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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the extent to which one's world view and acculturation behavior were related to one's acculturative stress. The study had descriptive and correlational research objectives and was designed as a cross-sectional survey research. FASE Stress Scale, Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire, and Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale were the three self-report instruments employed in this study. Two-hundred and forty six Asian sojourners and immigrants composed the sample population from five Asian cultural groups: Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese and Philippino. Pearson correlation and 2x2 two-way analysis of variance were performed on the data. Results indicate that acculturation behavior is the single best predictor of acculturative stress. There seems to be no significant correlation between one's world view orientation and acculturative stress. In addition, the findings indicate the need for future research to develop an instrument which can accurately measure and better account for the complicated and emic nature of acculturation and world view orientation.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Moving to a new culture is a complex experience. The experience of various changes and life events involved with the process of cross-cultural relocation is itself a source of stress (Dacosta, 1985; Fairbanks & Hough, 1981; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Gaylord, 1979; Hinkle, 1974; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Rumbaut, 1977; Shuval, 1982; Smith, 1983; Spradley & Phillips, 1972; Stening, 1979). Taft (1977) suggests that individuals feel "a sense of loss arising from being uprooted from their original and secure surroundings" and implies that "they often feel impotent because their unfamiliarity with the new culture does not permit them to deal competently with the new environment" (p. 106).

Biller, 1974; Naditch & Morrissey, 1976), sojourner adjustment stress (Church, 1982), refugee neurosis (Lee, 1982), psychocultural neurosis (Sommers, 1969), emigration stress (Nicassio, Solomon, Guest & McCullough, 1986), and acculturative stress (Berry & Annis, 1974; Chance, 1965; Dacosta, 1985; Doob, 1957; Gottlieb, 1982; Graham, 1981; Kiefer, 1974; Lanoix, 1983; Leong, 1986; Mena, Padilla & Maldonado, 1987; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Padilla, Alvarez & Lindholm, 1986; Padilla, Wagatsuma & Lindholm, 1985; Reyes, 1981; Shuval, 1982; Valdez, 1985; Vallez, 1985; Yu, 1981), each term possibly designating the theoretical position or discipline of the writer. Many of these terms have similar operational definitions, and thus, have been used interchangeably in the literature in the past. The other severe debilitating difficulties, or 'adjustment problems' immigrants or sojourners (individuals who temporarily stay in 'other country') experience in the United States have been well documented including depression, suicide, domestic violence, alcoholism, neurosis, coronary heart disease, to even sudden death (Abe, 1985; Aylesworth, Ossorio & Osaki, 1978; Baron, Thacker, Gorelkin, Vernon, Taylor & Choi, 1983; Bourne, 1975; Favazza, 1980; Firth, 1959; Henry & Saberwal, 1969; Hinkle, 1974; Jones, 1973; Kiefer, S. Kim, Choi, L. Kim, B. Kim, Shon & T. Kim, 1985; Koh & Upshaw, 1987; King, 1975; Lanoix, 1983; Lebra, 1972; Lee, 1982; Leighton,

Background of the Problem

There is a plethora of literature which attempts to explain why moving to a new culture can be stressful. Four general categories of the research will be briefly discussed: life-event changes; psychology of loss; cultural displacement; and dissonance model.

First, the life-event changes and illness is perhaps the most commonly examined concept in the area to explain acculturative stress (Brink & Saunders, 1976; Fairbanks & Hough, 1981; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Hinkle, 1974; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Leong, Tseng & Wu, 1985; Lin, Someone, Ensel & Kuo, 1979; Masuda & Holmes, 1967; Pihl & Caron, 1980; Reyes, 1981; Rumbaut, 1977; Shuval, 1982; Smith, 1983; Spradley & Phillips, 1972; Stening, 1979, Wallen, 1967). The life-events literature suggests that it is the experience of change and adaptation to new culture that is stressful and a possible cause of ill health (Fairbanks & Hough, 1981; Holmes & Rahe, 1967). The act of migration often involves a great number of potentially stressful
life-events -- changes in routine patterns of behavior. In fact, Brink and Saunders (1976) list five categories of stressors involved in entering a new culture: communication, mechanical differences, isolation, customs, and attitudes and beliefs. Components of each category, whether perceived as negative or positive stressors, all involve change and hence readjustment.

Second, psychology of loss, seen by some as a central theme in psychotherapy, is another concept used to explain acculturative stress (Bowlby, 1969; Church, 1982; Doan, 1977; Edgerton, 1965; Fernandez, 1988; Freeman, Kaplan & Sudock, 1976; Garza-Guerrero, 1973; Gottlieb, 1982; Kiefer, et al., 1985; Minkler & Biller, 1979; Munoz, 1980; Naditch & Morrissey, 1976; Oberg, 1960; Pavri, 1963; Pihl & Caron, 1980; Reyes, 1981; Shuval, 1982; Taft, 1977; Vallez, 1985). Furnham and Bochner (1986) suggest that concepts from this research area may also be used to shed light on the reactions of immigrants, wherein the examination of immigration is the experience of loss. Since immigration involves the deprivation of specific relationships or significant objects, Oberg (1960) noted that acculturative stress is "precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all one's familiar cues."

Garza-Guerrero (1973) also asserts that this mourning process related to the loss of a culture may be contributed to acculturative stress.
Third, the concept of cultural differences has also been used to account for the misunderstandings, distress and difficulties experienced by sojourners (Aylesworth et al, 1978; DuBois, 1903; Fabrega & Wallace, 1968; Favazza, 1980; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Head, 1980; Henry & Saberwal, 1969; Higginbotham, 1979; Iga, 1957; Juffer, 1983; Kiefer, 1970, 1974; Kiefer et al, 1985; Lanoix, 1983; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Shuval, 1982; Taft, 1977; Yu, 1981). These 'culturally displaced persons' are in a labyrinth in which they have lost all sense of bearing, familiar cues such as social norms, values and mores, and consequently do not possess the relevant matter of course receipes for action in a new culture (Shuval, 1982). This labyrinth represents a challenge to their primary value and norm socialization with consequent damage to self-esteem. They may feel ignorant because they must rely on others to guide, model, and translate for them in everyday matters (Padilla, 1980). The necessity of changing one's values and rearranging one's behavior can have disastrous consequences by disrupting one's whole system (Fabrega & Wallace, 1968). Consequently, by adhering to the systems of their own culture, sojourners may not fulfill the expectations of their new cultural environment. As a result, people may be forced to make a decision to either adhere to only one cultural system or to make an unsuitable compromise.
Fourth, the intrapersonal inconsistency between two dimensions of the culture (world view and acculturation behavior), i.e., the dissonance model, has been examined to explain acculturative stress (Bandura, 1982; Doan, 1977; Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974; Favazza, 1980; French, Rodgers & Cobb, 1974; Padilla, et al, 1985; Reyes, 1981; Smith, 1983; E. M. Smith, 1985; Spielberger & Diaz-Guerrero, 1976; Vallez, 1985). Accordingly, the dissonance model focuses on the differences between individual's world view and acculturation behavior but not differences between cultures. In other words, stress is said to exist to the extent that an individual in a culturally different environment defines a salient situation as disturbing for oneself as interpreted from one's world view, and one is unable to recruit effective coping mechanisms to remove or reduce the disturbance; thus affecting self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Vallez, 1985). Two simultaneous conditions are necessary for stress to be present or to increase: a subjective definition of a situation as disturbing (world view); and an inability to cope (behavioral acculturation). These are contrasted as: overt and covert culture (Benedict, 1964, 1967; Doob, 1957; Fabrega, 1969), objective and subjective culture (Triandis, et al, 1972), extrinsic and intrinsic cultural traits (Yao, 1979) and various other terms such as deep structure of culture (Bandler &
Grinder, 1975), cultural core (Akbar, 1981), and world views (English, 1984; Hsu, 1972; Ibrahim, 1985; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Kluckhohn, 1951, 1956; Myers, 1988; Padilla, 1980; Spindler & Spindler, 1963; D. W. Sue, 1978; Whorf, 1956; Zavalloni, 1980). Surface behavior differences across cultures and also differences in the world views and interactions of both are important variables contributing to acculturative stress.

Asians and Acculturative Stress

Since the differences in cultures can explain the stress and difficulties sojourners experience in a new culture, it is reasonable to predict that when the differences between two cultures, for example Asian and American, are great, sojourners experience greater difficulty. As a matter of fact, literature suggests that qualitative and quantitative differences in values between the sojourner's culture and a new culture are assumed to be directly proportional to the amount of difficulty experienced by that person (Berry & Annis, 1974; Favazza, 1980; Furnham & Botcher, 1986; Kiefer, 1974; Padilla, 1980; Taft, 1977; D. W. Sue, 1981).

For instance, when recent Asian immigrants and foreign students were compared to European and Cuban immigrants coming to the United States, it was found that
the acculturative stress experienced by non-Asians was predictably less than the stress experienced by Asians (Aylesworth, et al, 1978; Juffer, 1983; Kiefer, 1974) due to the fact that European and Cuban cultures do not appear to be as dissimilar to American culture as is Asian culture.

This greater cultural disparity between Asian and American world view may affect psychological stresses experienced by Asians during acculturation in the United States in three major ways: (a) personal psychological problems; (b) institutional and cultural racism; and (c) help seeking behaviors, e.g., underutilization of mental health services. The assumption that Asians residing in the United States are functioning effectively and experiencing little difficulty as an 'ideal immigrant' in the United States society, therefore, should be especially scrutinized (Caudill & DeVos, 1956; Endo & Della-Piana, 1983; Hsu, 1971; Kitano & S. Sue, 1973; Schwartz, 1971; D. W. Sue, 1981; D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 1973; Vernon, 1982).

In terms of personal psychological problems, there have been several clinical studies on Asians supporting the proposition that Asians have higher levels of disturbance: a very high prevalence of depression (Barnett, 1958; Bourne, 1975; Doan, 1977; Fernandez, 1988; Iga, 1957; Ito, 1981; Kiefer, et al, 1985; Kinzie & Manson, 1983; Koh & Upshaw, 1987; Masuda, et al, 1973;

More disturbing is the study by Baron and others (1983), which reports more than 115 cases of Sudden Unexplained Death Syndrome (SUDS), a mysterious malady that strikes young, apparently healthy Southeast Asian men in the United States. The researchers are speculating that the stress of culture shock may be a contributing factor to SUDS (Baron, et al, 1983; Sherman, 1988).

Secondly, there is considerable evidence in the United States that Asians, particularly Southeast Asian refugees, encounter active hostility and prejudice from certain sections of the United States (Alyesworth, et al, 1978; Asamen, 1983; Brewer & Campbell, 1976; Chin, 1981; Dacosta, 1985; Head, 1980; Nicassio, 1986). Small Asian groups may be the focus of more racial discrimination due to lack of a social support community system (Kim, 1980; Koh & Upshaw, 1987).

Thirdly, a serious problem of underutilization of mental health services by Asians in the United States has been well documented (Abbott, Tolefson & McDermott, 1982;
Anderson, 1983; Arkoff, et al, 1966; Atkinson, 1985; Higginbotham, 1979; Kanashige, 1973; Leong, 1986; Shium, 1985; D. W. Sue & Kirk, 1975; D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 1977; Tracey, Leong & Gidden, 1986; Yuen & Tinsley, 1981). This is due to (a) the physical inconveniences of going to a mental health clinic; (b) traditional taboos and inhibitions about telling non-physical problems to a doctor; and (c) the low priority given to psychological problems when multitude of other problems of survival, adaptation, and adjustment exist. But several therapeutic barriers are delineated in the literature based on a distinct set of Asian cultural values vs. embedded Western world views in clinical practices: English language; unfamiliarity of therapy process; stigma attached to psychological problems; saving face for one's family; and so forth.

Conflicting Literature

Although attempting to deal with the cultural factors affecting the mental health of Asians in the United States, the literature is polarized into two conflicting ways of conceptualizing and operationalizing psychological issues, and formulating intervention strategies (Brislin, 1983; Draguns, 1981; Lonner, 1981, 1985; Pedersen,

In terms of conceptual approaches and intervention strategies, the question is whether the categories of explanation and definition prevalent in one culture are valid or meaningful when applied to a different culture (Bochner, 1982; Brislin, 1983; Irvine & Berry, 1983; Kaplan, 1961; Lonner, 1981, 1985; Olmedo, 1979, 1980; S. Sue, 1988). In cross-culture research, the emic approach seeks to explain phenomena in terms of categories deemed meaningful within a specific culture, whereas the etic approach emphasizes the development of explanatory constructs that are applicable to all cultures (Brislin, 1983; Olmedo, 1979). Especially for psychologists and mental health professionals, the search for equivalent measure of constructs has been salient because of the traditional reliance on measurement instruments developed within rather narrow Western cultural perspectives (Atkinson, 1985; Ahia, 1984; Bochner, 1982; Brislin, 1983; Chow, 1985; Copeland, 1983; Draguns, 1981; Katz, 1985; Olmedo, 1979; Pedersen, et al, 1981; Price-Williams, 1975; Shium, 1985; Smith & Vasquez, 1985; D. W. Sue, 1975; S. Sue, 1988; Triandis, 1980). When applied to the acculturation process, the etic approach yields the linear model which involves replacement of the original culture by a new culture (Chow, 1985; Lebra, 1972; Maykovitch, 1976).

In addition, according to some studies, high acculturative stress is perceived due to the sojourner's unconscious or conscious adaptation to the American world view which negates his or her own ethnicity (Akbar, 1981; Alcantra, 1977; Baldwin & Bell, 1985; Chin, 1983; English, 1984; Higginbotham, 1977, 1979; Kaneshige, 1973; Kiefer, 1974; Onoda, 1977; Smith, 1983; D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 1973; D. W. Sue, 1978; Tomine, 1985). At the same time, there is enough literature reporting that low acculturative stress is related to high identification with American world view and acculturation behavior (Berry & Annis, 1974; Brewer & Campbell, 1976; Caudill, 1975; Feagin & Fujitaki, 1972; Graham, 1981; Iga, 1957; King, 1975; Kuroda, Suzuki & Hayashi, 1978; Head, 1980; Lonner, 1985; Levine & Campbell, 1972; Padilla, et al, 1985; D. W. Sue & S. Sue, 1974; Sommers, 1969; Szasz, 1970). Both theoretical and empirical documentation seems to support a relationship between a high American world view of
sojourners and immigrants and low acculturative stress, and a relationship between a high traditional world view and low acculturative stress. These findings are the complete opposite to each other. Such inconsistency in the literature of cross-cultural psychology has remained unexplored.

Purpose of the Study

This study was a preliminary exploration of the process by which recently arrived, non-institutionalized Asian residents adjust to their American environment. The study was concerned with the differences in degrees of adjustment difficulty experienced by Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States. Specifically, the study examined the extent to which one's world view and acculturation behavior were related to one's acculturative stress. Such an investigation will add empirically based information to current knowledge of Asian sojourners and immigrants that is mostly descriptive in nature and will test and extend existing socio-psychological and acculturation stress theories of acculturation patterns.
Significance of the Study

Theoretical Contributions

The rationale for the investigation was based on the paucity of acculturation research that examine acculturation behavior and world view impacting on acculturative stress. Reviewing the literature, there is certainly enough evidence to support the hypothesis that exposure to an unfamiliar culture may be, and often is, stressful and hence potentially harmful. It is true that considerable research on cross-cultural psychological issues has been conducted over the past decades yielding a wealth of data concerning the incidence and sources of acculturative stress. However, there is a conspicuous absence in the medical and applied psychology disciplines of empirical and systematic studies which examine what accounts for various differences in the reaction pattern of sojourners from different cultures, especially Asian immigrants and sojourners experiences.

In addition, it is the "sameness" of the process the sojourners experience when exposed to a new culture which is characteristic of most of the literature and research discussed previously herein. Conspicuously lacking is an analysis of the specificity associated with different cultural groups within their cultural contexts. There seems to be little attention given to the area of the
uniqueness of cultural experiences which can be only defined in terms of one's own cultural world view. While the acculturation process may perhaps be the 'same,' the effects are different. Therefore, this study is significant because it focused on the differences in the acculturation process attributable to the inherent differences in cultural world view possessed by each individual.

It also seeks to fill gaps in the present knowledge between world view and stress and to generate further research. Hopefully, this research will serve as a preliminary stage for subsequent, large scale investigations which can include additional Asian groups and other ethnic groups.

In and of itself this study sought to fill a void in the cross-cultural literature which exists between the etic and emic approaches. By examining these interactions, a better understanding of the relatively new construct of world view in psychology is expected.

In the past, a significant amount of research has focused on the counseling process itself. Although such research may have great heuristic value and some pragmatic value as well, it is not at all clear what it actually contributes toward improving the sensitivity, understanding, and, in turn, effectiveness of psychotherapy relative to Asian clients. To increase
sensitivity and understanding will necessitate that researchers study socio-political-cultural factors that affect the acculturation process, world views and acculturative stress of Asians from a culturally specific perspective.

The research in the aforementioned areas will add to a further understanding of acculturation behavior, theories of world views and acculturation, and will contribute to the current literature on acculturative stress and world views.

Practical Contributions

The research is important in light of its theoretical relevance, but it also has many psychological and social implications for dealing with a wide range of practical problems which Asians face in this country.

During the 1970s, over five million immigrants entered the United States and took up residence in every major region of the country. Among them, Asians were one of the fastest growing newcomer groups to the United States. The United States Bureau of Census reported in 1980 that there were 806,000 Chinese Americans, 775,000 Phillipino Americans, 701,000 Japanese Americans, and 362,000 Asian Indian Americans in the United States. The change of growth in the Asian American population is considerable (United States Bureau of Census, 1980).
More recent statistics in a *Time special issue* (1985) indicated that the Asian population grew to approximately 3.6 million, 1.6% of the total population in the United States. Just within the past few years, Asians have become the nation's fastest expanding ethnic group as measured by growth through birth and legal immigration. More than half (64%) settled in California, which has the nation's largest Asian population. By the year 2010, the Asian population in the United States is expected to more than double. According to other statistics from *Psychology Today* (July, 1986), five out of the top ten nationalities of the new immigrants are from Asian countries: Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, India and China. Concern has been expressed by health and mental health care providers at the ever increasing number of Asians coming to the United States.

Empirical support of the posited relationships in this study may generate a series of clinical case conceptualization and intervention strategies that counselors and psychologists can use. Such empirically based interventions would be more attuned to the clients' current status and culturally specific needs. Especially in the field of mental health, traditional modes of treatment have been reported to be ineffective and inappropriate for Japanese (Cox, 1984; Doi, 1971, 1976; Henkin, 1985; Higginbotham, 1979; Kitano & Matsushima,

It is worth noting that later-generation individuals are not immune to acculturative stress (Conner, 1975, 1977; Mena, et al, 1987; Montero, 1981; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Padilla, et al, 1985, 1986). A major contributor to stress may be that the second-generation is caught between two opposing value systems, those of their peers and that to which they have acculturated, and those of their parents which they cannot discard. The significance, therefore, of this study goes far beyond the scope of the subjects chosen for this study.

Moreover, cultural awareness and a cultural specific approach will help therapists, psychologists, educators and community agencies in planning and coordinating culturally relevant intervention and training programs for Asians. Cultural specific conceptualization and operationalization processes may also aid national policy
makers to make more informal decisions and to develop policies which consider specific factors affecting the fastest growing immigrants in this country, Asians.

Statement of the Problem

Using Asian sojourner and immigrant subjects in the United States, this study proposes to determine:

1. Is there a relationship between the levels of an individual's American world view orientation and perceived acculturative stress?

2. Is there a relationship between the levels of an individual's Asian world view orientation and perceived acculturative stress?

3. Is there a relationship between the levels of acculturation behavior and perceived acculturative stress?

4. Does consistency between the level of acculturation behavior and world view orientation relate to low acculturative stress?

5. Does inconsistency between the level of acculturation behavior and world view orientation relate to high acculturative stress?

The problem statement in interrogative form may be stated in the research hypothesis form as follows:

1. American world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.

2. Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.
3. A high acculturation score can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress, and a low acculturation score can be positively correlated with a high level of acculturative stress.

4. Both a high acculturation score with an American world view and a low acculturation score with an Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.

5. Both a low acculturation score with an American world view and a high acculturation score with an Asian world view can be positively correlated with a high level of acculturative stress.

Definition of the Terms

Both theoretical and operational definitions of the terms used in this study are presented in the following.

