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ABSTRACT

In a multicultural society, psychologists need psychological assessment inventories that produce accurate measurements for individuals of differing backgrounds. Currently, commonly used social desirability scales have forced choice true and false response selections or 5-point Likert type response choices and were normed on predominantly middle class European Americans.

However, evidence has suggested that culturally based behaviors and personality traits affect an individual's responses style. Thus, current social desirability scales may not be measuring true levels of social desirability of culturally different people, such as ethnic minorities. The purpose of this study was to examine how the emotional expressiveness of Asian Americans affects response style on a socially desirability measure and how expanding choices to items may improve the sensitivity of the measure.

Cultural characteristics common to many Asian Americans are restrained verbal expression and humbleness in public which may translate in conservative responses when reporting socially valued traits and behaviors. Increasing the number of response choices may help respondents to pick a choice that more accurately reflects their feelings, thus increasing the measure's sensitivity. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans will have lower social desirability scores than European Americans on true/false and 5-point response choices. However, Asian American
scores would not differ significantly from European Americans when a 10-point response scale is used.

Moos and Moos' (1987) FES and Halberstadt's (1986) FEQ was used to assess family expressiveness. The FEQ was also a reflection of individual expressiveness. The FES is a forced choice true/false survey. Thus this measure was also used to compare differences in response styles to true/false, 5-point Likert, and 10-point Likert response choices. It was hypothesized that family expressiveness scores would be lower for Asian Americans than European Americans for all three formats of the FES. However, the difference between the Asian American and European American scores would be reduced for the 10-point Likert format. As the FEQ has a 9-item Likert type scale, the FEQ served as a control measure for family expressiveness. The Marlowe Crowne (1960) MCSD scale was used to measure social desirability. The MCSD was administered in three formats, the original true and false forced choice, 5-point Likert type scale, and a 10-point Likert type scale. Expanding the choice number for Likert type scales may be an effective way to increase the internal and external validity of many other inventories when used with minority populations, as well.

Acculturation was measured using the Suinn and Lew's (1987) SL-ASIA, with the hypothesis that well acculturated Asian American would not respond significantly differently than European Americans on social desirability (MCSD, 1960) or expressiveness measures (FES, 1987; FEQ, 1986). Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (SES) was used to measure the possible confounding variable that one sample has a disproportionate amount of respondents with low self-esteem. Depression is highly correlated with low self-esteem. Depressives tend to score low on social desirability.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

All ethical mental health service providers are required to promote the well being of their clients, however many lack the cultural awareness to do so with ethnic minority clients (Sue & Sue, 1990). In response to the need for competent psychological care for traditionally oppressed groups, the American Psychological Association's Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs (1993) published specific guidelines for multicultural psychological service and assessment. The guidelines emphasized that an ethical psychologist would recognize cultural diversity and become familiar with culturally relevant issues before providing services or performing research.

Many professionals have responded by exploring cultural differences in behavior and diverse value systems (Pederson, Draguns, Lonner, and Trimble, 1996; Sue & Sue, 1990). Yet the daunting, enormous tasks of examining the validity of traditional assessment tools and creating tools that are culturally sensitive are just beginning to come together (Suzuki, Meller, & Ponterotto, 1996).

By 2050, it is projected that fifty percent of the population of the United States will be non-Whites (Hinkle, 1994). Ethnic minority groups, such as Asian American, African American, and Hispanic American, are steadily increasing in population. However, the majority of psychological assessment tools are normed on middle class European Americans. Much discussion has been generated over the validity of using
such tests and assessment criteria on ethnic minority groups. Item bias and construct bias are two major issues concerning the use of psychological tests with different ethnic groups (Hinkle, 1984; Padilla & Medina, 1996).

Many current assessment tools are extremely complex in their construction and measure extremely important concepts. It would be foolhardy to abandon them because they are not culturally sensitive. Instead, these inventories may be modified to become more sensitive to cultural differences. Researchers need to explore cultural variables that may impact an individual’s interpretation of and response to test items. How may these items be effectively changed to accommodate these variables, while leaving the internal validity intact?

The measurement of social desirability is one area where cross-cultural exploration has begun. A few studies have consistently shown that African Americans and Hispanic Americans tend to acquiesce more than European Americans and thus have inflated scores. Cultural reasons for acquiescence on social desirability scales, and ways to reduce its effect have been explored for Hispanic Americans. However, little consistent information on Asian Americans exists in the area of social desirability measurement.

Social Desirability

Social desirability scales have been used to detect defensiveness and impression management in survey response (Paulhus, 1991). They are often used in conjunction with assessment tests that may explore sensitive, personal information. The individual test results of high social desirability scorers' are usually held suspect, as socially undesirable information may be withheld (Kelly, 1998; Lau, 1996; Paulhus, 1991).
On the other hand, while high social desirability scorers' may over estimate their abilities, clinical observers of such individuals reported that they have a greater sense of control, are more confident and friendly (Paulhus, 1991). Reports of depression are low (Paulhus, 1991). While it is possible that the high social desirability scorer may be denying mental health difficulties, it is also possible that the individual is not experiencing much distress and perceives herself to be coping well (Kelly, 1998). Those with very low social desirability scores are associated with depression and low self-esteem. Those who do not portray themselves well may have many problems with which they are coping poorly (Graham, 1993; Paulhus, 1991).

