to resolve psychological problems on one's own.	1	2	3	4
22. Occupational failure does not bring shame to the family.	1	2	3	4

23. One need not follow the role expectations (gender, family hierarchy) of one's family.	1	2	3	4
24. One should not make waves.	1	2	3	4
25. One need not control one's expression of emotions.	1	2	3	4

European American Values Scale for Asian Americans (EAVS-AA)

INSTRUCTIONS: Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with the value expressed in each statement.

1	2	3	4
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Statement				
1. I think it is fine for an unmarried woman to have a child.	1	2	3	4
2. Abortion should be legal if the mother's health is in danger.	1	2	3	4
3. Sometimes it is necessary for the government to stifle individual development.	1	2	3	4
4. You can do anything you put your mind to.	1	2	3	4
5. A woman who is living alone should be able to have children.	1	2	3	4
6. I'm confident in my ability to handle most situations.	1	2	3	4
7. It is important to me to serve as a model for others.	1	2	3	4
8. The idea that one spouse does all the housework is outdated.	1	2	3	4
9. Single women should not have children and raise them alone.	1	2	3	4
10. I am rarely unsure about how I should behave.	1	2	3	4
11. I prefer not to take on responsibilities unless I must.	1	2	3	4
12. I do not like to serve as a model for others.	1	2	3	4
13. Good relationships are built on mutual respect.	1	2	3	4
14. If a pregnant woman wanted an abortion because her health was at risk, I could not support the abortion.	1	2	3	4
15. Having the chance to achieve is not important to me in a job.	1	2	3	4
16. I would like to have a job where I can serve as a model for others.	1	2	3	4
17. Abortion is okay when the mother's health is at risk.	1	2	3	4
18. Children should learn to be tolerant of others.	1	2	3	4

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or <u>ethnic groups</u> that people come from. Some examples of the names of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be _____

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

	1	2	3	4
1. I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.	1	2	3	4
2. I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group.	1	2	3	4
3. I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.	1	2	3	4
4. I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership.	1	2	3	4
5. I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.	1	2	3	4
6. I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.	1	2	3	4
7. I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.	1	2	3	4
8. In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group.	1	2	3	4
9. I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group.	1	2	3	4
10. I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.	1	2	3	4
11. I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.	1	2	3	4
12. I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.	1	2	3	4

13. My ethnicity is
      (1) Asian or Asian American, including Chinese, Japanese, and others
      (2) Black or African American
      (3) Hispanic or Latino, including Mexican American, Central American, and others				

(4) White, Caucasian, Anglo, European American; not Hispanic (5) American Indian/Native American (6) Mix; Parents are from two different groups (7) Other (write in): _____				
14. My father's ethnicity is (use numbers above)				
15. My mother's ethnicity is (use numbers above)				

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)

INSTRUCTIONS: This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then circle the appropriate answer next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way during the past week. Use the following scale to record your answers.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely

1. Interested.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Distressed.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Excited.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Upset.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Strong.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Guilty.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Scared.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Hostile.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Enthusiastic.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Proud.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Irritable.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Alert.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Ashamed.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Inspired.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Nervous.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Determined.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Attentive.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Jittery.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Active.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Afraid.	1	2	3	4	5

Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are five statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1-7 scale below indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. In most ways, my life is close to my ideal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I am satisfied with my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please take a moment to think about what makes your life feel important to you. Please respond to the following statements as truthfully and accurately as you can, and also please remember that these are very subjective questions and that there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer according to the scale below:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Absolutely Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Somewhat Untrue	Can't Say True or False	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Absolutely True

1. I understand my life's meaning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I am looking for something that makes my life feel meaningful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I am always looking to find my life's purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My life has a clear sense of purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I have a good sense of what makes my life meaningful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I have discovered a satisfying life purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I am always searching for something that makes my life feel significant.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. My life has no clear purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I am searching for meaning in my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX I

Demographic Information Form

Age: _____

Gender: (Check one)

Female: _____

Male: _____

Ethnic Background: (Mark all that apply)

_____ African American/Black	_____ Japanese
_____ American Indian/Alaskan Native	_____ Lao
	_____ Latina/Latino
_____ Asian Indian	_____ Korean
_____ Cambodian	_____ Portuguese
_____ Caucasian	_____ Puerto Rican
_____ Chinese	_____ Samoan
_____ Filipino	_____ Thai
_____ Guamanian	_____ Tongan
_____ Hawaiian	_____ Vietnamese
_____ Hispanic	_____ Unknown
_____ Hmong	_____ Other _____ (Specify)

Generation Level: (Indicate history of family immigration)

1st Generation _____   You immigrated to U.S.