1. Culture is defined by Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) as "patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts, the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially attached values; culture systems may, on one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action" (p. 81). In addition, Brislin (1983) defines culture, "a culture can be explained as an identifiable group with shared beliefs and experiences, feelings of worth and value attached to those experiences, and a shared interest in a common historical background" (p. 2). For the purpose of this study, experiences and symbols are shared in the cultural context in terms of four specific domains delineated by Padilla (1980): familial; attitudinal; social; and environmental domains.

2. World view consists of the values, beliefs, presuppositions, assumptions an individual holds about self, the makeup of one's world and one's relationship with other people (Horner & Vandersluys, 1981; Sire, 1976; D. W. Sue, 1978). World view constitutes our psychological and philosophical orientation in life and
can determine how we think, behave, make decisions, and define events (Kluckhohn, 1956; English, 1983). In this study, the Kluckhohn framework is used since it includes the concept of value orientation as critical components of one's world view (English, 1983; Kluckhohn, 1956; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1973).

3. Asian world view refers to the world view, the prevalent values and norms shared by the majority of people in Asia. For the purpose of this study, Asian world view is defined as a determined low score on the Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (AAEIQ) (Yamauchi, 1981).

4. American world view refers to the world view, the prevalent values and norms shared by the majority of people in the United States but not by the Hispanic, Afro- or native Americans. For the purpose of this study, American world view is defined as a determined high score on the Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (AAEIQ) (Yamauchi, 1981). For lack of a better term, the term 'America,' and 'Americans' are used to mean the United States of America or the citizens of the United States of America in this study, not including Canada, or South or Central America.

5. Sojourner refers to an individual who often spends six months to over five years in 'other country' for usually voluntary purposes (Althen, 1981; Favazza, 1980; Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Here we find literature on explorers, anthropological field workers, business representatives, military personnel, tourists, and foreign students. In this study, terms sojourners and immigrants are interchanged for lack of clear-cut definitions. For instance, many foreign students end up becoming immigrants as a result of an extended sojourn.

6. Immigrant refers to an individual who moves to and makes a life in 'other country' for various purposes: the influence of relatives and friends; personal advancement and standard-of-life considerations; economic or job considerations; academic considerations; dissatisfaction with own country; and other miscellaneous reasons, such as to retire (Favazza, 1980; Furnham & Bochner, 1986). The literature deals primarily with international immigrants, migrants and refugees. In this study, terms sojourners and immigrants are interchanged for lack of clear-cut definitions.

7. Acculturation refers to an adaptation process utilized by an individual in the changed cultural environment. This process involves cultural competence, the acquisition
of new cultural knowledge and skills, role acculturation, adoption of new culturally defined roles. Accordingly, one's acculturation level is assessed by behavioral indicators in multiple dimensions: language familiarity, usage and preference; ethnic identity; friendship choice; geographic history knowledge and attitude; and other cultural behaviors. In this study, it is measured by the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) (Suinn, Richard-Figueroa, Lew and Vigil, 1985).

8. Acculturative stress refers to psychological stress which is generated during acculturation and which is mildly pathological and disruptive to the individual and his or her group and other lasting psychological stress due to cultural change (Berry & Annis, 1974; Oberg, 1960; Padilla, 1980, 1986). It is traditionally labeled 'culture shock' and defined as the feeling of frustration, anxiety, and depression which arises when familiar cultural cues are suddenly removed and replaced by new and seemingly bizarre behavior. In this study, it is measured by the FASE Scale (Padilla, 1980).

9. Etic perspective refers to the cultural universal approach. The approach emphasizes the development of explanatory constructs that are applicable to all cultures (Lonner, 1981; Olmedo, 1979; Pedersen, 1981). The position also assumes that there is a universal, single method of inquiry, single definition of mental health, the concept of normality which is applicable to everyone, whatever the person's origin.

10. Emic perspective refers to the cultural specific approach. This approach seeks to explain phenomena in terms of categories deemed meaningful within a specific culture (Lonner, 1981; Olmedo, 1979; Pedersen, 1981). This position also views intercultural differences as clues to divergent attitudes, values, and assumptions that differentiate one culture from another in a relativist framework. This approach places importance on viewing behavior in the cultural framework in which it occurs, and understanding the phenomena within its cultural context.

11. Ethnic identity refers to a person's beliefs or attitudes about his or her own cultural or racial background. Initially, the concept of ethnic identity was used as a tool to validate the concept of cultural world view as important dimensions of world view (Atkinson, Morten & D. W. Sue, 1979; Parham & Helms, 1981; D. W. Sue, 1973, 1981).
Limitations of the Study

In reporting the conclusions from the present research, several limitations must be considered in three areas: subject selection; instruments; and methodology.

1. The major limitation of this study is that the sample population is not random. For obvious political, practical and ethical reasons, it was not possible to conduct a nation-wide survey of Asian sojourners and immigrants randomly. Since these data are confined to voluntary participants from the San Francisco Bay Area, the data source limits the generalizability of the study beyond the current sample population.

2. The study is limited by sampling only foreign born Asians residing in the United States as sojourners or immigrants. This study does not attempt to apply the concepts of acculturation and acculturative stress to Asians born in the United States. Thus, the study does not investigate the experiences of Asians who are born in the United States.

3. The third limitation of this study is that the sample subjects are Asian sojourners and immigrants who possess the capacity to proficiently respond to the questionnaire in English without requiring the assistance of translation. The research sample, therefore, excludes not only Asian sojourners and immigrants who do not
understand English, but also those who require the assistance of translation.

4. The fourth limitation of this study is that the severest cases of acculturative stress may be overlooked in that the subjects who may be confined in a wide variety of institutions were excluded from the study.

5. The fifth limitation of this study is its reliance on self-reported data. It was assumed that the subjects understood the questionnaire and responded to it honestly and accurately. Misunderstandings on the part of the subjects could have lead to erroneous information and faulty conclusions. Inherent in the self-report technique of gathering data is a limitation that self-perception or limited self-awareness may not produce results consistent with those obtained by a trained and objective observer.

6. The sixth limitation of this study is the paucity of information discussing the validity and reliability of the instruments utilized: FASE Stress Scale, Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire, and Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale. This paucity results from the narrow scope of the instruments' application. Nonetheless, these instruments were utilized because they were only ones applicable and available.

7. The seventh limitation of this study is its focus on the psychological aspect of acculturative stress to the exclusion of physical stress syndrome and language
acquisition process. Separating the psychological from the physical raises a difficult problem when conducting clinical research with Asian populations since Asians have been reported to 'somatize psychological problems' (Lebra, 1976; Murphy & Murphy, 1968; S. Sue & D. W. Sue, 1974; Yamamoto, et al, 1968). This mind-body separation reflects only the Western world view of science and medicine, and is contrary to Asian world view of mind-body unity.

8. The last limitation of the study is the assumption that English language is culture-free and efficient enough to describe and investigate Asian experiences. The study is limited to constructs that are explained only in the English language. English as a product of Western world view, only reflects reality from Western values just like any other language. Whorf (1956) states "(A)ll observers are not led by the same physical evidence to the same picture of the universe unless their linguistic backgrounds are similar, or can in some way be calibrated" (p. v). The all-English nature of the study presented dilemmas on three levels: on the author's attempt to describe concepts of acculturation, acculturative stress and Asian world view; on the Asian subjects' expression of their experiences; and on the investigation into the research constructs.
Basic Assumptions

This study was conducted based on a following set of assumptions that enabled investigation into the extent to which one's world view and acculturation behavior were related to one's acculturative stress. One significant assumption is the quantitative model of acculturation from a psychometric perspective proposed by Olmedo (1979, 1980) and others (Clark, Kaufman & Pierce, 1976; Olmedo & Padilla, 1978; Szapocznik, Scopeta, Kurtines & Arnalde, 1975). They argued that measurement of individual acculturation is not only a legitimate area of investigation but can also meet conventional criteria of reliability and validity (Clark, et al, 1976; Olmedo, 1979, 1980; Spradley & Phillips, 1972; Szapocznik, et al, 1975). In this study, behavioral acculturation is measured by the multidimensional acculturation scale including linguistic, psychological, and sociocultural items.

The second assumption in this study is that cultural change is a normal process that is inevitable among sojourners and immigrants. Padilla (1980, 1986) supports this assumption indicating that the cultural change is not a selective process.
The third assumption is that the process of acculturation has profound psychological consequences, whether the individual perceives it as a positive or negative experience. The literature indicates that the process of acculturation involves changes, hence readjustment (Brink & Saunders, 1976; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Padilla, 1986; Smith, 1983).

The fourth assumption in this study is that stress is a universal concept. Accordingly, the assumptions regarding acculturative stress, embedded in the FASE Acculturative Stress Scale, are assumed to be transferrable.

Lastly, it is also assumed that individual world views can be assessed by examining value system (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; D. W. Sue, 1981). Based on the Kluckhohn framework (1951, 1956), the concept of value orientation is considered to be critical components of one's world view.

Summary

In this chapter, the rationale and purpose of the study were stated. The five major research questions to be answered by the study were posed and the hypotheses were formulated. The descriptions of the variables related to the research approach were discussed. An
analysis of the theory on which the study was based and the assumptions were presented. The significance of this study was emphasized since general research on the acculturation stress of Asians has not been prolific and more specifically, cultural specific studies of foreign born Asians have been fragmental.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The following review is concerned with studies and theoretical approaches, aspects of which can be applied to the subjects of this current study. The purpose of this chapter is to conceptualize current research problems by substantiating with theoretical evidences and past empirical data. The review is divided into three parts. The first section consists of presenting a theoretical overview of acculturation as a general socio-cultural process from both an historical and anthropological perspective. The second section discusses the more specific relevant theories concerning acculturative stress and world view. The third section consists of a summary of current developments most relevant to the present study. Throughout the review, particular attention was paid to the independent variables under review in the present study -- acculturation behavior and world view -- and their effects on acculturative stress as perceived by the various writers.
Acculturation: Historical Background

From an historical perspective, most research on acculturation has been anthropological in nature (Bastide, 1971; Beals, 1962; Bourguignon, 1979; Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Doan, 1977; Dohrenwend & Smith, 1962; Edgerton, 1965; Gordon, 1964, 1978; Head, 1980, Herskovits, 1958; Mason, 1955; Maykovich, 1976; McFee, 1968; Redfield, et al, 1936; Siegel, 1955; Spindler & Spindler, 1963) and some traditional studies have focused on the acculturation of third world nations to industrialized Western societies (DuBois, 1955; Foster, 1962; Mason, 1955).

In the mid-1930s, the Social Science Research Council appointed a Subcommittee on Acculturation. The efforts of the committee resulted in the formal adoption of acculturation as a legitimate new area of study dealing with "those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different culture come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original pattern of either or both groups" (Redfield, Linton & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149).

A highlight of acculturation literature is the exploratory formulation published by members of the Social Science Research Seminar on Acculturation in 1954. The formulation comprehends four major aspects of the phenomena of acculturation: (1) characterization of the
properties of the autonomous cultural systems that come into contact; (2) the nature of the contact situation; (3) the conjunctive relations established between the cultural systems upon contact; and (4) the cultural processes which flow from the conjunction of the systems.

It is clear that the importance of these studies lie in analyzing the process of sociocultural change under conditions of cultures in contact, and how it leads to an emphasis on acculturation as a group process in terms of its relationship to socialization, social interaction, and mobility (Bastide, 1971; Beals, 1962; Dohrenwend & Smith, 1962; Herskovits, 1958; Mason, 1955). In an important paper, published early in the history of acculturation research, Herskovits argued that acculturation is a powerful technique for the study of the "nature and mechanisms of culture," for, among other reasons, "when traditions are in conflict, the readjustments within a culture...can throw much light on how the elements of culture are interrelated and how the resultant whole functions" (1958, p. 263).

A series of anthropological and sociological studies of acculturation, employing the approach of emphasizing the culture of the target group itself, were conducted with various immigrants in the United States. Spiro (1955), Gordon (1964), Dohrenwend and Smith (1962), Siegel (1955), and Broom and Kitsuse (1955), all studied various

Although some of the studies are problem-oriented (Caudill, 1952; Edgerton, 1965), most of them are in the descriptive, "natural history" tradition of anthropological research. Hypotheses are seldom tested, but some emerge from an analysis of data (Benedict, 1964, 1967; Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Clark, et al, 1976; Connor, 1977; Cuellar, et al, 1980; Doob, 1957; English, 1984; Hallowell, 1951, Henry, 1955; Hsu, 1972; Masuda, et al, 1973; Thompson, 1948; Wintrob, 1969). Some of the papers are too superficial to yield any general conclusions. Most of the studies have suggested a positive relationship between acculturation and social mobility: ethnics with
high social status tend to be the most acculturated 
(Bourguignon, 1979; Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Doan, 1977; 
Endo & Della-Piana, 1983; D. W. Sue, 1975; Yamamoto & Iga, 
1974). Further, descriptive terms like 
"dominant-subordinate," "majority-minority," "subcultural 
group," and others have been applied to the conditions of 
contact to designate the relative strength or power of the 
cultures involved (Cordon, 1964; Mason, 1955). Although 
these provide suggestive starting points, a general 
failure to elucidate makes them poor guides for systematic 
study.

A survey of this set of literature also reveals that 
acculturation is viewed as the ultimate assimilation of 
the ethnic culture in American society, with less of an 
emphasis on the individual as a legitimate unit of 
analysis. Although some discuss acculturative stress, 
individuals do not seem to experience the stress, but 
rather, cultures or groups (Berry & Annis, 1974). The 
problem of how to discuss culture as a system without 
anthropomorphizing was very much present until a new 
series of acculturation research was produced. This new 
series of research made explicit use of psychological 
concepts or methods in the analysis of the acculturation 
process (Henry, 1955; Hallowell, 1951; Kaplan, 1961; 
Psychology of Acculturation

In 1945, Irving Hallowell published a paper titled "Sociopsychological aspects of acculturation." He argues against the notion that the mechanism of acculturation is the diffusion from one culture to another of abstracted cultural traits. Instead, Hallowell argues for attention to readjustments in individual behavior (1945). He points out that humans are never passive culture bearers and that abstract cultures never meet; only humans meet. He makes a case for examining both the barriers and the incentives to learning in contact situations in order to gain insight into the dynamics of acculturation. He and many other anthropologists started to depart further from the formalistic overt concept of culture. It is clear that some anthropologists during this period moved toward "psychologizing" the analyses of acculturation.

The individual, therefore, had now become important in the study of acculturation. This was so for two reasons. First, it was fully recognized that the individual is crucial in whatever change occurs through contact between differing cultural orientations. Second, there had been a shift in acculturation research; from an overt culture to a covert culture, the overt formal cultural level toward the covert level of culture in personality (Arkoff, et al, 1966; Benedict, 1964, 1969;

Covert culture, with its permeative and integrative character, is by definition hidden, rarely verbalized, implicit. It is also referred to as "subjective culture" (Triandis, et al, 1972), "deep structure of culture" (Bandler & Grinder, 1975), "cultural core" (Akbar, 1981), "ethnic loyalty" (Padilla, 1980, 1986), "intrinsic cultural traits" (Yao, 1979), and "world views" (Kaplan, 1961; Klukhohn, 1951, 1956; Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952; Myers, 1988; Padilla, 1980; Spindler & Spindler, 1963; D. W. Sue, 1978; Vontress, 1971; Whorf, 1956). In this set of acculturation research, constructs such as "themes," "covert culture," "values," and "basic attitudes" have been applied to analyses of culturally patterned behavior (Spindler & Spindler, 1963) with use of psychological instruments such as Rorschach and the Thematic Apperception Test.

H. S. Mekeel was one of the first anthropologists to use values as a conceptual tool in the analysis of culture change (1936). Highly generalized attitudes and beliefs, considered indicative of world view, were used as analytic

Other research has offered evidence that world view is congruent with the traditional mode of life, and that these world views have apparently persisted despite great changes in economy, social structure, and overt culture resulting from the changes in conditions of life brought about by the impact of Euro-American culture (DuBois,

Yao (1979) looked at the acculturation of contemporary Chinese immigrating to the United States, paying particular attention to intrinsic cultural traits (religious beliefs, ethnic values, cultural heritage) and extrinsic cultural traits (dress, manners, life-style, patterns of emotional experience, mastery of English). Predictably, the immigrants showed less change in the intrinsic traits than in the extrinsic traits. A greater change was recognized in such extrinsic traits as integrated residences, membership of professional organizations, social acceptance and economic position.

Yet another study done by Padilla, Wagatsuma and Lindholm (1985) found that ethnic loyalty is more resistant to change among Japanese and Japanese Americans living in the United States. As such, the maintenance of ethnic loyalty, even when extended into later generations, appears to be due to the individual's perceived discrimination toward the self and/or other members of their ethnic group (Padilla, 1980, 1986; Padilla, et al., 1983, 1985).

Another by-product of this new field of study is that of acculturation stages. In order to clarify the psychological process sojourners experience, a great deal
of theoretical literature suggesting stages of acculturation has spawned not only from psychological anthropology, but also from the disciplines of cross-cultural psychology and intercultural communication (Bastide, 1971; Beals, 1962; Broom & Kitsuse, 1955; Caudill, 1952; Chow, 1985; Connor, 1975, 1977; Endo & Della-Piana, 1983; Head, 1980; Maykovich, 1976; Montero, 1981; Spiro, 1955). The representative models often are a characteristic three-phase course to acculturation: contact, conflict and adaptation. The first phase is necessary, the second is probable, and some form of the third is inevitable. For instance, Garza-Guerreo describes the mourning process of culture shock as self identity change process: (a) cultural encounter; (b) reorganization; and (c) new identity phases (1972). Chow (1985) also reports the acculturation experience of Asian American women, postulating three perspectives relating to the degree of acculturation to the development of ethnic identity: (a) subscription to American values; (b) the compatibility of Asian and American values; and (c) retention of certain Asian values. The model facilitates the framework by conceptualizing how individuals respond to a new cultural environment and how they may experience acculturative stress in the process.
Acculturative Stress

The psychological consequences of acculturation, such as culture shock or acculturative stress, are a common feature in the literature (Adler, 1975; Barnett, 1977; Berry & Annis, 1974; Bock, 1970; Chance, 1965; David, 1971; Doob, 1957; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Garza-Guerrero, 1973; Juffer, 1983; Kiefer, 1974; Koh & Upshaw, 1987; Murphy, 1977; Oberg, 1960; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Sommers, 1969; Taft, 1977; Wallen, 1967; Valdez, 1985; Valdez, 1985). Reviewing the literature, there is certainly enough evidence to support the hypothesis that exposure to an unfamiliar culture may be, and often is, stressful and potentially harmful.

Symptoms of Acculturative Stress

not been explored (Bourguignon, 1979; Favazza, 1980; Favazza & Oman, 1978; Kiev, 1972; Lebra, 1976). However, the possibility exists that some of these symptoms may not apply to all cross-cultural experiences.

Perhaps the oldest literature in this area may be that of the concept of 'heimweb,' homesickness. Homesickness was originally described as an epidemic, an incurable, melancholic disease of 16th century Swiss mercenaries (Favazza, 1980; Peters, 1863). Toffler (1970) equated the psychological concomitants of culture shock with the Post-traumatic Stress Disorder experienced by many combat soldiers and disaster victims, noting that the following factors are all present to some degree as responses to acculturation stressors: (a) confusion, disorientation, or distortion of reality; (b) fatigue, anxiety, tenseness, or extreme irritability; and (c) apathy, emotional numbness, and emotional withdrawal, suicide ideation, alcoholism, and other substance abuse.

Wallen (1967) noted that acculturative stress "acts in many instances as a stimulus or vehicle to marital discord, excessive drinking, and numerous hypochondriacal concerns" (p. 724). Leighton (1959), reporting on a psychiatric study, found that social isolation adds to adjustment problems and that symptoms of insomnia, anxiety and heavy drinking were among the results. It is not surprising, therefore, when Murphy (1977) and many others
(Fabrega, 1969; Favazza, 1980; Freeman, et al., 1976; Iga, 1957; Jacobson & Berenberg, 1952; Kinzie & Mason, 1983; King, 1975; Kitano, 1969; Onoda, 1977; Rumbaut, 1977; Sommers, 1969; Westermeyer, 1979; Westermeyer, et al., 1984; Yamamoto, et al., 1968) draw an apparent association between migration and such various mental disorders as schizophrenia, acute reactive psychoses, affective psychoses, arteriosclerotic psychosis, alcoholism, psychopathy, and psychoneuroses, or stress disorders such as coronary heart disease, and peptic ulcer (Firth, 1959, Hinkle, 1974; Lanoix, 1983; Marmot & Syme, 1976; Masuda & Holmes, 1967). Moreover, King (1975) reports that clinical depression and 'a mild form of insanity' is related to acculturation. It is too simplistic, however, to state that acculturation causes stress.