Cross-cultural studies of social desirability show that some ethnic minority groups score differently in on social desirability measures than European Americans. There is literature indicating that Hispanic Americans tend to score higher on social desirability measures than European Americans (Franco, Malloy, & Gonzalez, 1984; Ross & Mirowsky, 1984; Triandis, Marin, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984). Socioeconomic position, acculturation, and age affected mean scores (Franco, Malloy, & Gonzalez, 1984; Ross & Mirowsky, 1984).

The literature on Asian Americans is conflicting. Qualitative literature has suggested that Asian Americans would score higher on social desirability measures due to cultural characteristics, such as avoidance of shame and acquiescence, in an effort to be polite and respectful (Kitano & Maki, 1996; Uba, 1994). However, Asian American individuals may have tendency for self-abasement (Uba, 1994). In order to avoid resentment and conflict from others, Asian Americans may portray themselves poorly or be very timid (Uba, 1994). Such abasement may yield low social desirability scores.
Results from quantitative literature are not clear, as well. Eysenck and Chan (1982) administered the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) to 270 male and 462 female Chinese adults in Hong Kong; and 698 male and 629 female Chinese children ages 7-15 in Hong Kong. The study was performed to create separate EPQ norms for various ethnic groups. Both the adults and the children scored higher on the Social Desirability dimension than their British counterparts. However, Eysenck and Chan (1982) note that excluding the British norms, the Hong Kong Chinese did not have a pronounced Social Desirability score in comparison to other ethnic groups.

Lai (1996) examined social desirability scores of 140 Chinese college students in Hong Kong. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCDS) was administered in an anonymous condition (N = 70) and a non-anonymous condition (N = 70). The mean scores of the Chinese students in both conditions were comparable to that of normed European American mean scores (Lai, 1996).

Asian Americans scored differently than European Americans on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2) on particular scales. Only two studies examining MMPI-2 Asian American - European American differences were identified. However, their findings were quite consistent. Marsella, Sanborn, Kameoka, Shizuru, and Brennan (1975) found Japanese Americans and Chinese American college students tend to score higher than European Americans on the L and F Scales of the MMPI-2. Cogburn, Zalewski, Farrell, and Mendoza (1993) also found that Asian American college students scored higher on the L and F scales, but also lower on the K scale.

The L and K scales are types of social desirability measures, in which high scores often indicate a desire to portray oneself well (Graham, 1993; Paulhus, 1991). High F scale scores often indicate an exaggeration of one's problems or "faking bad'
(Graham, 1993). Having both a high L and F may be suggestive of random responding. At any rate, the results of these studies are not helpful in elucidating Asian American social desirability needs. More research on the social desirability patterns of Asian Americans needs to be performed.

Responding styles

It has been hypothesized that different ethnic groups are more likely to be more acquiescent than others (Moreland, 1996) and thus respond in a more extreme manner to test items. Are social desirability measures really detecting avoidance of disapproval or reflecting culturally influenced response styles?

Research has shown that Hispanic and African American populations have a greater tendency to endorse items than European Americans do. Although many have hypothesized that Asian Americans are also more acquiescent, there have been no studies on Asian Americans showing such a phenomenon. Studies on Asian nationals have shown that Asians do not acquiesce more than European Americans. However, Asians tend to make more neutral responses.

Cultural values, education level, and even regional background affected response styles. Those with lower socioeconomic background and lower level of education completed tended to be more acquiescent. For example Bachman and O'Malley (1984) examined data from three nationwide surveys of youth ages 15-23 year of age. All the surveys were Likert-type questionnaire items. The African Americans were significantly more likely to endorse extreme response categories than European Americans. Both African Americans and European Americans living in
traditionally more segregated, rural areas in the South tended to agree with items more than individuals living in other parts of the country. These results raised questions about potential racial differences in survey response and cultural factors that may contribute to these differences.

In a study by Marin, Gamba, and Marin (1992), analysis on four data sets completed by 1,908 Hispanic Americans and 14,425 non-Hispanic, European Americans revealed that Hispanics tended to respond in an extreme manner on Likert type items and tended to agree with items more than European Americans. The researchers found that Hispanic individuals that had high levels of acculturation and higher levels of education (more than 12 years of formal education) were less likely to respond in an extreme and acquiescent manner.

Hui and Triandis (1989) examined the responses style of 59 Hispanic and 60 non-Hispanics, mostly European Americans on 5 point Likert-type items. As predicted by the researchers, the Hispanics tended to endorse extreme responses on the 5-point scale. However, the Hui and Triandis (1989) took the research further to explore ways of reducing the extreme responding and thus making scores on questionnaire items comparable for Hispanic Americans and European Americans. They administered the same questionnaire using a 10-point Likert-type scale. The administration of the 10-point scale lowered the extreme responses of the Hispanics to the level of the non-Hispanics. The non-Hispanics responses remained consistent to responses on the 5-point scale.