2nd Generation _____   Your parents immigrated to U.S.

3rd Generation _____   Your grandparents immigrated to U.S.

4th Generation _____   Your great grandparents immigrated to U.S.

5th Generation _____   Your great, great grandparents immigrated to U.S.

6th Generation _____   Your great, great, great grandparents immigrated to U.S.

What is the highest degree or level of school you have COMPLETED?
Mark ONE box. If currently enrolled, mark the previous grade or highest degree received.

No schooling completed
Nursery school to 4th grade
5th grade or 6th grade
7th grade or 8th grade
9th grade
10th grade
11th grade
12th grade, **NO DIPLOMA**
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE – high school DIPLOMA or the equivalent (for example: GED)
Some college credit, but less than 1 year
1 or more years of college, no degree
Associate degree (for example: AA, AS)
Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, AB, BS)
Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, Med, MSW, MBA)
Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD)
Doctoral degree (for example: PhD, EdD)

What is your family income? Mark ONE box.

$10,000-20,000
$20,000-30,000
$30,000-40,000
$40,000-50,000
$50,000-60,000
$60,000-70,000
$70,000-80,000
$80,000-90,000
$90,000-100,000
$100,000 or more

APPENDIX J

RAFFLE TICKET
Please print your name and address below. This information will be used only to enter you into a drawing for Visa gift cards in the amounts of $100, $75, $50, and $25, and will be stored separately from your demographic information and survey answers. Thank you for your time.
NAME:
ADDRESS:

Table 3.1

Summary of Participants by Generation

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Issei	4	2.3	2.3	2.3
Nisei	27	15.4	15.4	17.7
Sansei	112	64.0	64.0	81.7
Yonsei	29	16.6	16.6	98.3
Gosei	3	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	175	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.1

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Measures as a Function of Generation

	Nisei		Sansei		Yonsei	
Measure	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Asian Values Scale Revised	2.53	.23	2.43	.28	2.48	.37
European American Values Scale for Asian Americans	3.01	.25	3.31	.32	3.28	.27
Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale Dominant Society Immersion	5.38	.63	5.46	.38	5.15	.48
Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale Ethnic Society Immersion	2.33	1.19	2.41	1.02	2.52	1.23
Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure	3.22	.46	3.30	.44	3.32	.45
Positive and Negative Affect Schedule Positive Affect	32.62	10.53	36.30	6.89	34.52	6.08
Positive and Negative Affect Schedule Negative Affect	13.67	3.72	17.56	6.61	17.56	6.07
Satisfaction With Life Scale	26.13	5.90	26.13	6.71	24.70	6.74
Meaning in Life Questionnaire Presence of Meaning	26.23	4.72	27.49	4.97	25.22	4.96
Meaning in Life Questionnaire Search for Meaning	19.64	7.03	18.97	7.05	22.52	6.98

Table 4.2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations for Measures

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Age	58.55	16.59	1													
2. Gender	1.42	.50	.05	1												
3. Generation	3.00	.70	-.65***	-.18*	1											
4. Income	7.34	2.77	-.09	.18*	.15	1										
5. SMAS Dominant Society	5.36	.47	.08	-.12	.00	.27**	1									
6. SMAS Ethnic Society	2.53	1.18	-.10	.05	-.16	-.01	-.08	1								
7. AVS-R	2.47	.30	-.07	.25**	-.05	.04	-.12	.18*	1							
8. EAVS-AA	3.25	.32	-.21**	-.17*	.14	.20*	.25**	-.05	-.22**	1						
9. MEIM	3.30	.45	.00	-.04	.02	.08	.10	.21*	.06	.36***	1					
10. PANAS Positive Affect	35.23	7.43	-.09	-.13	.02	.20*	.30***	.12	.03	.41***	.33***	1				
11. PANAS Negative Affect	17.19	6.30	-.29***	-.03	.18*	-.04	-.13	.09	.09	-.02	-.03	.08	1			
12. SWLS	25.79	6.59	.14	-.07	-.11	.36***	.26**	.00	.08	.24**	.26**	.29***	-.38***	1		
13. MLQ Presence of Meaning	26.51	5.40	.15	-.07	-.13	.34***	.30***	-.03	.03	.40***	.32***	.49***	-.22**	.61***	1	
14. MLQ Search for Meaning	19.80	7.30	-.24**	.11	.10	-.17	-.21*	.15	.02	-.18*	.06	-.03	.24**	-.25**	-.25**	1