In their process of developing the FASE acculturative stress scale, Padilla and others conducted interviews with immigrants concerning the difficulties they were experiencing during acculturation (Padilla, 1980; Padilla, et al., 1983). They found that immigrants and sojourners expressed difficulties in four areas of cultural experiences: familial, attitudinal, social and environmental. These are difficulties related to language, culture, and prejudice in a new and unfamiliar environment; role conflict, ambiguity, and conflicting cultural patterns; appearance, food preference, dependence
on others, acceptance by peers, and disagreements with parents, and relationships with the opposite sex, and feelings of isolation (Padilla, et al, 1983).

There is a plethora of literature which attempts to explain why moving to a new culture can be stressful. Four general categories of the research will be discussed: life event changes, psychology of loss, cultural displacement, and the dissonance model.

**Life Event Changes**

First, the life-events changes and illness is perhaps the most commonly examined concept to explain acculturative stress (Brink & Saunders, 1976; Fairbanks & Hough, 1981; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Hinkle, 1974; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Leong, et al, 1985; Lin, et al, 1979; Masuda & Holmes, 1967; Pihl & Caron, 1980; Reyes, 1981; Rumbaut, 1977; Shuval, 1982; Smith, 1983; Spradley & Phillips, 1972; Stening, 1979; Wallen, 1967). Sojourners may experience changes in climate, financial state, living and work conditions, social and religious activities, dietary habits, as well as exposure to pollution, new pathogens, and exotic diseases. Changes in climate, in conjunction with the new culture, may induce changes in lifestyle that express themselves in patterns of sleep, nutrition, timing of meals, clothing, housing, or general pace of activity. All these physical changes may serve as stressors. There

At the same time, there are changes in financial state, living and work conditions, recreation, social and religious activities or others from among those of the Social Readjustment Rating Scale (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) often used in determining the magnitude of recent life-events. When sufficiently present, their cumulative effect may result in the development of psychological or physical illness which may be attributable directly to them. In short, the life-events index may be a simple but complexly derived score that predicts acculturative stress -- the greater the score, the greater the culture shock. Hinkle (1974) studied Chinese immigrant groups in the United States and looked at the relationship between the range and type of major life event changes and any resultant physical and mental illness. They were
surprised by the large number of Chinese who, though they had experienced major 'life changes,' seemed little affected by them. In their study using the Social Readjustment Rating Questionnaire (Masuda & Holmes, 1967) Leong, Tseng and Wu (1985) suggested qualitative approaches for cross-cultural research rather than simply counting the events because "American psychological constructs have not been determined to be transferable across cultures" (p. 74).

Psychology of Loss

Second, the psychology of loss, seen by some as a central theme in psychotherapy, is another concept used to explain acculturative stress (Bowlby, 1969; Church, 1982; Doan, 1977; Edgerton, 1965; Freeman, et al, 1976; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Garza-Guerrero, 1973; Gottlieb, 1982; Kiefer, et al, 1985; Minkler & Biller, 1979; Munoz, 1980; Naditch & Morrissey, 1976; Oberg, 1960; Pavri, 1963; Shuval, 1982; Stening, 1979; Taft, 1977; Yao, 1979; Zwingmann & Pfister-Ammende, 1973). One has left behind a cohesive system of social supports and an identity with accompanying roles. So, in addition to the stress of not clearly understanding the rules that are now regulating human interaction, the individual also experiences a loss of considerable magnitude (Minkler & Biller, 1979). These include family, friends, community, language, music,
culturally determined values, customs and attitudes, occupational status and a whole host of important physical variables ranging from food to weather patterns. Oberg (1960) noted that acculturative stress is "precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all one's familiar cues" which may produce a serious threat to one's identity, a kind of 'role shock' (Garza-Guerrero, 1973; Minkler & Biller, 1979), since one's identity is build around the objects in one's life.

The loss may be followed by grief and mourning. Indeed, it is the similarity between various documented symptoms of grief, and the stages or phases of grief, which have most interested researchers on acculturation and mental health (Furnham & Bochner, 1986). Freeman, Kaplan and Sadock (1976) referred also to the aspect of anxiety resulting from culture shock, noting that "the person undergoing culture shock experiences a variety of emotions -- isolation, anxiety, and depression, often accompanied by a sense of loss close to mourning" (p. 1164). Garza-Guerrero (1973) asserted that this "mourning (is) related to the loss of a culture and vicissitudes of identity in the face of the threat of a new culture" (p. 409). Because bereavement behavior is to some extent culturally determined, this may account for various differences in the reaction pattern of immigrants and sojourners from different cultures.
The idea of migration as a bereavement or grief process has been pursued by Munoz (1980), who examined the socio-psychological reactions of Chileans in Britain. However, it may be a problem to presume that all migrants and sojourners experience negative, grief-like reactions. For some people, migration may be a blessed escape. Although the grief literature discuss different phases, there are no cultural specific predictions as to what type of people suffer more or less or for how long. In addition, counseling for the grieving immigrant or sojourner would seem highly inappropriate since they need information and support as much as therapy (Furnham & Bochner, 1986).

Cultural Displacement

Third, the concept of cultural differences has also been used to account for the misunderstanding, distress and difficulties experienced by sojourners (Aylesworth, et al, 1978; Brewer & Campbell, 1976; DuBois, 1903; Fabrega & Wallace, 1968; Favazza, 1980; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Head, 1980; Henry & Saberwal, 1969; Higginbotham, 1979; Iga, 1957; Juffer, 1983; Kiefer, et al, 1985; Lanoix, 1983; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Shuval, 1982; Taft, 1977; Yu, 1981). These 'culturally displaced persons' are in a labyrinth in which they have lost all sense of bearing, lacking familiar cues such as social norms, values and
mores, and consequently do not possess the relevant matter-of-course recipes for action in a new culture (Shuval, 1982). This is especially so when there is an actual rejection by the new culture associated with the unavailability of a culturally relative support system (Katz, 1985; Smith, 1985; Copeland, 1983). This labyrinth represents a challenge to their primary value and norm socialization with consequent damage to self-esteem. They may feel ignorant because they must rely on others to guide, model, and translate for them in everyday matters (Padilla, 1980). The necessity of changing one's values and rearranging one's behavior can have disastrous consequences by disrupting one's whole system (Fabrega & Wallace, 1968). This constraining situation, the existential restructuring of values, is best illustrated by the concept of double consciousness, "Twoness," that is, "wanting to feel a part of society while being made to feel apart from it" (DuBois, 1903).

Since cultural differences can often explain the stress and difficulties sojourners experience in a new culture, it is reasonable to predict that when the differences between two cultures are great, sojourners experience greater difficulty. In other words, the greater the difference, the greater the acculturative stress exerted on a sojourner adapting to the new culture. As a matter of fact, research suggests that the
qualitative and quantitative differences between the sojourner's native and the new culture are assumed to be directly proportional to the amount of difficulty experienced by that person (Berry & Annis, 1974; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Furnham & Botchner, 1986).

Taft (1977) states that the difficulty of coping with unfamiliar cultures varies. Sometimes the gap is easy to bridge, sometimes it is difficult. The factors influencing the disparity and highly relevant to the size of the gap between cultures are the language used, economic structure, level of technology, size and complexity of the formal society, political structure, specific ceremonies and rituals and the style of primary social relationships. The greater the differences in these respects, the more difficult the task of coping, i.e., the greater the stress (Aylesworth, 1980; Furham & Botcher, 1986; Favazza, 1980; Padilla, 1980, 1986; Taft, 1977).

According to Juffer's study (1983) of acculturative stress and international university students, Asian students were experiencing more acculturative stress than other international students due to cultural differences. She and many others concluded that the higher level of acculturative stress of Asians is due to the fact that non-Asian cultures do not appear to be as dissimilar to American culture as is Asian culture. It has been
proposed that this greater cultural disparity between Asian and American cultures present explanation to the acculturative stresses Asians experience in the United States.

**Dissonance Model**

Fourth, the intrapersonal inconsistency between two dimensions of the culture (world view and acculturative behavior), i.e., dissonance model, has been examined to explain acculturative stress (Bandura, 1982; Doan, 1977; Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974; Fabrega, 1969; Favazza, 1980; French, et al, 1974; Padilla, et al, 1985; Reyes, 1981; Smith, 1983; E. M. Smith, 1985; Spielberger & Diaz-Guerreo, 1976; Spindler & Spindler, 1963; Triandis, et al, 1972; Vallez, 1985). The dissonance model concentrates on differences between these intrapersonal factors but not between cultures (Bandura, 1982). Stated most generally, this theory proposes a multidimensional process of potential stressor situations, subjectively determined perception variables, and the availability and usability of personal and social coping mechanisms (Bandura, 1982; French, et al, 1974). Thus, homeostasis on the individual level will be disrupted when a person perceives a given situation to be disturbing, alarming, or threatening. If he or she is unable to mobilize personal or social resources to cope with the situation in such a
manner as to restore homeostasis, his or her energy will be bound up dealing with this perceived disturbance; the preoccupation or dissonance thus raised defines a stressful condition (Bandura, 1982; Vallez, 1985).

To summarize, stress is said to exist to the extent that an individual in a culturally different environment defines a salient situation as disturbing for oneself when interpreted from one's world view, and one is unable to recruit effective coping mechanisms to remove or reduce the disturbance; thus affecting self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Vallez, 1985). Two simultaneous conditions are necessary for stress to be present or to increase: a subjective definition of a situation as disturbing (world view); and an inability (behavioral acculturation) -- for whatever reason -- to cope with the condition. Such a combination of circumstances may indeed occur in acculturation situations. The centrality of social and psychological factors in determining stress is seen in the fact that both these conditions (i.e., what one defines as disturbing and what resources one can utilize for coping) are largely culturally determined. In other words, discrepancy or conflict between two dimensions of the acculturation process may be contributing to the acculturative stress.

According to Spielberger and Diaz-Guerreo (1976), "stress" denotes the objective properties of situation
(and) 'threat' refers to the individual's 'pereption' of a situation as more or less dangerous or personally threatening to him or her." (p. 5). They further propose that heightened awareness of the situation, the 'stressor,' as threatening leads to an anxiety state. They also posit that "a stressful situation may not be perceived as threatening by an individual who ... has the necessary skills and experience to cope with it" (Spielberger & Diaz-Guerrero, 1976, p. 5). Their implication that behavioral changes can in turn change attitudes seems rather simplistic. The present research questions will examine such interactive effects on acculturative stress.

In Padilla, Wagatsuma and Lindholm's study of Japanese and Japanese Americans and acculturative stress, they found that Japanese sojourners and immigrants experience more acculturative stress and have lower self-esteem compared to Japanese Americans born in the United States (1985). Their research concluded that the level of acculturation behavior and self-esteem were good predictors of stress in both Japanese and Japanese Americans, but value orientation did not reach the same significant level in their study (1985).

It is, therefore, clear that acculturation as a socio-cultural process does not necessarily induce stress. However, while dealing with physical, social and cultural
changes involved, one's cultural world view orientation plays a vital role in better understanding a variety of subjective responses and definitions of the stressful situations that may take place.

Theory of World View

World view consists of the presuppositions and assumptions an individual holds about the makeup of his or her world (Sire, 1976). Horner and Vandersluis (1981) consider world view "as a general conception of the humans' place in the universe, and of factors that cause human beings to act and interact in the way they do" (p.33). D. W. Sue (1978) defines world view as how a person perceives his or her relationship to the various components of the world: nature, institutions, other people, things, and so forth. Most scholars suggest that world view constitutes our psychological orientation in life and can determine how we think, behave, make decisions, and define events (English, 1984). Our cultural experience and life events influence our world views. Value orientations also form critical components of an individual's world view (English, 1984; Ibrahim, 1985; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1973).
World view is a culturally based variable that influences not only the relationship between the counselor and the client (Horner & Vandersluis, 1981; Ibrahim, 1985; Triandis, et al, 1972; D. W. Sue, 1978; Pedersen, 1981), but also personality theory and research paradigm (Ahia, 1984; Atkinson, 1985; Copeland, 1983; Draguns, 1981; Katz, 1985; Leong, 1986; Lonner, 1981, 1985; Smith & Vasquez, 1985). As an example, consider attempts by counselors and psychologists to specify "the good life." We refer to people as mature or immature, as well-adjusted or poorly adjusted, as mentally healthy or mentally ill, as if these are statements of fact, when they are really value judgments influenced by the Western world view (Copeland, 1983; Katz, 1985; Pedersen, 1985, 1987; Shium, 1985; Smith & Vasquez, 1985; D. W. Sue, 1981; Taylor, 1977). In other words, this world view influences the goals of societies in general, individuals in particular, and specifically in the domains of scientific inquiry and technological advancement (Barrien, 1966; DuBois, 1955; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Katz, 1985; Kluchkhohn, 1976; Lonner, 1981, 1985; Mason, 1955; Stewart, 1979).

Initially, the concepts of ethnic self-identity, values, attitudes, beliefs, time perception, intracultural communication and locus of control were all used as a tool to validate the concept of cultural world view. Research on ethnic self-identity seems more prolific only in recent

World view is an important concept in this study. It has already been mentioned that the differences in values
that exist between cultures play a major role in misunderstandings, distresses and difficulties experienced by sojourners. Further, Asians, more so than individuals from other countries, seem to experience more acculturative stress in the United States (Aylesworth, et al, 1978; Baron, et al, 1983; Bourne, 1975; Juffer, 1983; Kiefer, 1974; Nicassio, et al, 1986; Smith, 1983; Yu, 1981). This is due to ideological and cultural incompatibilities. In the next section, the relevant contrasting dimensions of Asian and American world views are selectively discussed in relation to acculturation. The comparison is made according to four existential categories: (a) group vs. individual orientation; (b) Cosmic Unity vs. mastery of universe; (c) field dependent behavior vs. field independent behavior; and (d) self-effacement vs. self-expression.

Asian World View and American World View

Despite a multitude of intraethnic and interethnic factors, there are certain cultural similarities that reflect distinct sets of Asian experience and American experience (Azuma, 1984; Barrien, 1966; Caudill & DeVos, 1956; Connor, 1977; DuBois, 1955; Hsu, 1972; Iwahara, 1973; Kikuchi & Gordon, 1970; Kitano, 1976; Lebra, 1972, 1976; Leung, 1983; Marsella, et al, 1985; Murphy & Murphy,

American world view, on the other hand, is rooted in the Protestant ethic and eighteenth-century rationalism as middle-class American value system (Barrien, 1966; DuBois, 1955; Kikuchi & Gordon, 1970; Kluckhohn, 1976; Marsella, et al., 1985; Mason, 1955; Pedersen, 1987; Stewart, 1979; Yamamoto & Iga, 1974). Counseling theories and practices as a product of this configuration, for instance, reflect a distinct set of values which are different from Asian world view. In fact, Pedersen (1987) presents ten western values embedded in counseling and psychology: (1) assumptions of universal normality; (2) emphasis on individualism; (3) fragmentation by academic disciplines;
(4) dependence on abstractions; (5) overemphasis on independence; (6) neglect of client's support systems; (7) dependence on linear thinking and quantification; (8) autoplastic assumption; (9) neglect of history; and (10) danger of cultural encapsulation. There are varying dominant value profiles both in American and Asian cultures which seem directly antagonistic to each other. Several empirical studies have substantiated these differences in two cultures (Barrien, 1966; Barnett, 1958; Caudill & DeVos, 1956; DuBois, 1955; Marsella, et al, 1985; Yamamoto & Iga, 1974; Yamauchi, 1981).

**Group Orientation vs. Individual Orientation**

First, that Asian culture is group-oriented, emphasizing mainly the structure of family, clan, class, and state through which individuals relate to one another, has been well documented (Iwahara, 1973; Marsella, et al, 1985; Nakane, 1970; Pedersen, 1977; Reishauer, 1977; D. W. Sue, 1981). Loyalty and obedience to the group or family is valued more than individuality. Reishauer (1977) remarked that no difference was more significant between Asians and Americans than the greater Asian dependency to emphasize 'groupism,' somewhat at the expense of the individual. According to Nakane (1970), this group-orientationalness stems from the notion that the family rather than the individual is the basic unit of culture.
Since individuality and the independence of group members are deemphasized, adjustments have to be made to meet the value system of the group (Shon & Ja, 1982). In other words, one constantly feels 'pressured' to meet group requirements; otherwise, one may be excluded from the group and/or undergo tremendous hardship.

On the other hand, individualism, independence, personal freedom and concept of self, occupy a more psychologically prominent place in American culture (DuBois, 1955; Johnson, 1985; Kluckhohn, 1976; Pedersen, 1987; Stewart, 1979). Indeed, some consider American individualistic assertion a right. According to Johnson (1985), "Children, adolescents and young adults who objectively are not independent of their families feel the need to act as if (and to believe) they are, and to disregard transparently dependent aspects of their relationship to parents, teachers, employers, and other superiors. Much of this independence is 'psychological' and has the effect of inflating a sense of individualism" (p. 124).

As part of the Western emphasis on individualism, there is a presumption of self-reliance, that an individual should not be dependent on others, nor should the individual allow others to be dependent on them (Pedersen, 1987). Even the terms used in counseling and psychology alone, with their emphasis on self-awareness,
self-exploration, self-enhancement and the common autoplastic goals in psychotherapy (focus on changing the individual, not the system), illustrate the well established values enumerated above (Copeland, 1983; Katz, 1985; Pedersen, 1987; Sue, 1981).

Both group-orientedness and individualism are institutionalized in the whole of Asian and American culture respectively, penetrating all spheres of each society constituting ontology, axiology, cosmology and epistemology (Marsella, et al, 1985; Nakane, 1970; Rohlen, 1974; Sato, 1968; Shon & Ja, 1982; Yamauchi, 1981).

**Cosmic Unity vs. Mastery of Universe**

Secondly, another important Asian notion is a Cosmic Unity relating to the collective consciousness mentioned above. The notion of mind, soul or spirit rooted in the changeless reality of an inner self is considered to be the core of reality, both for individuals and for a Cosmic Unity. The person is not an individual and separate 'self' but part of an ultimate Cosmic Unity or Absolute (Azuma, 1984; Iwahara, 1973; Kuroda, et al, 1978; Maupin, 1962; Nakamura, 1964; Pedersen, 1977; Sato, 1968). Asian culture emphasizes the connection between an individual and the Cosmic Absolute rather than any aspects separately. For instance, Zen opposes the notion of a subject-object distinction. In the West we become aware
of ourselves as subject and the rest of existence as object; Zen teaches that this dualism is not real, that both self and nonself are unified in the totality of existence, so that the self is not an entity separate from experiencing but part of that experiencing itself (Sato, 1968). Iwahara (1973) states it is a whole mind-body experience or a holistic integration of the self and the world. The essential nature of mind, according to Iwahara (1973), is a dynamic psychic potentiality into which the subject-object dichotomy is "melted in Zen theory."

Meditation, practiced often in Asian cultures, is characterized as a condition of no mind, nothingness, or "being one with the world" (Das, 1987; Iwahara, 1973; Marsella, et al, 1985; Murphy & Murphy, 1968; Morita, 1978; Watanabe, 1973; Watts, 1961).

In American culture, mastery of one's environment epitomizes the people-nature relationship (Barri, 1966; DuBois, 1955; Kluckhohn, 1976; Stewart, 1979). It is that of people against or over nature, and the independence and separateness of people from nature. According to this view, natural forces are something to be overcome and put to use by human beings. In fact, "we span our rivers with bridges, blast through our mountains to make tunnels, make lakes where none existed, and do a thousand and one other things to exploit nature and make it serve our human needs" (Kluckhohn, 1976, p. 69). In general, this means
that people have an orientation to life which is that of overcoming obstacles. In other words, by controlling the environment and obstacles, one simply does not accept the inevitable as inevitable (DuBois, 1955; Pedersen, 1987; Stewart, 1979). This concept makes it hard for Americans to understand the kind of people who accept the obstacle and 'give in' to it, or even the people who stress the harmonious oneness of human and nature (Barrien, 1966; Lebra, 1976; Marsella, et al., 1985; Pedersen, 1987).