Chun, Campbell, and Yoo (1974) compared the response styles of 187 mostly European American college students and 204 Korean college students on a 130 item 5-point Likert scale questionnaire designed to measure Extreme Response Style (ERS). The Koreans scored gave consistently less extreme responses in both positive and
negative directions. In addition, the American sample gave more extreme responses to negatively phrased items, while the Korean sample's mean scores for negatively and positively phrased items were not significantly different.

Chen, Lee, and Stevenson (1995) examined 11th graders, 944 from Japan, 1,357 from Taiwan, 687 from Canada, and 2,174 from the United States. The Japanese and Chinese students were much more likely than the American or Canadian groups to use the midpoint of a 7-point Likert type scale.

The American and Canadian samples were not examined for ethnic differences within the sample. It is possible that Asian Americans and Asian Canadians tended to use the mid-point more than their European American peers, however, it is unknown. However, the researchers did measure endorsement of individualism (Chen, Lee, & Stevenson, 1995) and found a positive correlation between extreme responses and individualism, and a negative correlation between moderate mid-point responding and individualism. No study was identified that examined cultural reasons for Asians or Asian Americans tendency to respond in a more conservative manner.

Although Asian response styles are not like that of African Americans or Hispanic Americans, they are different from European Americans'. Asian Americans with traditional cultural behaviors and values most likely respond in a similar manner to Asian nationals. This conservative response style may result in under detection by psychological assessment tools.
Cultural values regarding expressiveness

There is much literature on the family styles of Asian Americans. The literature shows a number of differences in Asian American family behaviors from European Americans. More traditional Asian American families tend to be more cohesive and collectivist (Uba, 1994; Sue & Morishima, 1982). In such family units, open conflict is restrained and independence is not emphasized. Much of the research and ethnographic studies have concluded that in general Asian American families tend to be less verbal and more indirect in expressions of feelings and needs (Uba, 1994). The restrained expression is necessary to maintain the interdependence and group harmony. Conversely, a majority of European American families emphasize direct expression of ideas, emotions, individuality, and independence of each family member (Cooper, Baker, Policar, & Welsh, 1993).

In an example of the close knit nature of the Asian American family, Cooper, et al. (1993) found that Asian American youths endorsed statements such as "Family members should make sacrifices to guarantee a good education for their children," "Older siblings should directly support other family members economically," "Much of what a son or daughter does in life should be done to please parents," and "The family should consult close relatives such as uncles and aunts, concerning what they wee as important decisions." In this study, European American youths only endorsed the first statement. Asian American values of family solidarity can be seen quite clearly from this example. However, the results from various Asian American ethnic groups were all combined, making the assumption that each ethnic group had similar values. Acculturation levels were not measured, either.
Other examples of Asian American family cohesiveness are as follows: In a study of adults' relationship with their elderly parents revealed that Japanese American keep closer contact and give more financial aid to parents than European Americans do (Osako, 1976). Johnson (1977) found that Japanese American young adults are expected to live at home until they marry. Elderly parents are more often found living with family rather than nursing homes (Johnson, 1977). Although the Johnson study was done almost twenty years ago, Leonetti (1983) found that these living patterns are still maintained. Nihira, et al. (1991) examined Asian American families with developmentally disabled children and found such families to receive more help financially and time wise from extended family than European American families.

Research shows that Asian American parents are more restrictive with their children than European Americans. Chiu (1987) studied the behaviors of Chinese American parents and found that Chinese American mothers often choose their children's playmates. Chinese parents tend to relinquish supervision later than European American parents (Chiu, 1987). For example, Chiu (1987) gives an account of a 16 year old girl on her first date, being followed by her father. D. Sue, D. W. Sue, and D. Sue (1983) that both American born and immigrant Chinese parents feel children should be supervised until a later age than European American parents. Yao (1985) studied the parents of Asian American teenagers and found the parents had more say in their children's clothing, extracurricular activities, and selection of course to study than European American parents.

The general pattern of restrictiveness is also seen in emotional expressiveness. As many Asian Americans are collectivist, family members value to good of the family unit. Thus personal feelings and desires are kept at a minimum in order to maintain cohesion of the unit. Conflict not only disrupts interpersonal harmony but
may also make a family more susceptible to "losing face" or public humiliation. Furthermore, many Asian American adhere to a defined family structure, in which parents hold authoritarian roles (Tsui & Shultz, 1988). Children are expected to be deferent and thus express opinions and desires with low frequency.

Nihira, Mink, and Shapiro (1991) used interviews to determine verbal expression style. The Chinese American and Japanese American parents talked less than the European American parents. Through videotapes and questionnaires, Hsu, Tseng, Ashton, McDermott, and Char (1995) found that Japanese American spouses were vague and uncomfortable with expressing personal thoughts, personal feelings, and personal problems. In a multi-ethnic study using questionnaires from 393 adolescents, Copper, et al. (1993) found that youth in each Asian American ethnic group (24 Vietnamese, 42 Filipino Americans, and 47 Chinese Americans) felt less comfortable discussing personal and school issues with their parents than the European Americans.

Yu and Kim (1983) found a sample of Korean Americans to use little verbal communication between mothers and their children. Instead the mothers utilized nonverbal implicit communication. Johnson, Marsella, and Johnson (1974) observed that Japanese Americans communicate with family members through gestures, facial expressions, intonations, and speech volume more than direct statements.