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 4.3

Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance F Ratios for Age, Gender, and Income Covariates and Generation Effects for Asian Values Measures

		ANOVA F(2, 131)	
Variable	MANOVA F(4, 260)	Asian Values Scale Revised	European America Values Scale for Asian Americans
Age	2.54	2.17	2.09
Gender	5.94**	4.73	9.08
Income	4.94**	.37	8.71**
Generation	1.59	1.59	2.10

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 4.4

Multivariate and Univariate Analyses of Variance F Ratios for Age, Gender, and Income Covariates and Generation Effects for Asian Acculturated Behaviors Measures

| | | ANOVA $F(2, 117)$ | |
Variable	MANOVA $F(4, 232)$	Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale Dominant Society Immersion	Stephenson Multigroup Acculturation Scale Ethnic Society Immersion
Age	1.03	.59	1.65
Gender	.91	1.54	.44
Income	3.88*	7.81**	.16
Generation	1.70	3.35*	.16

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 4.5

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Asian Values and Ethnic Identity Variables Predicting Satisfaction With Life (N = 146)

Step and predictor variable	B	SE B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1:				.22***	.24***
Age	.07	.04	.17		
Gender	-3.00	1.05	-.22**		
Income	1.07	.18	.45***		
Step 2:				.21	.00
Generation	-.52	1.19	-.04		
Step 3:				.26**	.06**
Asian Values	2.44	1.66	.11		
Ethnic Identity	3.10	1.10	.21**		

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001; step 2 ΔR^2 = .00, step 3 ΔR^2 = .05**. Regression coefficients are from step 3 of analysis.

Table 4.6

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Asian Values and Ethnic Identity Variables Predicting Positive Affect (N = 144)

Step and predictor variable	B	SE B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1:				.08**	.10**
Age	-.07	.05	-.15		
Gender	-2.71	1.25	-.18*		
Income	.64	.22	.24**		
Step 2:				.08	.01
Generation	-1.69	1.42	-.13		
Step 3:				.16**	.09**
Asian Values	1.12	2.00	.05		
Ethnic Identity	5.14	1.32	.30***		

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001; step 2 ΔR^2 = .00, step 3 ΔR^2 = .09. Regression coefficients are from step 3 of analysis.

Table 4.7

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Asian Values and Ethnic Identity Variables Predicting Negative Affect (N = 146)

Step and predictor variable	B	SE B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1:				.08**	.10**
Age	-.14	.04	-.36**		
Gender	-.41	1.12	-.03		
Income	-.05	.19	-.02		
Step 2:				.08	.00
Generation	-.88	1.26	-.08		
Step 3:				.07	.01
Asian Values	.67	1.76	.03		
Ethnic Identity	-1.07	1.17	-.08		

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001; step 2 ΔR^2 = .00, step 3 ΔR^2 = .00.

Table 4.8

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Asian Values and Ethnic Identity Variables Predicting Presence of Meaning in Life (N = 145)

Step and predictor variable	B	SE B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1:				.23***	.24***
Age	.03	.03	.10		
Gender	-1.88	.77	-.19*		
Income	.80	.13	.45***		
Step 2:				.23	.00
.00					
Generation	-.97	.87	-.11		
Step 3:				.30**	.08**
.07***					
Asian Values	.58	1.21	.04		
Ethnic Identity	3.13	.81	.28***		

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001; step 2 ΔR^2 = .00, step 3 ΔR^2 = .07. Regression coefficients are from step 3 of analysis.

Table 4.9

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Summary for Asian Values and Ethnic Identity Variables
Predicting Search for Meaning in Life (N = 145)

Step and predictor variable	B	SE B	β	R^2	ΔR^2
Step 1:				.07**	.09**
Age	-.09	.05	-.21		
Gender	2.76	1.25	.20*		
Income	-.52	.21	-.21*		
Step 2:				.07	.00
Generation	.08	1.41	.01		
Step 3:				.05	.00
Asian Values	-.19	1.96	-.01		
Ethnic Identity	.44	1.31	.03		

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001; step 2 ΔR^2 = .00, step 3 ΔR^2 = .00.