Field Dependent Behavior vs. Field Independent Behavior

Thirdly, the concept of proper conduct depending on the situation (field dependent) is very important in Asian world view (Bolen, 1979; Das, 1987; Iwahara, 1973; Knoblauch, 1985; Lebra, 1972, 1976; Lee, 1982; Murphy & Murphy, 1968; Nakane, 1970; Pedersen, 1977; Rohlen, 1974; Tang, 1987). Confucius (551-479 B.C.) introduced 'Li,' the proper conduct, as the duty of and necessity for persons to observe proper forms of conduct for each social situation. Asians are reared morally as well as psychologically to be sensitized to the place they occupy in a socio-cultural setting (contextual perception), to perform faithfully whatever roles are assigned to them, and to respond to the expectations and evaluations of others (Hsu, 1972; Lebra, 1972; Nakane, 1970). This requires performing the 'correct behavior' in any given
situation. For instance, many Asians specifically have been raised in a socio-cultural context where filial piety is pervasive (Azuma, 1984; Hsu, 1972; Yamauchi, 1981). Individual obligation to and an unquestioning respect for parental and older male sibling authority supersedes 'personal' goals and aspirations (Yamauchi, 1981).

This situation-centered world view promotes a flexible and adaptive repertoire of behaviors based on the principle of situational selection and contextual perception. In other words, not only is there a sensitivity toward one's socio-cultural environment but also toward social accommodation, conformity, compliance and a willingness to accept that harmony with the socio-cultural environment must be maintained.

These are all valued. This means there is a tendency toward conformity in Asian cultures in the direction of a group norm (Nakane, 1970; Rohlen, 1974; Tang, 1987). Asians are more sensitive to group stress and accordingly, in conflict situations, tend to change their opinions, seeking harmony or balance. For an Asian, it is important to live in harmony and peace with one's surroundings, combining the powers of nature and of ideas or the role of the individual and the human organization as two aspects of the same universe (Kikuchi & Gordon, 1970). In fact, this discourages any assertive attempts to change dissatisfaction with the status quo in one's environment.
(Rohlen, 1974). Indeed, Yamauchi (1981) discusses fatalism as a calm acceptance of one's situation, a deftness at making the most of existing situations. It is very difficult for Asians to think of 'self' as being separate from carefully defined appropriate cultural norms and differentiated roles. This conformity and social accommodation may be the reason behind the myth of Asians' being 'ideal immigrants' in the United States (Caudill & DeVos, 1956; Endo & Della-Piana, 1983; Kitano & S. Sue, 1973; D. W. Sue, 1981; Vernon, 1982). Contextual perception allows Asians to transcend conflicts and restore a sense of relatedness between individuals and their environment.

To the contrary, the notion of an internal locus of control, referring to a belief that reinforcements are contingent on their own actions and that people can shape their own behaviors and fate (Barrien, 1966; Stewart, 1979; Myers, 1988; Pedersen, 1987; D. W. Sue, 1981), is valued in the American world view. Essentially, the behavior of individuals under this view is considered to be self-determined and self-conducted. It is more important for Americans to assert themselves rather than to comply or to conform automatically to the culturally prescribed norm and roles. Egalitarianism in American society promotes open and flexible relationships between people with less differentiated social status, and allows
a person to 'question authority' if necessary. Rather than being field or situation dependent, Americans tend to be field independent in that a person's self concept is independent from his or her environment (Marsella, et al, 1985; Lebra, 1972). Therefore, the individual should be consistent in his or her opinions across all social contexts rather than adopt the ethic of whatever group happens to claim his or her loyalty at the moment. Consequently, Americans may be seen as socially insensitive and non-accommodative, rigid, lacking regard for others and the environment (Barrien, 1966; Lebra, 1972; Marsella, et al, 1985). Instead, field independent behavior capitalizes upon the individuals' intuition, creativity and self-determination.

**Self-Effacement vs. Self-Expression**

Lastly, the ideals of self-effacement or self-denial are prominent in Asian culture (Baskin, 1972; Hong & Cooker, 1984; Hsu, 1972; Johnson, 1985; Knoblauch, 1985; Marsella, et al, 1985; Nakane, 1970; Pesersen, 1977; Tang, 1987; Watanabe, 1973; Watts, 1961). The individual reconciles self-expression against conformity throughout society by living in accord with prescribed roles for family and society. The notion of balance in Asian cultures is familiar. Consider as an example the harmonious tension between the Yin and Yang principles of
Asian philosophy. Human behavior theory in Asian countries requires an understanding of relational units instead of the individualistic assumptions of Western personality theory. Baskin (1972) writes that in the interest of maintaining harmony, "the nobler minded man (sic), will be agreeable even when he (sic) disagrees" (Baskin, 1972, p. 19). Baskin (1972) further states that "In fact, there is not requirement in Asian upbringing that there be any consistency between one's actions and one's inner convictions." This is in direct contrast to much of Western thought which condemns the wish as much as the action. Shame and guilt are associated with actions which demean the group or the family. In a way survival will depend largely on not only one's flexibility and adaptability but also on an extension of tolerance and conciliation with the environment, however paradoxical and complex the polarization between actions and convictions may be.

On the contrary, self-expression, openness, spontaneity and direct communication are valued in American society (DuBois, 1955; Kluckhohn, 1976; Myers, 1988; Pedersen, 1987; Vontress, 1971). Verbal, emotional and behavioral expressiveness are all reinforced. Given these American principles, it makes less sense for Americans to keep their personal feelings to themselves than it does for Asians to do so, even when
self-expression threatens to disrupt relationships. This self-expression and self-assertion make it difficult to compromise one's conflicting beliefs, and tolerate differing opinions in the environment. The notion of balance, 'the harmonious tension,' is seen as a conflictive dualism to analyze and confront. In psychotherapy, it is emphasized that congruency between one's actions and one's inner value system be reached (Pedersen, 1987; D. W. Sue, 1981). In fact, maladjustment is often conceptualized as stemming from the inconsistency between them. It is very important for a person's behavior to be congruent with one's belief. From this standpoint, the actualization of those Asian values mentioned above may seem to foster submissiveness, passivity, pessimism, timidity, and an adaptive tendency rather than active strategy for coping with one's world. Realization of American values, however, fosters self-interest, aggressiveness, initiative, independence, and spontaneity.

World View and Acculturation

A set of binary oppositions representing Asian and American world view emphases are enumerated. To summarize, Asian world view, including such values as group-orientation, Cosmic Unity, contextual perception,
situational-centered flexibility, conformity, fatalism, and extension of tolerance and conciliation with the environment, all seem to equip Asians with maximizing their readiness for acculturation to a new culture.

Nonetheless, American world view, including such values as individualism, independence, egalitarianism, self-assertion, mastery of nature, all seem to make it difficult for a person to adjust to a new environment with different cultural systems, norms and values. Consequently, American world view orientation does not seem to equip an individual with maximizing their readiness for acculturation to a new culture.

The following section discusses the etic and emic perspectives, approaches used to conceptualize and analyze the relationship between the research variables employed in this study.

Etic and Emic Perspectives

Two approaches, the etic and the emic, constitute the point of departure for cross-cultural research in psychology (Atkinson, 1985; Brislin, 1983; Brislin, et al, 1973; Campbell, 1974; Draguns, 1981; Lonner, 1985; Olmedo, 1979, 1980; Pedersen, 1981; Shium, 1985; S. Sue, 1988). The etic perspective, the cultural universal, and the emic perspective, the cultural specific, were terms first
coined by the linguist Pike (1954). They were widely analyzed in reference to the task of basic cross-cultural information gathering by Berry (1979), and Price-Williams (1975), and reviewed in relation to their application to empirical cross-cultural research by Brislin (1983), Olmedo (1979, 1980), Lonner (1981, 1985), and Triandis, Malpass, and Davidson (1972). These concepts have become the conceptual and methodological pivotal points of cross-cultural psychology (Draguns, 1981).

Etic Perspective

Etic perspective refers to the cultural universal approach in cross-cultural theories, research (both conceptualization and operationalization), and practices.

In research, the etic approach emphasizes the development of explanatory constructs that are applicable to all cultures (Atkinson, 1985; Lonner, 1985; Olmedo, 1979; Shuim, 1985; D. W. Sue, 1981; S. Sue, 1988). At the same time, in personality and counseling theories, the position assumes a single, universal definition of mental health, a concept of normality which is applicable to everyone, whatever the person's cultural origin without questioning the cross-cultural validity of the assumption. Although the etic approach has its merit, a problem of "imposed etics" (Lonner, 1981), arises when explanatory

For instance, it has been established that counseling, psychotherapy, theories of personality, evaluation and diagnosis, research, and counseling goals in the United States have traditionally been conceptualized based on the highly individualistic American world view (Ahia, 1984, Atkinson, 1985; Copeland, 1983; Ivey, 1980; Katz, 1985; Pedersen, 1981; D. W. Sue, 1981). So many accounts about psychology theories, problem definitions and counseling techniques have been raised, challenged and criticized that there are serious questions about its ethnocentric application to other cultures (Copeland, 1983; Ivey, 1980; Katz, 1985; Lonner, 1981; Olmedo, 1979; Padilla, 1980, 1986; D. W. Sue, 1981). Many claim that counseling techniques associated with a American world view may violate the implicit values and unarticulated presuppositions that contribute to the other world view of a person. The techniques may also be offensive or inappropriate (Copeland, 1983; Katz, 1985; Sue, 1981).
In addition, Sue (1981), Pedersen (1981), and Lonner (1981, 1985) assert that this universal application of American ethos through theories and practices may tend to infer that differences from expected normality in etic perspective should be viewed as deficits, suggesting psychopathology or lowered intelligence. More specifically, Sue categorizes "imposed etics" as: (1) the pathological view of ethnic group member; (2) the genetic deficiency model; (3) the culturally deficient model; and (4) the culturally different model (1981). Therefore, when etic approach is often employed to conceptualize and operationalize constructs, it is likely that 'etic results' are obtained, that are pathological, deviant, genetically deficient, and culturally deficient. Shuim (1985) advocates the need for a new psychological model for Asians.

For instance, a number of investigators have considered problems associated with the cross-cultural use of the MMPI (Gynther, 1979; D. W. Sue & Frank, 1973; D. W. Sue & Kirk, 1973; D. W. Sue & S. Sue, 1974; Lonner, 1981). Research done by D. W. Sue and Frank (1973), D. W. Sue and Kirk (1973), and D. W. Sue and S. Sue (1974) reveals Japanese and Chinese in the United States experience more stress and possess more MMPI scale elevations than their Caucasian counterparts. Their Asian subjects were characterized as socially isolated individuals who
generally felt less autonomous, more anxious, nervous, lonely, alienated, and rejected than did Caucasian counterparts. Considering the differences in the world views between Asian and American cultures, this result may be due to "imposed etics" of MMPI and this could possibly explain many discrepancies and contradictions that exist in psychology literature on Asians. Further, traditional counseling itself has drawn the sharpest criticism for its irrelevance to the requirements and life-styles of Asians (Aylesworth, et al, 1978; Doi, 1969; Henkin, 1985; Hurh & Kim, 1984; Kim, 1986; Kim, 1976; Kitano, 1981; Kitano & Matsushima, 1981; Lebra, 1976; Lee, 1982; Leong, 1986; Leung, 1983; Murase, 1982; Pedersen, 1977, 1987; D. W. Sue, 1981; D. W. Sue & D. Sue, 1977; S. Sue, 1988).

As a matter of fact, contrasting values and assumptive frameworks of Asian and American world views presented in the previous section illustrate a particular set of "imposed etics" for Asians in the United States. For instance, what constitutes healthy personality is clear according to the aforementioned four existential categories in American world view. Obvious criteria are sense of independence, self-reliance, internal locus of control, autonomous, self-expressive, assertive, congruency between action and belief, active problem solving skills.
For example, Sue (1981) in his study demonstrates that Asian adolescents' view of career decision making is much more 'restricted' by family considerations than Caucasian adolescents. More, emphasis on emotional expression in therapy in American world view could be another "imposed ethics" for Asians in the United States. Atkinson, Maruyama, and Matsui (1978) studied effectiveness of feedback of feelings of Asian clients in therapy. Their results indicate that continual focus on affect through the use of reflection and summarization of feelings was effective with American clients but not necessarily so with Asian clients.

Yet another is an activist orientation implicit in American world view when confronted with a problem. Americans will be likely to do something to solve the incongruency between one's belief and action. "If at first you do not succeed, try, try again." Finding ways "to do something" about any and all situations are stock American phrases (DuBois, 1955). Under the same conditions, Asians would have been socialized to restrain themselves, to behave according to environmental and relationship demands and avoid a direct response. This would be the favored mode of dealing with the problem, even though such compliance is antagonistic to one's belief: "healthy denial" (D. W. Sue, 1981).
In summary, the stressful situations within the American world view can be described as conditions where individuals feel out of control, incongruent with action and belief, and not being able to assert oneself (English, 1984; Lebra, 1976; Pedersen, 1987; D. W. Sue, 1981). In order to deal with the situations, emotional self-disclosure, assertiveness, reclaiming feeling of control, and cognitive restructuring are often encouraged in the therapy. Some research evidence support these concept of stress and intervention strategies do not reflect the values and lifestyles of Asians (Fairbanks & Hough, 1981; Leong, et al., 1985; D. W. Sue, 1986; Watanabe, 1973). Many claim one of the major reasons why Asian clients may prematurely terminate counseling is that counselors may not only differ in world view, but employ counseling skills inappropriate to Asian's world view (Kitano, 1981; Pedersen, 1977, 1987; D. W. Sue, 1981). Consequently, we as counselors need to begin to understand the concepts of health or normality within the specific framework of world view, and to develop contextual or situational assessment procedures.
Emic Perspective

Emic perspective refers to the cultural specific approach in cross-cultural theories, research, and practices (Brislin, et al, 1973; Price-Williams, 1975; Pedersen, 1981). This approach has been particularly prevalent in anthropological literature and has fostered a perspective that attempts to understand ethnic groups in their own terms rather than contrasting them with other cultures or reference groups (Brislin, 1983; Draguns, 1981; Lebra, 1976; Lonner, 1981, 1985; Olmedo, 1979; Shium, 1985; S. Sue, 1988). Therefore, the emic position views intercultural differences as clues to divergent attitudes, values and assumptions that differentiate one culture from another in a relativist framework. This approach also seeks to explain phenomena in terms of categories considered to be meaningful within a specific culture (Brislin, 1983; Lonner, 1985; Olmedo, 1979). It emphasizes the importance on viewing behavior in the cultural framework in which it occurs, and understanding phenomena within its cultural context. Regarding emic approach, Lonner states that "every case of everything in the mammoth arena of human behavior has to be considered in the context of its own configuration of actors and setting" (1985).

According to the emic perspective, experiences of Asians in the United States can only be understood and analyzed from an Asian world view. In her decision to use the life history approach (the most intensive emic form of interviewing used in field work) to investigate the experiences of Japanese in the United States, Kikumura states that the emic approach avoids not only portraying culture change within the context of abstract statistics and generalizations lacking the humanistic and cultural quality of life experiences, but also obscuring the relationship of the individual to the culture and the society (1981).

From the emic perspective, conceptualization and operationalization of the normality standard, or experiences such as acculturation and acculturative stress, would derive from the Asian world view. The instruments used for this study, Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire and Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity
Acculturation Scale, therefore, were selected because they were both conceptualized and operationalized from the emic tradition, designed specifically to measure values and acculturation behaviors of Asians in the United States (Suinn, et al, 1985; Yamauchi, 1981).

Their benefit of cultural specificity, however, limits their application. The paucity of information discussing the validity and reliability of these instruments results from the emic nature of the instruments. At the same time, equally scarce is the empirical validation of emic concepts despite the abundant theoretical research and conceptualization literature on the acculturation, acculturative stress, and recommendations for intervention strategies.

In order to avoid creating another group typology study or etic imposing study, the concept of stress requires Asian world view framework in this study. According to the Asian values discussed previously, it is clear that Asians would be most stressed or disturbed by the disharmony within the relationship or the environment. It is stressed that the principle of nonaction, to allow things to be or to act within the true nature of things be understood (Knoblauch, 1985). Therefore, according to Knoblauch (1985), Pedersen (1977), D. W. Sue (1986), and Watts (1975), the clearest way to deal with stress is not to run from the bad but to accept things as they are,
whether they are agreeable or disagreeable. "The task of the counselor, then, is to show clients how the process of acceptance works and how they will gain the freedom to change if they stop racing around trying to achieve it" (Knoblauch, 1985, p. 55). "To try to control the mind forcefully is like trying to flatten out waves with a board, and can only result in more and more disturbance" (Watts, 1976, p. 118). By externalizing the causes of problem onto imbalance of yin and yang, or the fate, one can make self image more acceptable (Lebra, 1976). One should be satisfied with what one has for the time being so that better things can happen in the future. Individual is further encouraged to see oneself as a blessed person who operates in accordance with the Cosmic order rather than a failure (Lebra, 1976; Knoblauch, 1985; Watts, 1961).

The emic perspective is not only consistent with the view that human beings differ and vary their cultural values, moral outlooks and experiences, but also necessary to accurately represent the indigenous perspectives of human beings. However, cross-cultural comparisons still require universal analytic constructs derived from the etic approach.

The next section reviews both emic and etic literature on acculturation and acculturative stress in order to shed light on understanding the contradictions
surrounding the conceptualization and operationalization of research, and the formulation of intervention strategies in the cross-cultural psychology and counseling.

Acculturation: Etic and Emic Perspectives

Two models of acculturation are presented, the linear and non-linear model. In this study, the linear model is conceptualized within the etic perspective and is assumed to be applicable to any sojourner or immigrant, while the non-linear model is conceptualized within the emic perspective and is assumed to be applicable to culturally specific situation.

Etic Model: Linear, Continuum Model

Traditionally, acculturation has been examined by a linear, conflict model. According to the linear model, acquisition of a new culture means replacement of the original culture (Bowíby, 1969; Kiefer, 1974; Furnham & Bochner, 1986; Oberg, 1960; Feagin & Fujitaki, 1972). Regardless of the sojourner's and immigrant's cultural background, or regardless of the culture they are moving to, it was assumed that acculturation meant "to give up traditional ethnic customs and values" (Feagin & Fujitaki, 1972). The linear model postulates that during the
acculturation process, an individuals' dynamics of world view orientation and acculturative behavior can be placed anywhere within a continuum containing antagonistic ends. The ends range from the original culture to the new culture.

Accordingly, sojourners, during the acculturation 'replacement' process or while mourning the loss of their original culture (Kiefer, 1974), experience acculturative stress by trying to accommodate two values considered to be conflicting or antagonistic. Not surprisingly, high acculturative stress is perceived to result from the sojourner's unconscious or conscious resistance against, or inability to, adapt to the norms and values of the new cultural world view orientation. In other words, one's failure to assimilate or adjust to one's culturally new environment produces acculturative stress. Consequently, it assumes that the more similar a sojourners' value system is to the new cultural system, the more 'normal' they are. They are more than likely, therefore, to experience less acculturative stress.

According to the etic model, sojourners rigidly adhering to traditional cultural world views are considered to be pathological and suffering from high acculturative stress (Berry & Annis, 1974; Padilla, et al, 1985). Recall that the etic model espouses the notion that difference is deviant or deficient. Therefore, the
etic, linear perspective requires an 'adjustment model' to help sojourners and immigrants assimilate. Group differences are de-emphasized, and the goal of treatment becomes assisting various ethnic groups function as members of the larger society. Using such terms as 'disadvantaged' and 'culturally deprived' to refer to ethnic populations seems to infer inferiority rather than difference. Professionals appear ethnocentric when using the American 'dominant' culture as the standard against which all other groups are to aspire (Ahia, 1984; Atkinson, 1985; Copeland, 1983; Katz, 1985; Lonner, 1985; Olmedo, 1979; Padilla, 1980; Shuim, 1985; D. W. Sue, 1981; S. Sue, 1988).