Emotional expression is restrained in comparison to European Americans. Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans are often socialized to limit their emotional expressiveness (Morris, 1990). Blatant displays of emotion are thought to show lack of self-control and disrupt interpersonal harmony. Traditional Chinese feel public demonstrations of affection to be childish or vulgar (Huang, 1981). Thus, open conflict, is discouraged.
Kao, Nagata, and Peterson (1997) found that 59 Asian American college students, mostly of Chinese and Korean descent, to report less verbal assertions of feelings and less open displays of affection than their 40 European American peers. In this study, Halberstadt's (1986) Family Expressiveness Questionnaire (FEQ) was administered. Emotional expressions were divided into categories of positive dominance (PD), positive submissive (PS), negative dominance (ND), and negative submissive (NS). Positive denotes affirming expressions such as "exclaiming over a beautiful day." Negative denotes expressions that are uncomfortable or sad, such as "apologizing for being late." Dominance describes expressions that are actively made rather than received and submissive describes expressions made as the receiver.

The Asian Americans reported significantly lower means of PD, PS, NS than the European Americans, indicating overall lower occurrence of emotional expressions. There was no significant difference between the groups in mean ND scores. Previously reviewed literature indicates that Asian American parents are authoritarian, which may help explain the relatively higher amount of reported angry, scolding expressions over other types of emotional expression.

The family dynamics of Asian Americans appear to incorporate collectivism, which emphasizes group harmony through minimization of the individual. Thus restrained emotional and verbal expression may be a value. Such a style of expressiveness may affect survey response styles such that Asian Americans respond in a humble manner, self-effacing manner.
Acculturation

It appears that the integration level of Western values plays an important role in family styles and career interests. Acculturation is the term often used to describe cultural integration. Acculturation is defined as a complex process of cultural movement involving a multitude of choices and outcomes (Leong & Chou, 1994). In this present literature review, the term acculturation refers to the acceptance of Western norms (Americanization).

Berry (1980) proposed a model of acculturation. This model consisted of four degrees of acculturation. Assimilationists attempt to shed their ethnic identity and blend in with the host culture. Conversely, Separationalists strive to maintain their ethnic traditions and values, and avoid influences of the host culture. Integrationists are interested in the host culture as well as maintaining their original culture. Finally, Marginalists are not interested in either their ethnic culture nor the dominant culture and are often times isolated.

The Suinn-Lew Self Identity Acculturation scale (SL-ASIA) measures acculturation, however is based on Sue and Sue’s (1973) ethnic identity typologies for Chinese Americans (Leong & Chou, 1994). The three personality types described by Sue and Sue (1973) are similar to Berry’s model, but also detailed behaviors and outcomes for each identity. The Traditionalist holds Chinese values of filial piety, emotional restraint, guilt and shame, and persistence. Such individuals are passive towards racism. The Asian American integrates both Chinese and Western values and may face confusion trying to balance the separate cultures. The Marginal Man rebels against traditional values, thinking them archaic and detrimental to success. Such a person often completely rejects Chinese culture in favor of White society. Low,
medium, and high acculturation levels correspond with Traditionalist, Asian American, and Marginal, respectively. The SL-ASIA is also useful in operationalizing the Berry (1980) model, except that Berry's conceptualization of the Marginalist is not measureable. Levels of high, medium, and low acculturation would correspond to Assimilationalist, Integrationist, and Separationalist, respectively.

There are many studies regarding the effect of acculturation on everyday life behaviors and attitudes. Because the number of studies is large, a few representative studies will be outlined. Padilla, Wagatsuma, and Lindholm (1985) explored the relationship of stress to different levels of acculturation for Japanese Americans. In this study acculturation was categorized according to generational group. First generation, First generation, immigrant Japanese Americans experienced the most stress of the three groups. Second generation Japanese Americans reported the next highest level of stress, and third generation Japanese Americans reported low levels of stress. The results of this study suggest that those not well acculturated experience stress from a new environment, unfamiliar social mores, and perhaps from leaving their homeland. For the native born generations, the more acculturated have less issues with cultural inconsistencies and thus less stress.

Related to stress, mental disorders occur more frequently in foreign born Asian Americans (Abe & Zane, 1990). However, there are interethnic differences in rates of mental maladjustment. Thus acculturation is not the sole factor for determining mental well being in Asian Americans. In fact, Yu and Harburg (1980) found no relationship between acculturation and psychological stress. Espousing the values of the dominant culture may bring very different but equally as distressing issues for certain Asian Americans.
Acculturation level seems to have influence on family values. A few researchers found that well acculturated Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans more often encouraged their children to be adventuresome and independent than less acculturated mothers (Kurokawa, 1969; S. Sue & Chin, 1983). Chiu (1987) found that although Chinese American mothers interceded more in their children's lives than European American mothers, the Chinese American mothers were still less authoritarian and involved than mothers in Taiwan.

No studies examining the effects of acculturation on Asian American response styles were identified. Nor were any studies found on the effects of acculturation on social desirability scores of Asian Americans. However, a few studies examine acculturation's effect on response styles and social desirability for Hispanic Americans. Marin, Gamba, and Marin (1992) found that more acculturated Hispanic Americans tended to have more moderate response styles in comparison to less acculturated Hispanics.

In a study of 118 Mexican Americans, Franco, Malloy, and Gonzalez (1984) found that Mexican Americans who were well acculturated tended to disclose private information more often than Mexican Americans that were low on acculturation. The tendency to be guarded rather than to openly self-disclose is often associated with high social desirability scores.

Ross and Mirowsky (1984) found that Mexican nationals scored higher than Mexican Americans on the MCSD. It is assumed that Mexican nationals would have little to no acculturation to American culture. Mexican Americans, however, are more exposed to European American culture at least by citizenship. Differences in acculturation levels within the Mexican American sample were not examined.
Adjustment to a new culture involves many variables. Overall, the process of acculturation initially appears to create stress. As individuals of different ethnic backgrounds become familiar with the predominant culture, they begin to incorporate behaviors of the larger culture into their lifestyles. Also as such individuals become familiar with the popular culture's ways and values, their distress declines.

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of family expressiveness and acculturation to response styles of Asian American adolescents and adults on a social desirability measure. In addition, the study examined if expanding the number of Likert-type choices, like in the Hui and Triandis (1989) study, reduces response style differences. The literature appeared to demonstrate that Asian Americans tend to be less emotionally expressive and therefore may respond in a more restricted manner. However, acculturation levels moderate the cultural variables surrounding expressiveness. This study examined these variables through the following hypotheses:

1) The relationship of ethnicity to general and specific types of family expressiveness and was explored. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans would demonstrate lower amounts of family expressiveness and lower amounts of socially affirming behaviors (positive dominant, positive submissive) than European Americans. Asian Americans tend to value collectivism, which emphasizes group harmony over individual expression and pride.

2) The relationship of ethnicity to a measure of social desirability in the T/F format was explored. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans would score significantly lower on social desirability measures in the true/false format than European Americans. Cultural personality traits such as humbleness and restrained emotional expression may factor into the way many Asian Americans answer...
questions. However, lower social desirability scores have been found to be correlated with depression or low self-esteem. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was included to determine if a confounding variable exists of one sample group having higher rates of depression than the other. If a higher rate of depression exists in one group, a significant negative correlation between depression and social desirability will exist.

3) The effects of ethnicity on response styles to a 5-point scale Likert scale was explored. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans will tend to answer more conservatively on 5-point Likert scales than European Americans. Research has shown that Asian Americans tend to be less verbally expressive and emotionally demonstrative. These cultural behaviors may translate into restrained response styles as well.

4) The effect of ethnicity on 10-point Likert scales was examined, with the hypothesis that Asian Americans' response style will not differ significantly from European Americans' on a longer Likert scale, such as a 10 point scale. Increasing the number of choices on a Likert scale will allow for greater freedom for Asian Americans to answer honestly yet in a non-extreme manner.

5) The effect of acculturation on family expressiveness and emotional expression of Asian Americans was examined through the hypothesis that more acculturated Asian Americans will display higher levels of family expressiveness and emotional expression. As Asian American individuals become more acculturated to individualistic Western culture, they will take on values of self-expression and open expressions of high self esteem.

6) The general and specific types of family expressiveness of well acculturated Asian Americans were compared to European Americans. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans who are well acculturated will not differ significantly from European
Americans in level family expressiveness or amounts of socially affirming (positive dominant, positive submissive) or socially dis-affirming (negative dominant, negative submissive) behaviors.

7) The social desirability scores of well acculturated Asian Americans were compared to European Americans, with the hypothesis that Asian Americans who are well acculturated to the dominant European American culture will not differ significantly on social desirability scores, regardless of format. Cultural behaviors may often supersede ethnic background. Individuals who have embraced Western culture completely will thus respond on surveys in a manner consistent with their cultural beliefs and behaviors.
CHAPTER 2
METHOD

Participants

The participants for this study were Asian American and European American undergraduates enrolled at the Ohio State University during the Winter 1999, Spring 1999, Summer 1999, and Fall 1999 trimesters. A total of 103 Asian American and 90 European American students participated in this study. All the participants were Introduction to Psychology students who received course credit for their participation. There were a total of six sample groups, categorized by ethnicity into groups of three subsamples.

Ninety European American undergraduates (46 men and 44 women) participated in this study. The mean age for this sample was 18.78 years ($SD=1.74$, range= 18-32). In this sample, 80.6% were 19 or younger. Seven and a half percent were 20 years old, 6.5% were 21 years old, 1.1% were 23 years old, and 1.1% were 32 years old. Three respondents (3.2%) did not give their age.

Family income was surveyed. Participants were asked to chose among a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being 0-15,000 dollars a year (poverty range) and 5 being over 110,001 + dollars a year (highest income bracket). Of this sample, 17.2% were in the highest income bracket, 28.0% in the upper middle, 33.3% in the middle, and 17.2% in the lower middle. No one reported an income being in the poverty range. However, number in family affects economic standing. A mean socioeconomic measure (SES,
The higher the numerical result, the higher the SES.