In Feagin and Fujitaki's study, Buddhist Japanese Americans (close to Japanese world view orientation) experience more acculturative stress than Christian Japanese Americans (more American world view orientation) (1972). In Iga's study, acculturative stress results from the 'retarded' process of Japanese assimilation into
American social and cultural life, and from 'rigid adherence' to 'old' traditional Asian values (1957). Sommers (1969) observed in her Asian patients cases of 'value saturation' or 'value polymorphism' degenerating into 'psychocultural neurosis.' In Graham's study (1981), low assimilation rate among Chinese and Japanese students influenced their high level of acculturative stress when compared with Caucasian students.

Additionally, there may be two reasons why the linear model may not adequately and sufficiently explain acculturative stress and the acculturation process of immigrants and sojourners, especially Asian immigrants and sojourners residing in the United States.

First, there is an abundance of literature, contradicting the previously mentioned findings, which states that acculturative stress results not from a failure to assimilate or a retarded acculturation process, but rather from the acculturation process itself. In other words, high acculturative stress contributes to a sojourner's conscious or unconscious adaptation to the world view presently negating his or her own ethnicity (Akbar, 1981). Much theoretical and some empirical literature supports a positive relationship between American world view orientation of sojourners and immigrants and experiences of high acculturative stress (Akbar, 1981; Alcantra, 1977; Baldwin & Beil, 1985; Chin,

For instance, Japanese immigrants in Onoda's study showed significantly higher neurotic tendencies than Caucasians (1977). He concluded that possibly because of rapid acculturation, they were more likely to complain of vague somatic disorders and express more feelings of anxiety, worry, and frustration (Onoda, 1977). Kiefer also reported that the "loss of Japanese skills" is related to acculturative stress of Japanese in the United States (1974).

Another study, done by Tomine (1985), offered Japanese children the opportunity to maintain not only their intrinsic Japanese values but also to learn extrinsic Japanese traits through the Jan Ken Po Gakko. Tomine found an increase in positive self-concept over time on the Piers-Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale. The results of this study suggests that the cultural education program had a positive influence on the children's sense of self (Tomin, 1985).

Secondly, encountering conflicting values appears to be a routine part of Asian life, a life noted for its group-orientedness (Iwahara, 1973; Lebra, 1972; Maykovitch, 1981; Pedersen, 1977; Yamauchi, 1981). Asians' field dependent behavior and situation-centered
world view promote social accommodation, conformity, compliance and a willingness to maintain harmony with the socio-cultural environment maintained and to accept as fate. Asians, therefore, forego self-expression and agree even when they disagree because these conflicts are seen as "harmonious tension," due to a high tolerance for inconsistency and a flexible identity (Kiefer, 1974). The linear model of acculturation, therefore, does not seem to provide sufficient information to explain the acculturation of Asians in the United States.

**Emic Model: Nonlinear, Matrix Model**

More recent literature has examined acculturation according to a non-linear model, a premise of which is that acquisition of new culture means addition to, rather than replacement of, the original culture (Chow, 1985; English, 1984; Lebra, 1972; D. W. Sue, 1981; McFee, 1968; Highlen, et al, 1986). The non-linear model assumes that acculturation generates biculturality, resulting in greater freedom of choice and a more expansive bicultural repertoire of behaviors.

As the non-linear model replaces the linear model when analyzing the acculturation process, so too does the matrix model replace the continuum model (Lebra, 1972; McFee, 1968). Borrowing from the terms of this study, the continuum model assumes a linear change from a more Asian
to a more American world view orientation. The matrix model, however, suggests four possible alternatives by combining high and low Asian world view with high and low American world view. This bicultural alternation model, where the individual switches freely back and forth between the two cultures depending upon the environment in which one finds oneself, seems to be possible only in the context of an Asian situational-centered world view orientation. In reality, high acculturation behavior may be a reflection of one's flexibility and adaptability in order to contextually perceive and sense a person-environment harmony (Chow, 1985; English, 1984; Kiefer, 1974; Lebra, 1972; McFee, 1968; D. W. Sue, 1981).

In fact, Lebra (1972) points out that, while residing in the United States, it seems to be an Asian's identification with Asian world view which enables sojourners to accept American culture. Moreover, Maykovitch's findings (1976) suggests that Asian sojourners who accept American values and associate with Americans also perceive themselves very strongly as Asian world view oriented. It seems that the Asian world view facilitates non-linear acculturation. This means that a high Asian world view commitment allows Asian sojourners to accept American world view orientation and to conform
to acculturation behaviors. It then implies that the more one has an Asian world view, the more prepared one is to 'behave like an American' in the United States.

Using the operational terms in this study, this may account for a higher score on the acculturation scale and American world view orientation. Here one finds a paradoxical phenomena; the Asian value system itself propels individuals towards seemingly 'conflictive' acculturation behaviors. Compulsion for acculturation is built into the Asian world view for the reasons discussed in the section on the nature of Asian world view. The hypothetical formula here is "if higher score in Asian world view, than higher acculturation behavior, and higher in American world view scale." This is quite opposite from what is commonly believed; "if pro-Asian world view, then anti-American world view, and anti-Acculturation behavior" (Chow, 1985; English, 1974; Lebra, 1972; Maykovitch, 1976; McFee, 1968; D. W. Sue, 1981).

An extreme expression of this combination of a strong Asian value system and a high acculturation to America was found in the 100th Battalion and the 442nd Regiment Combat Team composed of second generation Japanese-American volunteers during World War II who had received moral Japanese education at Japanese language schools in the United States. They were said to be "more Japanese than Japanese in Japan, in terms of their Japanese pride"
(Yamasaki, 1983). This case confirms that for Asians, the non-linear model attains full significance. The same cannot be said for Americans, however, as the non-linear model possesses no special significance (Lebra, 1972).

Unlike Asian world view, American world view is socially insensitive and non-accommodative (Lebra, 1972); instead, it capitalizes upon the individual's initiative, creativity, and self-determination. While Asian world view is instrumental to the individual's acculturation, thanks to its emphasis on the virtue of cultural and social accommodation, American world view does not reinforce Asian world view. Rather, with its individualistic focus, the American world view dissolves them (Lebra, 1972). Asians' efforts at acculturation itself, when looked at from the philosophy of American world view, appears 'un-Asian.' Reinforcement is thus not reciprocal but only unilateral. Therefore, the linear model seems more applicable to the American world view.

Recent Development

Recently, there has been an increased number of cross-cultural studies of ethnic groups in the United States. However, systematic empirical investigations of acculturative stress and reliable emic instrument development, especially with Asian populations, have been
proportionately scarce. In general, there seems to be an increased in theoretical studies on general or cultural specific typology and an increased emphasis on methodological issues. Several recent trends are prevalent in the field: (1) empirical studies continue to produce controversial findings; (2) conceptual work on general or cultural specific typology continues to appear in publication without empirical validation; (3) quantification of acculturation and world views in a multidimensional approach has been operationalized; and (4) qualitative research methodology has been re-evaluated as a legitimate way of inquiry in cross-cultural psychology and counseling.


Another set of conflictive findings in the area of acculturative stress not focused in this study also continue to exist. This body of literature attempts to examine the relationship between demographic backgrounds of sojourners and immigrants, e.g., gender, age, generations and marital status; and the level of
acculturation. On the other hand, men have more difficulty according to Gaylord (1979) and Olive (1976), while Pavri (1963) found no relationship.


Second, focusing on ethnic identity models to explain world view differences resulted in the proliferation of conceptual work in the area. Few models are systematically developed and even fewer have been empirically validated (Helms, 1985; Highlen, et al, 1986, 1988). For instance, research on ethnic self-identity stages seems more prolific only in recent years: Black

arbitrary cultural group or general typologies. The literature review indicates that the measurement of individual acculturation is not only a legitimate area of investigation but can also meet conventional criteria of reliability and validity (Clark, et al, 1976; Olmedo, 1979; Suinn, et al, 1985; Szapocznik, et al, 1975).

Of particular importance has been the search for increased precision in the definition and measurement of acculturation and world views (Cuellar, et al, 1980; Parham & Kahn, 1987; Suinn, et al, 1985; Yamauchi, 1981). This trend has led to the development and application of a variety of quantitative models of acculturation and world views, which have added a significant new dimension to research in the field: Acculturative Balance Scale (ABS) (Pierce, Clark, & Kiefer, 1972), Racial Identity Scale (Parham & Helms, 1981), Worldview Questionnaire (Kelsey, 1982), Belief System Analysis Scale (Myers, 1985), African Self-Consciousness Scale (Baldwin & Bell, 1985), Behavioral Acculturation Scale (Szapocznik & Scopetta, 1976), Ethnic Loyalty Scale (Padilla, 1980), Suinn-Lew Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn, 1987), Ethnic Identity Scale (Chow, 1985), Scale to Assess World Views (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987), and Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (Yamauchi, 1981).
Multidimensionality of acculturation is derived from its long research history, one that has been approached from the perspectives of anthropology, sociology and more recently, psychology and psychiatry. As a result, the concept of acculturation benefited from the richness of data available from multidisciplinary traditions. Since acculturation has been conceptualized in terms of intrapsychic, interpsychic, and interpersonal mechanisms, it is only natural to operationalize the construct as a multidimensional phenomena (Cuellar, et al, 1980; Mena, et al, 1987; Clark, et al, 1976; Szapocznik, et al, 1975). Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale (1985) used in this study is a multidimensional scale which measures acculturational behavior levels from the areas such as language familiarity, usage and preference ethnic identity, friendship choice, geographic history knowledge, ethnic attitudes, and other cultural behaviors.

In conceptualizing and operationalizing constructs such as acculturation, acculturative stress and world views, the essential question is whether the categories of explanation and definition prevalent in one culture are valid or meaningful when applied to a different culture (Butcher & Clark, 1979; Butcher & Pancheri, 1976; Irvine & Berry, 1983; Kaplan, 1961; Lonner, 1981, 1985). In cross-cultural research, the emic approach seeks to explain phenomena in terms of categories deemed meaningful
within a specific culture, whereas the etic approach emphasizes the development of explanatory constructs that are applicable to all cultures (Bochner, 1982; Brislin, 1983; Lonner, 1981, 1985; Olmedo, 1979; Smith & Vasquez, 1985; Shium, 1985; S. Sue, 1988).

Although each approach has merit, a problem arises when explanatory constructs in a particular culture are assumed to be universal and are therefore applied to other cultures without establishing their cross-cultural equivalence (Triandis & Berry, 1979; Triandis & Brislin, 1984). This imposed etics has already been elaborated previously. In order to identify the relevant cultural variable(s) and to determine the interdependence structure among the relevant cultural variables to establish cultural equivalence, a traditional anthropological approach, qualitative methodology, has recently been rediscovered and reevaluated.

A fourth trend is the reevaluation of the qualitative approach. In general, while the quantitative approach provides statistically significant correlations or indicators of prediction, the qualitative approach provides themes and patterns of phenomena with rich contextual material (Kikumura, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Matheny, et al, 1986; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984). Qualitative interpretation of research results in the study provide the depth of knowledge of understanding the acculturation
process from a cultural relative standpoint. In order to
develop sound emic research with cultural specific
conceptualization and operationalization to avoid inherent
imposed etics, it is very important to view behavior in
the cultural framework in which it occurs (Lincoln & Guba,
1985).

For instance, what is stressful in one culture may
not be stressful in another cultural setting (Leong, et
al., 1985; Matheny, et al., 1986; D. W. Sue, 1986; Watanabe,
1973). Or, as indicated by the literature review,
acculturation behavior may turned out to be one of the
phenotypic manifestations of an Asian axiology. To some
extent, everyone receives, interprets, and reacts to the
acculturation process in peculiar ways, depending upon
special meanings from developmental sources, special
meanings and associations with current life experiences,
and special ways that have become habitual and predictable
as a personal or cultural value. As a result, phenomena
such as acculturation and acculturative stress needs to be
examined in a broader context.

Qualitative descriptive research is an appropriate
method of investigation for studying social or
intrapsychic processes. Studying these processes will
promote understanding of their variations and their
essential characteristics. Data gathered from personal
interviews afford the researcher new ways of perceiving
and ordering everyday experiences in order to develop hypotheses and or categories that give structure to the phenomena under study (Campbell, 1974; Dixter, 1970; Kikumura, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Taylor & Bogdan, 1984) and to identify factors that are culturally equivalent to possibly enable future cross-cultural research. In other words, qualitative analyses of culture and research constructs are necessary not only before the researcher can obtain quantitative measurements, but are necessary even prior to the researcher's selection of measurements. Careful considerations are necessary because as Price-Williams (1975) states, "Merely comparing the variables in different cultures does not itself make the study a proper contribution to cross-cultural study."

Summary

In this chapter, selected literature and studies on acculturation, acculturative stress and world views are reviewed. Historically, it is clear that acculturation research has been approached from the perspectives of anthropology, sociology, and, more recently, psychology and psychiatry. As a result, the field has benefitted from the richness and flexibility of a multidisciplinary
informational approach. However, it has also suffered from the increased complexity and frequent confusion resulting from the application of constructs, definitions, and methodologies peculiar to different disciplines.

After the historical background of acculturation, four models of acculturative stress within the psychology of acculturation were presented. They are life-event changes, psychology of loss, cultural displacement and dissonance model. Independent variables, Asian and American world views, are also discussed in detail in a contrasting paradigm in four axiological categories: individual vs. group orientation; Cosmic Unity vs. mastery of universe; field dependent behavior vs. field independent behavior; and self-effacement vs. self-expression. This section provided literature review to help conceptualize and operationalize the current research.

The following section focusses on the two important frameworks of conceptualizing and operationalizing cross-cultural research: the etic and emic approaches. Both etic and emic literature on acculturation are reviewed to further understand the complexities of cross-cultural research and clinical practices.
Recent developments reveal inconclusive findings regarding the acculturation and world views of Asians in the United States. Attempts to define acculturation for individuals quantitatively are a more recent pursuit, and from a psychometric perspective, emic-etic perspectives, research in this area remains exploratory in nature.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study has descriptive and exploratory research objectives and is designed as a cross-sectional survey study utilizing questionnaires as the major method of data collection for hypothesis testing. The translation of theoretical ideas into a concrete process of operationalization with specific plans for research design, selection of the sample, instrumentation, testing procedures, and data analyses are outlined in the following section.

Research Design

The approach selected for this study is a descriptive-correlational survey research design. According to Kerlinger (1973), this design approach serves to "minimize bias and maximize the reliability of the evidence collected" (p.98). The goal of the study is to correlate levels of acculturative stress experienced with variables of world view and acculturation behavior of Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States.
As indicated earlier, this investigation will be characterized as survey research, which Wiersma (1980) defines as "dealing more with questions of what is, rather than why it is so" (p.16). In short, the survey researcher wants to know something about samples drawn from a population. Survey research has several advantages. For example, a great deal of information can be obtained from the population (Babbie, 1973). While surveys tend to be more expensive than laboratory experiments and field studies, yet for the amount and quality of information they yield they are more economical. By using survey method, the researcher is able to gather the data essential to answering the research questions posed.

Selection of the Sample

The sampling choice for the study is a stratified cluster sample in order to guarantee desired representation of relevant subgroups (Gay, 1981). The steps in stratified sampling are very similar to those in random sampling except that selection is from relevant subgroups in the population rather than the population as a whole (Gay, 1981). It was selected because it (a) derives its control from using a random method that permits greater precision and less bias in sampling
procedures, (b) yields a greater likelihood of obtaining a sample that is representative of the population from which it is drawn, (c) allows the researcher to estimate the accuracy of a sample or sampling errors, and (d) permits the use of statistical tests of significance so that the issue of generalizability of the research results can be adequately addressed. Secondly, because of the nature of the research problem and the diverse nature of Asian ethnic groups, the study called for a more rigorous sampling procedure of stratified random sampling to obtain a greater degree of representativeness and homogeneity with minimal sampling errors and biases.

For participation in this study subjects were required to satisfy the following three criteria established for data selection:

1. Subjects were foreign born Asians residing in the United States as sojourners or immigrants;

2. Subjects were Asian sojourners and immigrants born in the countries of Japan, China, Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam and Philippines; and

3. Subjects had the capacity to respond proficiently to the questionnaire in English without requiring the assistance of translation.

The first criterion requires explanation. As discussed in the literature review, the concepts of acculturation and acculturative stress do not apply to
experiences of Asians who are born in the United States in this study. Traditionally, studies on Asians and the acculturation process have included data obtained not only from Asians but also from Asians born in the United States. Rather than designing a methodology which assures the accuracy of the selected sample group, many researchers have simply relied on the subjects' own self-identification of whether they consider themselves Asian or Asian American. As a result, many researchers have obtained results that are not very clear. They further distort their results by making generalizations which are then applied to other separate and distinct sample groups (Shium, 1985). For instance, studies which supposedly investigate Asians' behaviors or values, are derived from a sample that consists of both Asian and Asian American subjects. These results are then applied to all Asian populations: sojourners, immigrants, students, and so forth. This study avoids such a fatal methodological defect by asking each subject their country of birth. Thus, it is the methodology employed by this study which ensures that each subject is an Asian sojourner or immigrant, and not the subjects' own self determination.

Secondly, the term 'Asian' used in this study is limited. These particular Asian cultural groups were selected to reflect the diversity and proportions of Asian
populations in the San Francisco Bay Area. The literature review also reveals limited materials on acculturation of other Asian groups in the United States. The other Asian cultural groups, therefore, lacked enough literature to substantiate the theoretical basis of commonality with the Asian groups studied (Iwahara, 1973; Kitano, 1981; Lebra, 1976; Pedersen, 1977; D. W. Sue, 1981).

Thirdly, the reason for this criterion seems rather obvious due to the all-English nature of the present study to ensure accurate and valid data collection.

The steps involved in the sampling selection in this study are described below. First, San Francisco was chosen as a study site because it is a port of entry for many Asians, and is a large city offering a variety of opportunities for newcomers. Since an official list of immigrants and sojourners was not made available by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, random sampling was not possible. Asian community resources of five Asian cultural populations: Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese and Filipino, in the San Francisco Bay Area were identified through personal contacts by the researcher (who was active in the various Asian community organizations) and through the Asian Yellow Page telephone directory. The Asian American Psychology Training Center had a list of research sites utilized by past psychology interns for their dissertation research. In addition, the
executive director of Richmond Maxi Center suggested the San Francisco State University Asian Studies Department and San Francisco Community College as possible data collection sites. Since it was hypothesized that not all Asians belong to Asian organizations (Yamauchi, 1981), a list of non-Asian resources was also compiled by asking community leaders and professors. As a result, the following community resources were identified through the sources above as possible sampling groups: Japanese Family Services, the Japanese and Chinese Newcomer's Services, Chinese for Affirmative Action, The Asian Business League, the Korean Community Center, Bay Area Indochinese Mental Health Services, Canon Kip Youth Program, Japanese Cultural and Community Center, Pilipino Resource Group, West Bay Pilipino Multi-Service Corporation, Asian Gay Community, National Asian American Psychology Training Center, San Francisco Chinatown Youth Center, Asian American Recovery Services, Inc., Japanese Mental Health Task Force, Asian AIDS Task Force, Asian Mental Health Task Force, Chinatown Child Development Center, Chinatown Outpatient Clinic, Asian Studies Department at San Francisco State University, Japanese Community Youth Council, and Korean, Japanese and Chinese bilingual churches and temples in the San Francisco Bay Area. A list of non-Asian resources included the San Francisco General Hospital, the San Francisco Health
Department, St. Mary Hospital, McAuley Neuropsychiatric Institute, Richmond Maxi Center, Richmond Business District, San Francisco Department of Adult Education, and the University of California San Francisco Medical Center.

Through personal contact (face-to-face interactions, and/or phone calls), the subject criteria for sampling was shared with community leaders of over 30 organizations and professors at the universities above along with the purpose of the study. These contacts were made in order to obtain endorsements of the study, to secure Asians who might be possible respondents, and to ascertain their meeting times (e.g., organization's monthly subcommittee meeting) or class time for a group administration of the questionnaire. After the initial contact, leaders and professors identified approximately 800 prospective Asian sojourners and immigrants who might be eligible for participation in the study. From their responses, a list of available numbers of prospective subjects was compiled.

The list was examined to eliminate any possible subjects under 18 years of age. Then, the list was classified into five Asian cultural groups and gender groups: (1) Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese and Filipino groups; and (2) gender, based on replies obtained from the initial contacts. Since surnames such as Kim, Lee, and Wong among others, are common in Asian cultural groups, an attempt was made to avoid possible
duplications resulting from overlapping names. After eliminating possible duplication, 600 estimated prospective subjects were selected representing five Asian cultural groups and genders. The community and organization leaders and professors were then contacted by phone or in person to make an arrangement for the researcher to attend their meetings or classes to administer the questionnaire in small groups. Five-hundred sixty questionnaires were actually administered, and 439 were returned. Among returned responses, 386 questionnaires had all the items answered. Of the 386 questionnaires, 246 were used for analyses because 140 questionnaires were data obtained from Asian Americans born in the United States. The actual ethnic compositions of the subjects did not reflect the expected representatives from five Asian groups due to the large Chinese population in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire booklet (see Appendix C) was created for ease of administration and scoring. The booklet contained a cover letter, a consent form, a questionnaire for demographic backgrounds, and three instruments. It took about 20 to 30 minutes for subjects to complete the 12-page pencil-and-paper booklet. As stated before, the
self-report and all-English nature of the instruments may have increased the possibility of misunderstanding the questionnaire items. In addition, the scarcity of instruments that are applicable to Asians in the United States in this field has already been documented (Lonner, 1985; Olmedo, 1979, 1980; Shium, 1985; S. Sue, 1988). Further, the instruments that are applicable and available suffer from the lack of information discussing their validity and reliability.

Personal contacts with five experts in the cross-cultural counseling and psychology field did not generate additional information for validity and reliability of each measurement. In addition, validity and reliability of each measurement used in the study was not reviewed in Buros's Tests in Print, Mental Measurements Yearbook series, Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, The Journal of Educational Measurement, and Educational and Psychological Measurement. Under these circumstances, three instruments were selected to measure research variables, acculturative stress, world view orientation, and acculturation behaviors in this study.

The FASE Acculturative Stress Scale.

The FASE Acculturative Stress Scale measures the degree of over-all acculturative stress, as well as the amount of difficulty of adjustment for each of four major
domains of "kinds of cultural experiences" (Padilla, 1980, 1986): the familial, attitudinal, social, and environmental (FASE). It was constructed specifically for use with acculturating populations (Padilla, 1980; Padilla, et al, 1983) as a result of semi-structured interviews conducted with immigrant university students and a literature review. Each domain reflects difficulties particular to acculturating populations related to physical appearance, food preference, dependence on others, transportation (Padilla, 1980, 1986; Wright, 1966); role conflict, ambiguity, and conflicting cultural patterns (Naditch & Morrissey, 1976; Padilla, 1980, 1986); language and culture, prejudice in a new unfamiliar environment (Babiker, Cox & Miller, 1980; Padilla, 1980, 1986); acceptance by peers, disagreements with parents, relationships with the opposite sex, and feeling of isolation (Padilla, 1980, 1986).

The FASE scale consists of 60 items answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (not stressful) to 5 (extremely stressful). If an item was not applicable to subjects, it was assigned a score of 0. Its maximum value is 300 and each domain stress score has a maximum value of 75 from 15 items. A high score indicates high acculturative stress while a low score indicates low acculturative stress. For the FASE scales, the scores represent the number of stressors weighted by the severity
of those stressors. Mena, Padilla and Maldonado (1987) reported internal consistency reliability coefficients of 0.89 (a Cronbach Alpha coefficient). No other reliability or validity data were provided.

**The Asian-American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire.**

Individual's world view orientation was measured by the Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire developed by Yamauchi (1981). This questionnaire is based on the Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (EIQ) developed by Masuda, Matsumoto, and Meredith (1970), the Bales and Couch Value Profile (1969), the Withey Dimensions of Values List (1973), and the Perloe Social Values Questionnaire (1973). For the validation process, the 12 independent judges representing four Asian groups: Japanese, Chinese, Korean, and Filipino; and Caucasian Americans in Washington D. C. area were asked to identify 50 statements from the instruments above, which they thought to be typically Asian values and typically American values in Yamauchi's study (1981). From the list of value statements selected by the expert judges, seventeen items were finally chosen which reflected the five dimensions of contrasting values: (1) individual/group orientation; (2) fatalism; (3) obedience to authority; (4) self-control;
and (5) filial piety. Since the focus of the exploration of degrees of acculturation is relevant, statements were designed and selected that embody contrasting poles.

AAEIQ consists of 17 items assessing world view orientation. Item responses were obtained using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). A response of agreement reflects an Asian world view orientation, whereas a response of disagreement with the statements reflects an American world view orientation. Total scores are obtained by summing the 17 items and they can range from 17 to 85. To reduce the variability inherent in the analyses of the scales, it is suggested that the subjects' scores to be dichotomized into high and low by using the median as the cutoff score; those falling above the median are categorized as high and those below the median as low (Yamauchi, 1981). A low score on AAEIQ indicates Asian world view orientation and a high score indicates American world view orientation.

In her study, Yamauchi (1981) examined 287 Asian Americans' world view orientation with AAEIQ. To determine the content and construct validity of the instrument, an application of factor analyses and a multiple classification analysis was used to analyze the relation between each of the items. In light of the exploratory nature of her study, the criterion of
directional fit was utilized to select only those scale items with scores in the same direction as scores of the comparison variables. Consequently, the 17 statements were then identified as valid empirical referents of the theoretical constructs represented in the five value orientations that were indicated as traditionally adhered to by the four major Asian groups of: Japanese, Chinese, Korean and Philippino. However, general comment was not helpful to researchers.

The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale.

The degree of behavioral acculturation of Asians was measured by the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn, et al, 1985). The SL-ASIA was developed specifically for Asians and modeled after the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (Cuellar, Harris & Jasso, 1980). Multidimensional in nature, SL-ASIA measures acculturation behavior such as language familiarity, usage and preference; ethnic identity; friendship choice, generation, geographic history knowledge and other cultural behaviors. It consists of 21 items and item responses were obtained using multiple-choice scale. The SL-ASIA acculturation score was arrived at by summing across the five possible answers for the 21 items and dividing the total value by 21, the number of items. Total score can range from 1.00 (low
acculturation) to 5.00 (high acculturation). A low score indicates high Asian cultural traits, i.e., a low level of acculturative behavior, while a high score indicates high American cultural behavior pattern. To reduce the variability inherent in the analyses of the scales, the subjects' scores were dichotomized into high and low by using the median score as the cutoff score; those falling above the median were categorized as high acculturation and those below the median as low acculturation (Suinn, et al, 1985).

Suinn and others (1985) report a reliability coefficient of 0.88 (the Alpha Coefficient) on the 21 items, indicating an acceptable level of stability for the instrument assessing 82 Asian university students. It also suggests a high level of internal consistency among the items. Since Olmedo and Padilla (1978) argued that acculturation levels should show a relationship to generation levels, with the lowest for the first generation, and the highest for the most recent generations, the criterion of generational level was also used in order to validate the instrument. Analysis of variance was calculated for generation responses (item 12) and the remaining 20 items as total scores for subjects. ANOVA was found to be significant (F = 7.20, p = 0.0001), suggesting that the scale may indeed be assessing acculturation levels. The mean values on the scale
reflected the predicted increase in acculturation, i.e., high SL-ASIA scores, for each generation (Suinn, et al, 1985). No other reliability or validity data were provided.

Testing Procedures

Test administrations were conducted starting in February and ending in May, 1988. Subjects anonymously completed the self-report questionnaire in small groups in community meetings or in university classes. The data were collected by the test administrator conducting the research, following the procedure approved by the Ohio State University Behavioral and Social Sciences Human Subjects Review Committee (see Appendix A: Human Subject Review Committee Approval Form). A questionnaire booklet (Appendix C) that contained all the instruments was used for data collection. Instructions for responding to the questionnaire were included in a cover letter in the booklet. A script (Appendix B) was also read to the subjects to emphasize confidentiality and to ensure uniformity of format for administration. In addition, the test administrator was available to answer any questions respondents might have had and also to allow them the option of not answering questions they felt were personal.
Every test administration was conducted by the investigator in person and also every attempt was made for the investigator to receive the completed questionnaire and instruments. There were several occasions, however, where the test administrator had to leave before all the subjects had completed the questionnaire. In each case, the researcher collected the instruments the next morning either from the community organization or a university staff member. Sixteen questionnaires that were mailed back to the researcher were not included in the study.

**Data Analyses**

**Research Questions 1 and 2**

The research design and the predictions for research question 1 and 2 are shown in Table 1, Figures 1 and 2. The design provided for one independent variable, world view orientations (as measured by the Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire), and one dependent variable, acculturative stress, including the four domains of cultural experiences (as measured by the FASE Scale). Figure 1 shows the hypothesized negative correlation between American world view orientation and a high level of acculturative stress, and Figure 2 shows the hypothesized negative correlation between Asian world view orientation and a high level of acculturative stress.
Table 1

Correlation Research Design for Research Questions 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World View Orientation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FASE Acculturative Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American World View</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian World View</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prediction for Research Question 1

Figure 1
Artificial dichotomies were created by operationally defining a midpoint and categorizing subjects as falling above it or below it to create a nominal scale from AAEIQ results (Yamauchi, 1981). A nominal scale is the lowest level of measurement which classifies subjects into two or more categories. A subject can only be in one category, and members of a category have a common set of characteristics. In this study, the subjects' scores were dichotomized into Asian and American world view orientation categories by using the median as the cut off point for each scale (Yamauchi, 1981). Each research hypothesis is tested by a Pearson's correlation
coefficient statistical analysis at the 0.05 level of significance. A one-tailed test is employed because of the nature of the directional alternative hypotheses asked in the current research. The design provides a means for testing hypotheses and predicting significant correlation coefficients between world view orientation and level of acculturative stress.

Research Question 3

The research design and prediction for research question 3 is shown in Figure 3. This design provides for one independent variable, level of acculturation (as measured by the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale) and one dependent variable, acculturative stress. Figure 3 shows the hypothesized negative correlation between acculturation behavior and high level of acculturative stress.

In this statistical analysis, acculturation scale is treated as an interval scale, a measurement scale that classifies and ranks subjects, and is based upon predetermined equal intervals, but does not have a true zero point. The research hypothesis is tested by calculating Pearson's correlation coefficient between acculturative stress scores and acculturation level. This design provides a measure for analyzing research question 3 and for testing research hypothesis 3 at the 0.05 level
of significance on one-tailed test. The prediction for hypothesis 3 states acculturative stress would be of less magnitude with high level of acculturation.

![Graph showing relationship between acculturative stress and acculturation behavior]

Prediction for Research Question 3
Figure 3

Research Questions 4 and 5

These research questions derive from the premises that the dissonance between one's world view orientation and acculturation behavior may contribute to one's acculturative stress. The research design, therefore, needs to demonstrate both main effects and interactive effects of these independent variables. The design provided for two independent variables, levels of acculturation and world view, and one dependent variable,
acculturative stress. Artificial dichotomies were also
created by operationally defining a midpoint and
categorizing subjects as falling above it or below it to
create a nominal scale from SL-ASIA results (Suinn, et al,
1985). With regard to acculturation, the subjects' scores
were dichotomized into high and low acculturation score
categories by using the median as the cut off point for
each scale (Suinn, et al, 1985). The research hypotheses
are tested by a two-way analysis of variance among the two
groups: Asian world view and American world view
orientations, and high and low levels of acculturation of
the acculturative stress scores.

The research design and the predictions for research
questions 4 and 5 are shown in Table 2. The design
provided for two independent variables; levels of
acculturation (SL-ASIA score) and world view orientation
(AAEIQ score); and one dependent variable, acculturative
stress (FASE stress score).
Table 2
Prediction for 2x2 Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Research Questions 4 and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World View Orientation</th>
<th>Asian World View</th>
<th>American World View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Acculturation</td>
<td>I. Low Stress</td>
<td>II. High Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No Conflict)</td>
<td>(Conflict)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Acculturation</td>
<td>III. High Stress</td>
<td>IV. Low Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Conflict)</td>
<td>(No Conflict)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way ANOVA was selected because hypothesis tests that run on two factors (world view and acculturation) separately, i.e., the main effects, are in general more powerful tests (Weinberg & Goldberg, 1979). In other words, this analysis has a higher power for the same $0.05$ level of significance, and sample size than one-way ANOVA tests of the same hypotheses. This is so because, by grouping sample subjects into cells according to two
factors (world view and acculturation), we are exercising more control over extraneous variables that might cause differences than if we simply grouped the sample subjects according to one factor alone (world view or acculturation, but not both) (Weinberg & Goldberg, 1979). In this study, where two given variables, acculturation behavior and world view orientation are both suspected of being related to the dependent variable being measured, a two-way ANOVA test was selected rather than two separate one-way ANOVA tests. When ANOVA was performed for main effects, a partial sum of squares was calculated for unequal cell means in order to adjust for the imbalance between cells. Consequently, the main effect of A (column effect) was adjusted against an imbalanced B, and likewise, the main effect of B (row effect) was adjusted against an imbalanced A. The design provides a means for testing hypotheses and predicting significant main effects and interactive effects between world view orientation and acculturation behavior on acculturative stress with $F$ ratio significant at the level of 0.05.

Summary

In this chapter, the descriptive-correlational research design, selection of the sample, instrumentation, testing procedure, and data analyses were presented. The
goal of the study is to correlate levels of acculturative stress experienced with variables of world view orientation and acculturation behavior of Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States utilizing questionnaire as the major method of data collection for hypothesis testing. Each instrument in the research questionnaire utilized were described with their inherent limitations. The tests were administered in a small group by the researcher to ensure the survey return and the uniformity. Data analyses utilizing Pearson correlation coefficient and 2x2 two-way analysis of variance were also described for hypotheses testing.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSES OF DATA

In this chapter, responses to the questionnaire are reported for frequency distribution. Additionally, these responses are analyzed statistically to determine whether the null hypotheses are to be accepted or rejected when cross-tabulations are performed with the selected dependent and independent variables previously mentioned.

Preliminary Analyses

Five-hundred sixty questionnaires were distributed, and 439 were returned, yielding 78.4% return rate. Among returned responses, 386 questionnaires had all the items answered. Of the 386 questionnaires, 246 were used for analyses because 140 questionnaires were data obtained from Asian Americans born in the United States. As mentioned previously, it was important not to rely solely on the subjects' own self-identification of whether they consider themselves Asian or Asian American. By asking the subjects their country of birth, this study ensures foreign born Asian subjects and avoids committing a serious sampling error and making erroneous generalizations from
an inaccurate group of Asians and Asian Americans.

The research sample (N = 246) consisted of 142 females and 104 males, comprising 58% and 42%, respectively, of this group. Tables 3, 4 and 5 provide frequency and sociodemographic statistics for the sample: gender, age, country of birth, marital status, education, years in the United States of America, annual income, language and self-identification.

With regard to ethnic groups of Asians in the sample, the 1980 Census show that there were 147,426 Asians in San Francisco, comprising the largest ethnic group and making up 21.7% of the total population. Of the total Asian population, Chinese are the largest group, but growing numbers of Vietnamese and Filipinos are expected to surpass the Chinese population (United States Bureau of Census, 1980). Breakdown of ethnic groups of Asians in San Francisco in 1980 presents the five major Asian ethnic groups also represented in this study: Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipinos, Japanese and Koreans (Table 3). It is interesting to note that even among Asians born outside of the United States in this study, 53.9% of the sample identify themselves as American in some ways and 2% even identify themselves exclusively American without any reference to their Asian heritage (Table 5).
Table 3

Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Sample: Gender, Age, Country of Birth and Marital Status (N = 246)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian Country</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Sample: Education Level, Years in the U.S.A. and Annual Income (N = 246)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(\bar{x})</strong></td>
<td>15.56 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>missing</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High school</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate school or Professional school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's level</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral level</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in the U.S.A.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(\bar{x})</strong></td>
<td>11.8 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.D.</strong></td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>missing</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&lt; 1 year</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 - 5</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 - 10</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11 - 15</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16 - 20</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21 - 25</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26 - 30</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31 - 35</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Income ($)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 - 4999</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5000 - 9999</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10000 - 14999</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15000 - 19999</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20000 - 24999</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25000 or more</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Usually Spoken</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian language only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Asian language</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Asian language equally</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly English</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Prefer to Speak</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian language only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly Asian language</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Asian language equally</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly English</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English only</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Self Identification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese American, Japanese American, etc.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among the sample, with regard to world view orientation, the mean value score was 55 (N = 244, S.D. = 6.797, 2 missing cases), as measured by the Asian-American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (Yamauchi, 1981) whose maximum value is 85 (Table 6). The distribution indicates a very narrow range of variability and the higher sample mean (\(\bar{X} = 55.07\)) suggests a skewed distribution toward more American world view orientation as a whole. The subjects' scores were dichotomized into Asian and American world view orientation categories by using the median, 55 as the cut off point for each scale (Yamauchi, 1981). As a result, there were 122 subjects for each world view orientation group. The American world view orientation group scores ranged from 56 to 72, such that the higher the score, the stronger the American world view orientation. On the other hand, the Asian world view orientation group scores ranged from 35 to 55, and the lower the score, the stronger the Asian world view orientation.
Table 6

Frequency Distribution of World View Orientation
Measured by AAEIQ. (N = 244, 2 missing cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World View Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to acculturation, the mean acculturation score was 2.449 \((N = 244, \text{ S.D.} = 0.444, 2 \text{ missing cases})\), as measured by Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) (Suinn et al., 1985) whose maximum value is five (Table 7). The distribution indicates a very narrow range of variability and the lower sample mean \((\bar{X} = 2.449)\) suggests a skewed distribution toward lower acculturation behavior as a group. The subjects' scores on SL-ASIA were also dichotomized into high and low acculturation score categories by using the median, 2.38, as the cut off point for each scale (Suinn, et al., 1985). There were 131 subjects in the high acculturation level group with scores ranging from 2.43 to 3.95, where 3.95 indicates higher
acculturation behaviors. On the other hand, there were 113 subjects in low acculturation level group with the score ranging from 1.33 to 2.38, indicating lower acculturation behaviors.

Table 7
Frequency Distribution in Acculturation Measured by SL-ASIA. (N = 244, 2 missing cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2.619 (1.33 - 3.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acculturative stress was measured by the FASE Acculturative Stress Scale on each domain of cultural experience: familial, attitudinal, social and environmental (Padilla, 1980; Padilla et al, 1983; Padilla et al, 1985). First, a reliability check conducted on the FASE stress scale with this group of samples resulted in a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.89. Thus, the stress scale is highly reliable for use with this sample. With regard to acculturative stress, Table 8 presents a frequency distribution of acculturative stress scores of
all the subjects used in the study. The sample group has a mean acculturative stress score of 108.87 (N = 246, S.D. = 46.88) and a range of 233. The variability statistics indicate this group experiences a rather lower level of acculturative stress as a whole. The familial cultural domain yields more stress than any other domain of the acculturative stress (Table 8).

Table 8

Frequency Distribution in FASE Acculturation Stress Scale (F = Familial, A = Attitudinal, S = Social, E = Environmental) (N = 246)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FASE Acculturative Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\bar{X}</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>27.37</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>108.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>46.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Statistical Analyses

What follows are the results of the statistical analyses for each research hypothesis of this study. This section includes descriptive statistics and the results of tests of significance. Unless otherwise specified, hypotheses are tested at the 0.05 significance level in a one-tailed test. Additional analyses are also added where necessary.

Hypothesis 1.
American world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.

Statistical analysis involved calculating Pearson's correlation coefficient. The variables of interest are American world view orientation and acculturative stress. American world view scores were obtained from the Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (AAEIQ). Acculturative stress scores were obtained from the FASE scale.

Table 9 presents the correlation coefficients for American world view orientation and acculturative stress measures. Pearson's correlation coefficient r is -0.1357 (p = 0.068), and is not statistically significant at the 0.05 level (Table 9). Thus, this hypothesis was not supported. Further examination reveals that the
correlation between the American world view and acculturative stress domains, only social stress \((r = -0.1708, p = 0.030)\) and environmental stress \((r = -0.1542, p = 0.045)\) were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, the result shows that high scores on American world view orientation is not positively correlated with a low level of over-all acculturative stress. Although the results fell short of significance, the general patterns suggest the hypothesis that low acculturative stress is associated with an American world view orientation.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FASE Acculturative Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>(-0.1146)</td>
<td>(-0.0515)</td>
<td>(-0.1708)</td>
<td>(-0.1542)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p critical value significant at \(a = 0.05\) (one-tailed test)
Hypothesis 2.

Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.