The mean number of years of education for the European Americans was 12.9 with a standard deviation of 1.20 (range=12-18). Eighty percent of the sample had completed 13 or 12 years of schooling, 9.7% finished 14 years, 4.3% finished 15 years, 4.3% finished 16 years, and 1.1% finished 18 years of schooling. Three participants did not indicate years of education.

The mean level of education for the participants’ father’s was higher than the national average, with the mean reported being an associate’s degree ($M=5.2, SD=1.4$, range 3-8). Lower numbers, such as 1 indicated an elementary school level education and higher numbers indicated postgraduate work, with choice 8 being a doctorate or professional degree. Mean score for mother’s level of education was 4.73, $SD=1.49$, range=3-8.

The majority of the European American sample had families that had been in the United States for over 4 generations with 86% of the sample being at least a 4th generation American. Mean generation was 4.77, $SD=1.13$, range 2-over 6.

The 90 Caucasian American students were randomly assigned to complete three different formats of the survey, with 30 participant in each group. The formats differed in response scales: Form A was true/false, Form B was 5 point Likert type scale, and Form C was 10 point Likert type scale. Originally, it was planned to have fifty participants in each sample to attain an optimal effect size, power, and significance level. However, due to time and researcher availability constraints, the sample sizes were smaller than planned.

Asian Americans comprised the other three sample groups. A total of 103 Asian American college students participated in this study, and were randomly
assigned to complete one of the three formats of surveys. As Asian American students are a very small minority, around 2% at the Ohio State University OMA, 1997), it was extremely difficult to reach this number. The surveys were very similar to the surveys administered to the European Americans, except that the Asian American surveys have the additional SL-ASIA questions.

Forty-seven males and 56 females comprised the Asian American sample. Specific Asian heritage was not measured. Judging from surnames on the experiment sign up sheets, East Indian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, and other Southeast Asian Americans were represented. The diversity of Asian ethnic groups was such that there would not have been enough of each ethnic group to make within group comparisons.

The average age reported was older than that of the European Americans ($M=19.61, SD=3.34$, range of 17-39). Two and nine tenths percent were 17 years old, 41.7% were 18 years old, 26.2% were 19 years old, 10.7% were 20 years old, 4.9% were 21 years old, 2.9% were 22 years old, 1.9% were 23 years old, 1% was 24 years old, 1.9% were 25 years old, 1.9% was 28 years old, 1% was 38 years old, and 1% was 39 years old.

Ten and seven tenths percent reported being in the highest income bracket, 18.4% reported being in the upper middle, 26.2% reported being in the middle income bracket, 31.1% reported being in the lower middle, and 6.8% reported being in the poverty range. Mean SES was $M=.77 SD=.60$, range=.10-3.0.

The average number of years of school completed was 13.31, SD=1.73, range=12-20. Thirty nine and eight tenths percent had 12 years of education, 30.1% had 13 years of schooling, 13.6% had 14 years, 5.8% had 15 years, 6.8% had 16 years, 1% had 18 years and 2.9%, had 20 years.
The mean educational level for the respondents’ fathers was as follows: 
$M=5.38$, $SD=1.73$, range=1-8. The mean educational level of the mothers of the participants was $M=4.84$ $SD=1.76$, range=1-8.

The mean generational status for the Asian Americans ($M=1.42$ $SD=.86$, range=1-3) was considerably lower than that of the European Americans. Fifty nine and two tenths percent were 1$^{st}$ generation, 38.9% were second generation, and 1.9% were 3$^{rd}$ generation.

Procedures

The European American participants were recruited from students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology 100. Students signed up on a sheet that states the location, date, time, and brief description of the study. This sign up sheet was posted in the Psychology building along with other sign up sheets for other experiments. The sign up sheet specified that all students who are citizens of the United States and identify English as their first language were welcome. Those who signed up to participate filled out surveys in the designated classroom, supervised by a research assistant.

The non-Asian students were asked to fill out questions regarding their demographics, such as age, sex, family income, and level in school. They were also asked how they identify themselves ethnically and culturally. Surveys of students who identify themselves as non-European Americans were not used in order to reduce confounding variables presented by having more than one culture present in a sample. Surveys of students who identified themselves as European American but identify strongly with another culture were planned to be omitted for the same reason. However, none such survey was collected.
Both versions of the survey had questions inquiring about the amount of experience the individuals had with surveys. Two questions explored the respondent's suspiciousness of research surveys and amount of surveys completed. Those who were suspicious and unfamiliar with survey research may have had the potential to answer less candidly, and thus present a confounding variable to results. Any survey in which the participant reported being “somewhat uneasy” or “not comfortable at all” would not be used. Again, none of the participants responded in such a manner. In addition, respondents from both groups were asked to give their parents or guardian’s education level to look at within group differences.

The Asian American students were recruited from the Introduction to Psychology participant pool at the Ohio State University. Surveys were similar to those administered to the non-Asian American student, however in addition to demographic questions, the SL-ASIA, a measurement of acculturation, was given.