Testing this hypothesis, statistical analysis involved calculating Pearson's correlation coefficient. The variables of interest are Asian world view orientation and acculturative stress. Asian world view scores were obtained from AAEIQ and acculturative stress scores from the FASE scale. The correlation statistics between these measures of this question are given in Table 10. The Pearson's correlation coefficient \( r \) between Asian world view and over-all acculturative stress was \(-0.012\). The result shows that none of the correlation statistics between Asian world view and acculturative stress (\( r = -0.012, \ p = 0.448 \)) at the 0.05 level of significance, including the four cultural domains of FASE, reached statistical significance (Table 10). Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported. Although the result fell short of significance, the general patterns suggest the hypothesis that low acculturative stress is associated with an Asian world view orientation.
Table 10
Pearson's Correlation Coefficients between Asian World View Orientation and Acculturative Stress (N = 124)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>FASE Acculturative Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>-0.0636</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>-0.0279</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p critical value significant at α = 0.05 (one-tailed test)

Hypothesis 3.
A high acculturation score can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress, and a low acculturation score can be positively correlated with a high level of acculturative stress.

Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the degree of relationship between two variables: one's acculturation behavior and acculturative stress. Scores for the first variable were obtained from SL-ASIA while those for the second were obtained from the FASE scale. Table 11 reports the correlation coefficients for measures of acculturation and acculturative stress.
used in the study. The Pearson's correlation coefficient \( r \) was \(-0.2231\) (\( p = 0.001 \)), indicating statistical significance at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 11). Thus, this hypothesis was supported. Further examination reveals that the correlation coefficient between the acculturation measure and all four domains of acculturative stress score, familial stress (\( r = -0.1916, p = 0.001 \)), attitudinal stress (\( r = -0.1489, p = 0.010 \)), social stress (\( r = -0.2642, p = 0.001 \)) and environmental stress (\( r = -0.2017, p = 0.001 \)) reached statistical significance at the 0.05 level (Table 11). Thus, high score on acculturative behavior is positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress in all four cultural domains.
Table 11

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients between Acculturation Level and Acculturative Stress
(N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturative Stress</th>
<th>Acculturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| F stress             | \( r = -0.1916 \)  
                      | \( p = 0.001 \) |
| A stress             | \( r = -0.1489 \)  
                      | \( p = 0.010 \) |
| S stress             | \( r = -0.2642 \)  
                      | \( p = 0.001 \) |
| E stress             | \( r = -0.2017 \)  
                      | \( p = 0.001 \) |
| FASE                 | \( r = -0.2231 \)  
                      | \( p = 0.001 \) |

\( p \) critical value significant at \( a = 0.05 \)
Additional analysis shown in Table 12 indicates the consistency of the finding in both Asian world view orientation and American world view orientation groups except attitudinal stress for Asian world view group (r = -0.1421, p = 0.059) at the 0.05 level of significance. Thus, there is a significant correlation between high acculturation and low acculturative stress in both groups.

Table 12

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients between Acculturation Level and Acculturative Stress (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Asian World View</th>
<th>American World View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F stress</td>
<td>r = -0.1678</td>
<td>r = -0.2173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.032</td>
<td>p = 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stress</td>
<td>r = -0.1421</td>
<td>r = -0.1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.059</td>
<td>p = 0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S stress</td>
<td>r = -0.2790</td>
<td>r = -0.2395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E stress</td>
<td>r = -0.2201</td>
<td>r = -0.1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.007</td>
<td>p = 0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASE Acculturative Stress</td>
<td>r = -0.2261</td>
<td>r = -0.2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.006</td>
<td>p = 0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p critical value significant at α = 0.05 (one-tailed test)
Hypothesis 4.
Both a high acculturation score with an American world view and a low acculturation score with an Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.

Hypothesis 5.
Both a low acculturation score with an American world view and a high acculturation score with an Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress.

A 2x2 two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to test both hypotheses 4 and 5 to investigate main effects and interactive effects of two independent variables, world view and acculturation, against a dependent variable, acculturative stress. The prediction made previously is indicated in Table 2 in the methodology chapter. According to the previous research, it was predicted that cell groups I and IV experience less acculturative stress due to a lack of conflict or dissonance between their world view and acculturation behavior. On the contrary, cell groups II and III were both predicted to experience high acculturative stress due to a conflict or dissonance between world view and acculturation behavior.
Table 13

Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Acculturative Stress, Acculturation and World View Orientation: Sample Subgroup Means (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian World View</th>
<th>American World View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>F 30.74</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 29.71</td>
<td>28.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>S 30.53</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 29.98</td>
<td>28.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASE</td>
<td>120.97</td>
<td>117.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>F 28.97</td>
<td>26.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 26.64</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>S 24.23</td>
<td>22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 24.03</td>
<td>23.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FASE</td>
<td>103.88</td>
<td>97.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test these hypotheses, the cell frequencies of 2x2 two-way analysis of variance data were calculated and presented in Table 13. Table 14 also presents a simplified cell means and standard deviations for the overall acculturative stress measures.
Table 14
Cell Frequency Distribution of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for FASE Acculturative Stress, Acculturation and World View Orientation (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian World View Orientation</th>
<th>American World View Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Acculturation Behavior</td>
<td>120.97 (S.D. = 53.12)</td>
<td>117.07 (S.D. = 46.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Acculturation Behavior</td>
<td>103.88 (S.D. = 48.20)</td>
<td>97.55 (S.D. = 36.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studying the cell means of ANOVA suggests inconsistencies from the prediction in the cells I, II and III in all four domains of cultural experiences. In other words, cell group IV with American world view and a high acculturation measure seems to experience least acculturative stress ($\bar{X} = 97.55$, S.D. = 36.63) while cell I group with Asian world view and low acculturation measure seems to experience most acculturative stress ($\bar{X} = 120.97$, S.D. = 53.12) (Tables 13, 14). Furthermore, the scores from cell groups II and III, although predicted to
experience high acculturative stress, fell in the middle:
cell group II with American world view and low
acculturation (X = 117.07, S.D. = 46.49) and cell group
III with Asian world view and high acculturation (X =
103.88, S.D. = 48.20) (Tables 13, 14).

Tables 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 illustrate the results
of planned comparisons for two-way ANOVA for acculturative
stress followed by all four domains of the variable. A
partial sum of squares was calculated for unequal cell
means in order to adjust for the imbalance between cells.
Consequently, the main effect of A (column effect) was
adjusted against an imbalanced B, and likewise, the main
effect of B (row effect) was adjusted against an
imbalanced A. In this study, the tests for both main
effects (both the column effect and the row effect) were
significant. According to Table 19, world view
orientation alone is not related to the dependent variable
of acculturative stress. The difference between the
effects of Asian and American world view orientations on
acculturative stress did not reach the statistical
significance at the 0.05 level (r index: F (0.381) =
0.771) (Table 19). However, acculturation behavior alone
is related to the dependent variable of acculturative
stress with high and low levels of acculturation behavior,
not all having the same effect on acculturative stress (r
index: F (0.002) = 9.510) at the 0.05 level of
significance (Table 19).

There is, however, no interaction between the two
independent variables, world view orientation and
acculturation behavior levels (r index: F (0.838) = 0.042)
at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 19). The effects
of world view orientations do not depend on levels of
acculturation behaviors, and vice versa. In other words,
these results can be interpreted as saying that there is
a difference between high and low acculturation behaviors
and Asian and American world view orientations. But the
difference between Asian and American world view
orientations is the same whether high or low acculturative
behaviors is examined; and the difference between high and
low acculturative behaviors is the same whether Asian or
American world view orientation is examined.

The results of the two-way ANOVA reveal that there
are significant main effects of world view and
acculturation on over-all acculturative stress (r index: F
(0.006) = 5.211) but there are no significant interaction
effects found. This finding was consistent across the
four domains of acculturative stress (Tables 15, 16, 17, 18).
This means that, within the limits of sensitivity of
this experiment, the effect of each variable was the same over all levels of the other variable. Hypotheses 4 and 5, therefore, were not supported. The findings of interaction effects would have provided a plausible explanation for the dissonance-stress paradigm.
Table 15

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Familial Domain of Acculturative Stress, Acculturation and World View (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>625.683</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>312.841</td>
<td>2.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World View (A)</td>
<td>41.578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.578</td>
<td>0.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>576.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>576.093</td>
<td>4.461*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way Interaction (A) x (B)</td>
<td>104.785</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104.785</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>730.468</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>243.489</td>
<td>1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>30995.794</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>129.149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31726.262</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>130.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F ratio significant at the α = 0.05 significance level
Table 16

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Attitudinal Domain of Acculturative Stress, Acculturation and World View (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>824.049</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>412.025</td>
<td>2.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World View (A)</td>
<td>107.208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107.208</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>702.804</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>702.804</td>
<td>4.080*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way Interaction (A) x (B)</td>
<td>6.992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.992</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>831.042</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>277.014</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>41343.188</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>172.263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42174.230</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>173.557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F ratio significant at the α = 0.05 significance level
Table 17

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for
Social Domain of Acculturative Stress,
Acculturation and World View (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2581.458</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1290.729</td>
<td>8.266*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World View (A)</td>
<td>230.976</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>230.976</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>2312.868</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2312.868</td>
<td>14.813*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way Interaction (A) x (B)</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2582.394</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>860.798</td>
<td>5.513*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>37473.671</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>156.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40056.066</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>164.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F ratio significant at the a = 0.05 significance level
Table 18
Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Environmental Domain of Acculturative Stress, Acculturation and World View (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2020.520</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1010.260</td>
<td>4.950*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World View (A)</td>
<td>73.641</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.641</td>
<td>0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>1927.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1927.074</td>
<td>9.443*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way Interaction (A) x (B)</td>
<td>6.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.015</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2026.535</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>675.512</td>
<td>3.310*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>48978.198</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>204.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51004.734</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>209.896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F ratio significant at the a = 0.05 significance level
Table 19

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for FASE Acculturative Stress, Acculturation and World View (N = 244)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>22252.713</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11126.356</td>
<td>5.211*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World View (A)</td>
<td>1646.862</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1646.862</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation (B)</td>
<td>20307.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20307.135</td>
<td>9.510*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-way Interaction (A) x (B)</td>
<td>89.502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.502</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>22342.215</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7447.405</td>
<td>3.488*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>512459.207</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2135.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>534801.422</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2200.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F ratio significant at the α = 0.05 significance level
Summary

In this chapter, frequency distributions and analyses of the collected data for hypotheses testing are reported. Sociodemographic characteristics, world view orientation, acculturative level, and acculturative stress level of the sample subjects reveal a narrow range of variabilities within each variable, and thus, rather homogenous sample group. With regard to world view orientation and acculturative level, the scores from the sample group indicate a skewed distribution toward more American world view orientation and lower level of acculturative behavior. In addition, with regard to acculturative stress, the variability statistics indicate this group experiences a rather lower level of acculturative stress as a whole.

According to the statistical analyses for each research hypotheses, hypothesis 3 is accepted and hypotheses 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected. The analyses results indicate that a high level of acculturative behavior is significantly correlated with a low level of acculturative stress for Asians studied in this research. The American world view orientation is significantly correlated with only social and environmental domains of acculturative stress.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was concerned with the differences in degrees of adjustment difficulty experienced by Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States. Consequently, the purpose of the present study was to examine the extent to which one's world view and acculturation behavior were related to one's acculturative stress. This chapter presents summary of the research and findings, discussion of the findings, conclusions, theoretical and practical implications, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Research

This study is a preliminary exploration of the process by which Asian sojourners and immigrants are adapting to their environment in the United States, and is intended to clarify what knowledge and services might be helpful to those who are experiencing acculturative stress. Thus, the study has descriptive and correlational
research objectives and is designed as a cross-sectional survey study which utilizes questionnaires as the major method of data collection for hypotheses testing.

Research was conducted in the San Francisco Bay Area and data collected from 246 foreign born Asians out of a possible 560 who volunteered to participate. The questionnaire booklet to which subjects responded included questions for demographic background and three instruments to obtain measures of three sets of variables (Appendix C). There are two independent variables in the study. One independent variable, world view orientation, was measured by the Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (Yamauchi, 1981). Subjects responded to items that included contrasting values in Asian and American world view in five areas: (1) individual/group orientation; (2) fatalism; (3) obedience to authority; (4) self-control; and (5) filial piety. The other independent variable, degree of behavioral acculturation, was measured by the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn et al, 1985). This multidimensional scale measures acculturation behavior such as language familiarity, friendship choice, geographic history knowledge and cultural attitude. The lone dependent variable, acculturative stress, was measured by the FASE Acculturative Stress Scale (Padilla, 1980; Padilla, et al, 1983). The scale entails measuring the amount of
difficulty of adjustment acculturating population especially experience for each of four major domains of cultural experiences: the familial, attitudinal, social and environmental.

Descriptive statistics for the sample of subjects showed a narrow range of variabilities within each variable. Five hypotheses were tested by correlational analyses and 2x2 two-way analysis of variance.

Summary of Findings

Hypothesis 1.
American world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States.

The hypothesis was not accepted because the correlational coefficient did not yield a statistically significant relationship \((r = -0.1357, p = 0.068)\) at the 0.05 level of significance, between American world view orientation and over-all acculturative stress (Table 9). The result indicated that American world view orientation had an inverse relation to acculturative stress experience as hypothesized only with the social \((r = -0.1708, p = 0.030)\) and environmental domains \((r = -0.1542, p = 0.045)\) of acculturative stress (Table 9).
Hypothesis 2.

Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States.

This was not supported because the correlational coefficient \( r = -0.012, p = 0.448 \) did not yield a statistical significance at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 10). No statistically significant relationships emerged from the data, suggesting that the Asian world view orientation is not related to a low level of acculturative stress for all four cultural domains. Although the result fell short of significance, the general pattern suggests the hypothesis that low acculturative stress is associated with an Asian world view orientation.

The results from both hypotheses 1 and 2 were surprising findings since conceptually, some relationships were expected from an emic approach. A possible explanation for this lack of relationship may be due to the narrow variability and the high mean score (\( \bar{X} = 55.07 \), closer to American world view orientation) obtained from the AAEIQ scale of the sample subjects. This high score may account for the restricted range observed in correlations with a stronger commitment to Asian world view orientation in hypothesis 2 testing.
Hypothesis 3.
A high level of acculturation can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress, and a low level of acculturation can be positively correlated with a high level of acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States.

This was accepted because the correlational coefficient yielded a statistically significant relationship between acculturation behavior and acculturative stress \( r = -0.2231, p = 0.001 \) at the 0.05 level of significance (Table 11). Additionally, statistically significant relationships were found between acculturation and all four domains of acculturative stress. These findings suggest that active participation in the American culture through friendship choices, language, food and music choices is correlated with experiences of less acculturative stress.

Hypothesis 4.
Both a high acculturation score with an American world view and a low acculturation score with an Asian world view can be positively correlated with a low level of acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States.
Hypothesis 5.
Both a low acculturation score with an American world view and a high acculturation score with an Asian world view can be positively correlated with a high level of acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States.

They were rejected because there were no statistically significant interaction effects between acculturation and world view orientation ($F = 0.029, p = 0.042$) at the $0.05$ level of significance (Table 19). An anticipated finding was that the dissonance or inconsistency between world view and acculturation behavior would produce higher acculturative stress, or the consistency between world view and acculturation behavior would produce lower acculturative stress, yet this was not statistically confirmed by a significant relationship. These findings suggest that the most crucial factor explaining low scores in acculturative stress measures was not the consistency between one's behavior and value system, but rather, one's acculturation behavior.

Summarizing the research results, ANOVA and correlational analyses revealed that acculturation behavior was the single best predictor contributing to the experience of acculturative stress. The American world view orientation was not related to over-all acculturative
stress but was related to social and environmental domains of acculturative stress. There are no correlations between Asian or American world view and overall acculturative stress levels.

These findings are consistent with those in previous research utilizing an etic and assimilation approach as asserted by Greeley (1969) "Why can't they be like us?" (to experience less acculturative stress). According to an etic perspective, high acculturative stress is perceived to result from the sojourner's unconscious or conscious resistance against, or inability to, adapt to the norms and values of the new cultural world view orientation and the behavior. In other words, one's failure to assimilate or adjust to one's new cultural environment produces acculturative stress. The possible explanation to the unexpected results of the study may be due to a number of the limitations already discussed, but may also be due to the emic nature of the acculturation phenomena which may have been overlooked. What follows is the discussion to link the conceptualization of the research problems from the literature research to the results of data analyses.
Discussion of the Findings

According to the results of the research, behavioral acculturation and American world view emerged as the crucial variables relating to a low level of acculturative stress or some domains of acculturative stress. As illustrated in the literature review, the linear model of acculturation employed in the operationalization of this research may not be sufficient to explain acculturation experiences of Asians in the United States. The instruments used and the all-English nature of the study further limited the current research. Therefore, further examination from the emic and qualitative approach may be warranted to understand the culturally relative meaning of the data acquired from the current research. Quantitative research methodology describes the acculturation process independently of its relationship to the cultural framework in which it occurs. Qualitative analysis, on the other hand, is the only methodology which can yield cultural specific information as to what the acculturation process means to Asians, or explain the relationship between specific world views and acculturative stress (Fairbanks & Hough, 1981; Matheny, et al, 1986; D. W. Sue, 1986; Watanabe, 1973). The epistemological differences between Asian and American world views are utilized as tools to analyze the acculturation process and to decode
the quantitative data in the discussion of the findings. The concept of world view and differences between two world view orientations contain special significance in order to understand acculturation process since world view forms the conceptual basis for the relationship between people and their environment. Such relationship between people and environment is the central focus of the process of acculturation and acculturative stress.

By superimposing the nature of Asian world view on the acculturation scores for instance, a high acculturation score may mean a high commitment to Asian world view orientation, thus allowing Asian sojourners and immigrants to accept American norms and roles in their new environment, conforming and accepting their acculturation process as fate. In other words, this adaptation to American behavior, according to the non-linear model, may reflect the flexibility and accommodative nature of the Asian world view. Many studies in the field of stress have indicated that the flexibility of roles is related to a lower level of stress (Matheny, et al, 1986; Selye, 1983; Spielberger & Diaz-Guerrero, 1976). In fact, this study found a significant relationship between high acculturation level and low acculturative stress. This analysis cannot be derived without the in-depth knowledge of both Asian and American cultural world views.
Furthermore, the high acculturation may, at the same time, indicate the conformity, contextual nature, and fatalism of Asian world view orientation. High stress experienced by the cell group I. with high Asian world view and low acculturation behavior, in fact reflects the individualistic, independent, rigidity and separateness of American world view (DuBois, 1955; Lebra, 1972; Szasz, 1970). Asians who fail to accommodate their environmental needs and norms experience the highest acculturative stress. Here, the question of what one means by an Asian or American does not at all arise in terms of world view orientation. The adjectives 'Asian,' or 'American,' (world view) may not be sufficient to the concepts, but rather they apply only to person, systems, and the environment. Instead, the process of choosing between Asian or American world view orientation itself reflects the world view orientation of the individuals or the acculturation of the individuals.

Therefore, it is far too simplistic to conclude that the group with Asian world view and low acculturation behavior experience more stress due to culture conflict. The contradictions that exist in cross-cultural counseling and psychology literature may be explained, employing this non-linear model, as perhaps an attempt to redefine the etic assimilation approach as an emic cultural retention approach concerning Asians and the acculturation process.
The seeming assimilation of Asians, in fact, is a reflection of the retention of their Asian world view orientation, i.e., the characteristic of being socially accommodating. Often, when Asian phenomena is explained using Western theoretical constructs or the quantitative model, the universal appropriateness of linear thinking is presumed, and data collected may need to be conformed to preconceived ideas that are based on ethnocentric biases. Perhaps, a qualitative and emic analysis of culture or the concept of stress is necessary before quantification of data and the operationalization of research. As elaborated earlier, "imposed etics" are prevalent in cross-cultural research, hence, the importance of cultural relative approach cannot be emphasized too much: to view behavior in the cultural framework in which it occurs, and understand the phenomena within its cultural context.