**Instruments**

**The Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA).**

Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) is a 21-item, multiple choice questionnaire which assesses the amount an individual retains of Asian culture or has embraced Western culture. Topics cover language preferences, ethnic identity, ethnicity of friends, cultural behaviors, generational and geographic background, and attitudes towards cultures. Original terms used in the SL-ASIA were *Anglo* and *Anglicized*. In this current study, the lead experimenter changed these terms to the more modern and correct term of *Caucasian American* and *Westernized*. 
Participants answer on a 5 point scale ranging from 1 (highly Asian) to 5 (highly Westernized). Thus low, medium, and high scores refer to Asian-Identified, Bicultural, and Assimilated (Suinn, et al., 1987). The SL-ASIA was normed on 324 Asian American participants varying from first generation to fifth generation in the United States. Suinn, et al. (1987) found the measure to have a reliability of .91 and a consistency of .88.

In an unpublished master's thesis (Kao, 1997), the lead experimenter created a shorter, similar measure to assess the cultural values of the European American participants. It is highly possible that recent European immigrants may have strong ties to their ethnicity, which may be collective in nature. Some European Americans may not identify strongly with Western individualism and other cultural attributes, regardless of their generational status or ethnic background. Thus questions were generated asking about language preference, ethnicity of friends, time spent living abroad, neighborhood that participant grew up in, and generational status. The five questions each were answered by a 5 point scale, scored like the SL-ASIA.

Family Environment Scale.

The Family Environment Scale (FES; Moos & Moos, 1987) was developed as an extensive measure of family Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Independence, Achievement orientation, Intellectual-cultural orientation, Active-recreational orientation, Moral religious emphasis, Organization, and Control. There are 3 forms of the FES. For this study, the Real Form (Form R) will be used. Form R measures people's perception of their conjugal and nuclear family environments (Moos, 1987). One of the scales will be used from Form R: Expressiveness. This subscale has 9 items. Questions consist of statements like, we say anything we want to around home.
to which participants answer true or false. As it is a main hypothesis of the study that Chinese Americans may answer in a restrained manner on a forced choice formats, the 9 questions will be repeated with a 5-point likert type response scale and a 10-point Likert type response scale.

The entire measure, including all the subscales, was normed on over 1000 families. There are separate normative distributions for normal and pathological families. The internal consistency for the Expressiveness subscale is .69 with a 2 month retest reliability of .73.

Halberstadt's Family Expressiveness Questionnaire

The Family Expressiveness Questionnaire (FEQ, Halberstadt, 1986) is a 40 item questionnaire asks the participant to assess how often a behavior occurs in his or her family compared to other families by giving a numerical choice of 1 to 9. On this Likert type scale, the higher the number the more common the behavior. Each item reflects one of four types of behavior: positive dominant (PD), positive submissiveness (PS), negative dominant (ND), and negative submissive (NS). Dominant denotes active behaviors such as giving a family member a hug or scolding someone, and submissive denotes passive behaviors such as crying or offering to do a favor.

The FEQ was found to be a reflection of individuals' self expression. In a study assessing the effects of family socialization of emotional expression on individuals own emotional expression, verbal and nonverbal, significant positive correlations were found among FEQ scores and videotaped social interactions (Halberstadt, 1986). The experiment was performed double blind.
The FEQ has been tested on three different groups of college students (N=52, N=32, N=64). The PS scale has an internal consistency of .88, PS = .87, PD = .75, and NS = .99, and ND = .88. The FEQ has a 10 day retest reliability of PS = .91, PD = .92, NS = .89, and ND = .91.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES; Rosenberg, 1965) is used to determine levels of self-esteem. The survey consists of 10 statements to which the participant endorses how well he or she agrees with the statement on a scale that ranges from 1, strongly agree, to 4, strongly disagree. An example of a statement on the SES is, "I feel that I have a number of good qualities." The SES was normed on a population of over 5000 high school students. It has a re-test reliability of .85 and an internal validity of .72. Depression and self-esteem have been found to be highly correlated at .92 (Beck, 1970). Therefore, a low score on the SES provides a strong indicator of depression.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desireability Scale

This 33 item scale was designed to measure avoidance of disapproval (Crowne, 1979; Crowne and Marlow, 1960). The MCSD is a true/false inventory that focuses on an individual's avoidance of disapproval in everyday, nonpathological personal and interpersonal situations (Paulhus, 1991). Therefore this scale is most appropriate for a non-psychiatric population and inappropriate to utilize as a measure of "faking bad" or "faking good" on a psychopathology inventory such as the MMPI. Higher scores indicate a higher need for approval or need to avoid disapproval.
Crowne (1979) finds the MCSD to have convergent validity with constructs of motivation for approval. High scorers tend to be more inhibited in aggression, responsive to social reinforcement, and more easily influenced by social pressure and social evaluation than low scorers. The scale was normed on a sample of 300 college students. The internal consistency ranged from .73 to .88. The one month retest reliability was .88.

**Data Analyses**

Participants responded to questions directly on the surveys provided. The surveys were then coded and entered into the data editor of the statistical package, SPSS 9.0, on the personal computer of the main researcher.

Initially the data was examined for outliers and incorrect coding. Any mistakes found were corrected. In the next step, a correlation matrix was made in order to examine the intercorrelations. The descriptive statistics were examined for discrepancies. Gender differences were examined for all groups.