Conclusions

Within the limitations of this study, the following conclusions are warranted, based upon the survey results, the statistical analysis, and the emic interpretation of the results:
1. Individuals' acculturation behavior is the single best predictor contributing to the experience of acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States;

2. The American world view orientation has an inverse relation to acculturative stress experience only with the social and environmental domains for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States;

3. There seems to be no significant correlation between one's world view orientation and the level of over-all acculturative stress for Asian sojourners and immigrants in the United States;

4. There seems to be no significant interaction effects between acculturation behavior and world view orientation contributing to the experience of acculturative stress. In other words, the dissonance or inconsistency between world view and acculturation behavior is not related to a high acculturative stress; and

5. The linear model of acculturation seems insufficient to explain the acculturation experience of Asians in the United States.
Implications

First, theoretically, the study fills a gap in the body of research related to acculturative stress and the acculturation process of Asians by introducing a nonlinear model of acculturation and an emic analysis of data. This study indicates that the manner in which Asian individuals perceive their relationship to the world is highly correlated to their cultural development and life experiences in the United States. Cross-cultural research conceptualized and operationalized from a cultural specific approach also requires cultural specific interpretation of the data. The fact that interpreting research results from this study requires special sensitivity and in-depth knowledge of both Asian and American culture demonstrates that valid and relevant analysis of data often requires understanding of intervening attribution variables within their cultural context. Therefore, the adjectives 'Asian' or 'American,' behaviors or value systems may not be sufficient to the concepts in the conflicting literature exist in the cross-cultural counseling and psychology field. The conclusions of this study implies the values and importance of redefining experiences of Asians through in-depth emic analysis. Perhaps, a qualitative analysis
of culture or the research concept is necessary before quantification of data and the operationalization of research.

Secondly, world view is a culturally based variable that also influences the relationship between the therapist and the client (Horner & Vandersluis, 1981; Ibrahim, 1985; Triandis, et al, 1972). For counselors, the implications of the study lie in the need for differential interventions for acculturative stress problems experienced by clients from Asian countries. Counselors should recognize the cultural context of mental health problems. Failure to learn about and integrate these cultural dynamics in counseling these persons can lead to problems and possible therapeutic failures. For instance, Asian immigrants appearing to be adhering to their Asian value system in the United States may be experiencing more stress than previously thought. On the other hand, Asian sojourners appearing to be 'Americanized' may be confused about their ethnic loyalty. The counseling profession's capacity to maximize the potential for the productive resolution of acculturation process in clients, will be enhanced by a greater understanding of the nature of events from their point of view.
Focusing on the possibility that world view does influence the social and environmental domains of acculturative stress indicates that a program like counseling strategies, can provide an environment which introduces Asian clients to new therapeutic contexts to challenge their current beliefs and actions. These concepts can be further operationalized when discussing or presenting more cultural specific treatment which allow these clients an opportunity to test out new behaviors and ideas and introduced to new options based on their world view.

Usually, intervention is provided after the client starts to experience acculturative stress. However, there is a critical need for pre-culture shock strategies. While the prevention of acculturative stress is not possible, psychotherapy and counseling programs can institute specific pre-entry action steps to lessen the impact of acculturation stressors, therefore making culture shock, transition, and stress less debilitating.

Recommendations for Future Research

In summarizing the current study, one question is evident: What factors do influence acculturative stress? Despite the lack of interaction effects, this study partially supports the hypotheses that factors of
acculturation behaviors and world views are related to acculturative stress. This suggests that further work needs to be done to determine what types of situational and personality factors influence acculturative stress. The current research also questions the universality of certain intact conceptual transfers, e.g., world view, acculturative stress, acculturation, especially those that are extremely sensitive to intra-cultural dynamics and interpretations. This may affect instrumentation and research methodology. Since this study contained limitations in three areas, recommendations for future research is also discussed in terms of these categories: subject selection, instrumentation, and research methodology; to improve hopefully in all three areas of the future research.

**Subject Selection and Setting**

In regard to subject selection, the sampling procedure requires much improvement in the future. The future research may continue to investigate the question "From which country, to which country, which personality type, and which world view orientation may affect what kind of acculturative stress and symptoms one may experience during acculturation process?", attempting to explore what accounts for various differences in the reaction pattern of sojourners and immigrants. Ethnicity
of Asians and Asian Americans in the United States is affected by demographic differences, levels of English literacy, achievements, incomes, and values (Kitano, 1981; Shium, 1985; S. Sue, 1988). A valid random sampling of any Asian group requires in-depth information on the parameters which are unique to each of these groups.

1. A replication of this study in various geographical areas in the United States, using a larger and heterogeneous population; and

2. A replication of this study with the component of comparison among different Asian cultural groups to assess differences and the similarities of impact acculturation have on each Asian populations.

Instrumentation

The instruments also were limited in terms of information on reliability and validity, English language, their focus on psychological aspects of acculturative stress, and their conceptual basis of the linear model. The relevance and creditability of development of instruments are pending on the concerted effort by researchers on further investigations of measurement theories and techniques with Asians and Asian Americans in the United States. We need to make efforts to avoid "imposed etics" without cultural equvalancey, by comprehensive and holistic systems of assessment.
1. Development and validation research of the instrument to assess the acculturation, world view and acculturative stress for Asians. The instruments will be more accurate, culturally specific and language specific. A composite of culturally relevant constructs and factors that influence acculturative stress should be evaluated and included carefully. This process may require redefining variables, terms and constructs from emic perspectives and move toward comprehensive and holistic systems of assessment;

2. Development and validation research of the acculturation instrument based on the non-linear model. This instrument will help researchers assess more accurately and validly the phenomena of acculturation process from culturally specific perspective without "imposed etics" which describe Asian experiences from the Western world view framework;

3. Development and validation research of the acculturative stress instrument including both psychological and physical aspects of stress response symptoms for Asians. This assessment system embraces the medical model, the social system model, and pluralistic model. Holistic measures techniques, systematic observations, biofeedback instruments, and skilled interviews are other invaluable tools which could provide relevant information; and
4. Development and validation of a structured interview questionnaire to compile culturally specific constructs that are relevant to Asians' acculturation experiences, acculturation stress and world view orientation. Data gathered from single case interviews afford the researcher a basis for the operationalization of research and quantification of data.

Research Methodology

Many researchers who have advocated for the rigor of scientific research, have began to recognize the problems and inadequacy of the narrow traditional quantitative model when applied to investigate Asian experiences. "Statistical data from research studies with the Asian Americans population sometimes signifies the beginning of a conceptual jig-saw-puzzle rather than the end of it" (Shium, 1985, p. 7). There is the need for a new psychological model, bold theoretical reconceptualizations and creative research techniques and strategies to formulate Asian research problems.

1. Experimental research method with pre- and post-testing of Asians coming to live in the United States will provide the explanation to causal relationships between the variables;
2. Longitudinal and extensive archival research to examine the longer-term effect and developmental effects of acculturation;

3. Qualitative research to understand the variation and the essential characteristics of the acculturation phenomena and acculturative stress experienced from Asian specific standpoint. Perhaps, in-depth life history single case approach to investigate the acculturation process, acculturative stress, and world views by focusing on the life of several Asians, one Asian from each cultural groups. Complete personality analysis and data gathered from personal interviews afford the researcher new ways of interpreting the different meaning of the acculturation experience: how and why some Asians experience more acculturative stress than others; how different, how similar these experiences and symptoms are. This will add depth to the quantitative data in search for a composite of factors that influence acculturative stress. As mentioned before, a qualitative analysis of culture and certain constructs maybe necessary before quantification of data and the operationalization of research to overcome the myth of universality and transferability of concepts;

4. Empirical studies of the influence of culture on the experience of stress, the role of stressors in the development of psychological disorders, and the kinds of
stress that produce these symptoms and disorders. Studies
designed to distinguish cultural stressors from universal
stressors should contribute to more effective mental
health interventions for Asian populations and avoid the
assumption that the American situation automatically
applies to other cultures; and

5. Lastly, more collaborative efforts in which data
are gathered in many countries and shared among a number
of collaborators are needed. Additionally, input should
also insure dealing with the inevitable biases which is
inherent in cross-cultural research.
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APPENDIX A

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES HUMAN

SUBJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM
Research Involving Human Subjects

ACTION OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

With regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research protocol:

87B0186 ACCULTURATIVE STRESS AND WORLD VIEW, Susan J. Sears, Chikako I. Cox, Human Services Education

THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES REVIEW COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN THE FOLLOWING ACTION:

____ APPROVED
X APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS*
____ DISAPPROVED
____ WAIVER OF WRITTEN CONSENT GRANTED

* Conditions stated by the Committee have been met by the Investigator and, therefore, the protocol is APPROVED.

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least four (4) years beyond the termination of the subject's participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subjects Review Committee for the required retention period. This application has been approved for the period of one year. You are reminded that you must promptly report any problems to the Review Committee, and that no procedural changes may be made without prior review and approval. You are also reminded that the identity of the research participants must be kept confidential.

Date: December 11, 1987

Signed: [Signature]
Chairperson

HS-0238 (Rev. 3/85)
APPENDIX B

TEST ADMINISTRATOR'S SCRIPT
TEST ADMINISTRATOR'S SCRIPT

Hello. My name is Chikako Cox. I am conducting a research under the principal investigator, Dr. Susan J. Sears from the Ohio State University. We are currently studying life experiences of Asians in this country. There are a series of questions which we would like you to answer today. There will be questions asking about your experiences in this country, your value system and certain stressful situations. All of your responses will be kept confidential.

It would be very helpful if you would answer every item and to respond to each question as honestly as you can. You will be working at your own pace. There are a lot of items though, so you will want to proceed as quickly as you can. I will be available throughout this time to answer any questions you might have. You will have 30 to 40 minutes to complete the booklet.

Your voluntary participation in the study will make a significant contribution to the empirical information about life experiences of Asians in this country. If you feel questions are too personal or too difficult to answer, please let me know after the others start. Again, feel free to ask questions. Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE BOOKLET
Dear Friend,

Thank you for responding to the questionnaire in advance. This study is designed to determine what you might have experienced as you have been learning and adjusting to the U.S.A. culture.

You need not identify yourself by name or address on the survey form. All your responses will be kept confidential and will be used for research purpose only on a strictly anonymous basis.

Your voluntary participation in the study will make a significant contribution to the compilation of empirical information about acculturation of Asians in this country.

Thank you again for your time and consideration of this project.

Susan Jones Sears
Susan J. Sears, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Principal Investigator

Chikako I. Cox, M.A.
Investigator

Program Areas: Counseling, School Psychology, Special Education, Gifted Education
Rehabilitation Services, Psycho-Education Clinic
College of Education
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

ACCULTURATIVE STRESS AND WORLD VIEW

Susan J. Sears, Ph.D. or his/her authorized representative has
(Principal Investigator)

explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ___________________________ Signed: ___________________________

Signed: ___________________________ Signed: ___________________________

(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ___________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 3/87) --(To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
Please read each of the following questions carefully. Check or write in the most appropriate answer to the question.

1. Age: _______

2. Sex: Male______ Female______

3. Born in the U.S.A.______
   Born outside of the U.S.A.—Specify ____________________

4. Ethnicity (Check all that apply):
   American______ Chinese______ Korean______
   Japanese______ Vietnamese______ Filipino______
   Other—Specify________________________

5. Marital Status:
   Single____ Married____ Separated____ Divorced____ Widowed____

6. Education:
   Highest year achieved ________ years
   Highest degree achieved __________________

7. Student? Yes____ No____

8. Employed? Yes____ No____
   What is your occupation? ____________________________

9. Annual Income:
   ______ 0 - $4,999
   ______ $5,000 - $9,999
   ______ $10,000 - $14,999
   ______ $15,000 - $19,999
   ______ $20,000 - $24,999
   ______ $25,000 or more

10. If you were not born in the United States, how long have you been in this country?
   ______ year(s) ______ month(s)

   Why did you come to the United States?
Asian American Ethnic Identity Questionnaire

Listed below are a number of statements about which people often have different opinions. Please read each statement carefully, then circle the letter that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. Answer every statement, even if you have to guess at some. There is no right or wrong answer.

SA...Strongly Agree
A...Agree
N...Neither Agree or Disagree
D...Disagree
SD...Strongly Disagree

1. Obedience to authority is an important virtue children should learn.
   SA   A   N   D   SD

2. One should never express anger even when one has a reason for doing so.
   SA   A   N   D   SD

3. A person should not feel bound to follow the decisions of groups to which he or she belongs if these decisions are not in accord with his or her private preferences.
   SA   A   N   D   SD

4. A good child is an obedient child.
   SA   A   N   D   SD

5. It is all right for personal desires to come before duty to one's family.
   SA   A   N   D   SD

6. A person should hide his or her feelings in some things, even though people may hurt him or her without their knowledge.
   SA   A   N   D   SD

7. An older brother's decision is to be respected more than that of a younger one.
   SA   A   N   D   SD
SA...Strongly Agree  
A...Agree  
N...Neither Agree or Disagree  
D...Disagree  
SD...Strongly Disagree

8. A person can learn better striking out on his or her own  
   than by following the advice of others. 
   SA   A   N   D   SD

9. It is important for children to respect authority.  
   SA   A   N   D   SD

10. People ought to pay more attention to new ideas, even if  
     they go against the traditional way of life.  
     SA   A   N   D   SD

11. One should be spontaneous and casual with people.  
    SA   A   N   D   SD

12. It is all right for children to question the decisions of  
     their parents.  
     SA   A   N   D   SD

13. It is best to avoid places where a person is not totally  
    welcome.  
    SA   A   N   D   SD

14. When a person is born, the success he or she is going to  
    have is already in the cards.  
    SA   A   N   D   SD

15. One can never let oneself down without letting the family  
    down at the same time.  
    SA   A   N   D   SD

16. It is the duty of the eldest son to take care of his  
    parents in their old age.  
    SA   A   N   D   SD

17. When in need of aid, it is best to rely mainly on one’s  
    relatives.  
    SA   A   N   D   SD
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Please read each of the following questions carefully.
Check the most appropriate answer to the question.

1. What language can you speak?
   ____ Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etc.)
   ____ Mostly Asian language, some English
   ____ Asian language and English about equally well (bilingual)
   ____ Mostly English, some Asian language
   ____ Only English

2. What language do you prefer?
   ____ Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etc.)
   ____ Mostly Asian language, some English
   ____ Asian language and English about equally well (bilingual)
   ____ Mostly English, some Asian language
   ____ Only English

3. How do you identify yourself?
   ____ "Oriental"
   ____ Asian
   ____ Asian American
   ____ Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, etc.
   ____ American

4. Which identification does (did) your mother use?
   ____ "Oriental"
   ____ Asian
   ____ Asian American
   ____ Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, etc.
   ____ American

5. Which identification does (did) your father use?
   ____ "Oriental"
   ____ Asian
   ____ Asian American
   ____ Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, etc.
   ____ American

6. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child up to age 6?
   ____ Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
   ____ Mostly Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
   ____ About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
   ____ Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
   ____ Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics or other non-Asian ethnic groups
7. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child from 6 to 18?

- Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
- Mostly Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
- About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
- Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
- Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics or other non-Asian ethnic groups

8. Whom do you now associate with in the community?

- Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
- Mostly Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
- About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
- Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
- Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics or other non-Asian ethnic groups

9. If you could pick, whom would you prefer to associate with in the community?

- Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
- Mostly Asians, Asian Americans, "Orientals"
- About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
- Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
- Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics or other non-Asian ethnic groups

10. What is your music preference?

- Only Asian music (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, etc.)
- Mostly Asian
- Equally Asian and English
- Mostly English
- English only

11. What is your movie preference?

- Asian-language movies only
- Asian-language movies mostly
- Equally Asian and English
- English-language movies mostly
- English-language movies only
12. Where were you born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o Where was your father born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o Where was your mother born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o Where was your father's father born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o Where was your father's mother born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o Where was your mother's father born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o Where was your mother's mother born?

____ U.S. _____ Asia _____ Other-Specify_________ _____ Don't Know

o On the basis of the above answers, check the generation that best applies to you:

____ 1st Generation = I was born in Asia or other

____ 2nd Generation = I was born in U.S., either parent was born in Asia or other

____ 3rd Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S., and all grandparents born in Asia or other

____ 4th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents born in U.S., and at least one grandparent born in Asia or other and one grandparent born in U.S.

____ 5th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents and all grandparents also born in U.S.

____ I don't know what generation best fits since I lack some information

13. Where were you raised?

____ In Asia only

____ Mostly in Asia, some in U.S.

____ Equally in Asia and U.S.

____ Mostly in U.S., some in Asia

____ In U.S. only

14. What contact have you had with Asia?

____ Raised one year or more in Asia

____ Lived for less than one year in Asia

____ Occasional visits to Asia

____ Occasional communications (letters, phone calls, etc.) with people in Asia

____ No exposure or communications with people in Asia
15. What is your food preference at home?
   ______ Exclusively Asian food
   ______ Mostly Asian food, some American
   ______ About equally Asian and American
   ______ Mostly American food
   ______ Exclusively American food

16. What is your food preference in restaurants?
   ______ Exclusively Asian food
   ______ Mostly Asian food, some American
   ______ About equally Asian and American
   ______ Mostly American food
   ______ Exclusively American food

17. Do you
   ______ read only an Asian language
   ______ read an Asian language better than English
   ______ read both Asian language and English equally well
   ______ read English better than an Asian language
   ______ read only English

18. Do you
   ______ write only an Asian language
   ______ write an Asian language better than English
   ______ write both Asian language and English equally well
   ______ write English better than an Asian language
   ______ write only English

19. If you consider yourself a member of the Asian group ("Oriental", Asian, Asian American, Chinese American, etc., whatever term you prefer), how much pride do you have in this group?
   ______ Extremely proud
   ______ Moderately proud
   ______ Little pride
   ______ No pride but do not feel negative toward group
   ______ No pride but do feel negative toward group

20. How would you rate yourself?
   ______ Very Asian
   ______ Mostly Asian
   ______ Bicultural
   ______ Mostly Americanized
   ______ Very Americanized

21. Do you participate in Asian occasions, holidays, traditions, etc.?
   ______ Nearly all
   ______ Most of them
   ______ Some of them
   ______ A few of them
   ______ None at all
Please read each of the following questions carefully. On the 6-point scale shown beside each question, indicate how stressful each item is for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Not stressful</th>
<th>Barely stressful</th>
<th>Somewhat stressful</th>
<th>Moderately stressful</th>
<th>Extremely stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have trouble making close personal friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am not comfortable with people who are different from me</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I don't agree with others' sexual attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I worry that others do not think I am as good as they are</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is difficult for me to argue for my rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am uncomfortable meeting people</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My parents and I argue often</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I worry about doing something inappropriate at social gatherings</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel uncomfortable in this unfamiliar environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It bothers me to think that so many people use drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I don't blend in with others very well</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People that are from a different culture than I am don't understand me</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It bothers me that others don't like to do what I enjoy doing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is difficult to go where I want since I don't know the area well</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I cannot trust very many people</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. My parents don’t want me to move out but I would like to

17. It's hard for me to show what I really know

18. I don’t know to whom to turn when I have problems

19. Leaving my family was very difficult

20. My parents and I have conflicting expectations about my future

21. People make judgments about me before they get to know me

22. I often think about my cultural background

23. Sometimes I have difficulty expressing myself in English

24. The amount of competition in the United States bothers me

25. It's hard to express to my friends how I really feel

26. I feel as if I am in the middle of two opposing value systems (those of my peers & parents)

27. I have more barriers to overcome than most people

28. I have difficulty finding food that I like

29. I don’t have any close friends

30. I often feel alone
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. I have trouble understanding others when they speak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My parents are too old fashioned or conservative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The lack of clearly defined male and female roles in the U.S. bothers me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I feel awkward at social events</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Sometimes I feel uncomfortable having to tell people where I am from</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. It bothers me that I cannot be with my family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. It bothers me that I have an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am concerned about the widespread use of alcohol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I am very self conscious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Going to a strange country was very difficult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I miss my old friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. People look down upon me if I practice customs of my culture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. People think I am unsociable when in fact I have trouble communicating in English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. It is difficult for me to &quot;show off&quot; my parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. It's very hard for me to explain what I do to my parents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. It's difficult for me to get the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality of entertainment that I want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Because of my culture I am limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in what I can do in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I don't feel at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I often worry about what I say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Loosening the ties with my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country is difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I have to read things a few</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>times before I understand them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Because I am different I don't get</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough credit for the work that I do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. My name/looks gives others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorrect preconceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. My parents worry that I am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I feel like I have to assert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myself more than I am accustomed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Not having a group to belong to,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel alienated and like a drifter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. People think I don't have an opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just because I don't express myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. My parents don't understand my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. My parents expect me to obey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them without question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I can't get emotionally involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with anyone outside my cultural group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU
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