**Research Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis One: Ethnicity, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional Expression.** It was hypothesized that Asian Americans would demonstrate lower amounts of family expressiveness and lower amounts of socially affirming behaviors (positive dominant, positive submissive) than European Americans. The first part of this hypothesis was conducted by performing a 2 x 3 Univariate Analysis of Variance (UANOVA) to compare the three forms of the Expressiveness scale by ethnicity. The second part of this hypothesis was tested by conducting an Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) on the FEQ subscales by ethnicity.
Hypothesis Two: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, T/F Format. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans would score significantly lower on the social desirability measure (MCSD) in the true/false format than European Americans. To test this hypothesis, an independent samples t-test was performed to compare mean MCSD T/F scores by ethnicity. A one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also conducted to minimize the possibility of error.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (SES) was included to determine if a confounding variable exists of one sample group having higher rates of low self-esteem than the other. An independent t-test and a one way ANOVA was performed to compare mean SES scores by ethnicity. In the existence of a higher rate of low self-esteem in one group, a significant negative correlation between depression and social desirability was predicted to exist. Thus six regressions with self-esteem predicting social desirability were run.

Hypothesis Three: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, 5-Pt. Format. An independent samples t-test was used to compare mean MCSD scores from the 5-point format of Asian Americans and European Americans. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans will tend to answer more conservatively on 5-point Likert scales than European Americans.

Hypothesis Four: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, 10-Pt. Format. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans' response style would not differ significantly from European Americans' on a longer Likert scale, such as a 10 point scale. This hypothesis was examined through conducting an independent samples t-test to compare Asian Americans' and European Americans' mean MCSD scores from the 10-point format.
Hypothesis Five: Acculturation and Family Expressiveness and Types of Emotional Expression. It was hypothesized that more acculturated Asian Americans would demonstrate higher levels of family expressiveness and total emotional expression. The relationship between acculturation and family expressiveness was examined by performing a regression with Acculturation (SL-ASIA) predicting Expressiveness (FES) for each Asian American sample. The relationship between acculturation and types of emotional expressiveness was explored by performing four regressions with Acculturation (SL-ASIA) predicting positive dominance (PDSEQ), positive submissiveness (PSSEQ), negative dominance (NDSEQ), negative submissiveness (NSSEQ), and total family emotional expressiveness score (FEQTOT).

Hypothesis Six: Acculturation, Ethnicity, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional Expression. The hypothesis that well acculturated Asian Americans do not differ significantly from European Americans in level of family expressiveness or amounts of socially affirming (positive dominant, positive submissive) or socially disaffirming (negative dominant, negative submissive) behavior was tested through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Mean scores on Expressiveness (FES) and PD, PS, ND, and NS subscales of the FEQ were calculated for Asian Americans who score high on acculturation ($M(\text{SL-ASIA}) < 3.00$). The relationship among Expressiveness, PD, PS, ND, NS, and ethnicity were compared through conducting an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the Expressiveness (FES) subscale and the FEQ subscales by ethnicity.

Hypothesis Seven: Acculturation and Social Desirability. The hypothesis that Asian Americans who are well acculturated to the dominant European American culture would not differ significantly on social desirability scores, regardless of format
was tested through ANOVA. The mean scores of well acculturated Asian Americans on all three MCSD formats were compared to the mean scores of the European Americans through performing an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the three MCSD formats by ethnicity.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Independent samples t-tests were administered to compare the means of the present study sample to the standardized means of each scale. However, formats B-A, C-A, B-W, and C-W involved changing the scale measurement of the FES and MCSD, and therefore had no standardized means to which to compare. Format B-A was the 5 point version for the Asian American participants. Format B-W was the 5 point version for the participants. C-A was the 10 point version of the survey for Asian Americans. C-W was the 10 point version of the survey for European Americans. In addition, a standardized mean for the RSES was not available, as the RSES is a measure of self-esteem designed to measure amount of self esteem rather than average level of self-esteem. Therefore, mean RSES scores were compared by ethnicity. Nor was there a standardized norm for the FEQ. Instead the FEQ had cut off scores for low level of expressiveness and high level of expressiveness.

The Asian American sample mean differed from the standardized FES mean and differed within group on comfort level. The European Americans only differed within sample on mean comfort level. These differences were expected and most likely did not adversely affect the data analysis.
For the Asian American participants, there was a significant difference between mean FES score of sample A-A ($M=4.12, SD=2.35$) and the standardized FES mean ($M=5.54, SD=1.61$), in which the standardized mean was significantly greater ($T=-3.19, p<.001$). The standardized sample comprised of mostly European Americans. Mean FEQTOT score fell between the standardized high and low means for the FEQ. For the European American participants, the present sample fell between the standardized samples’ mean low FEQTOT and high FEQTOT score. There was no significant difference between mean FES and mean MCSD scores of sample A-W and that of the standardized samples.

One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) with Tukey post-hoc tests were also administered on the demographic variables within the two ethnic groups to determine if the Asian American or the European American subsamples differed significantly from each other, presenting possible pre-existing confounding variables. For the Asian American samples, there was a significant difference in mean Comfort score ($F(2, 100)=3.44, p=.036$). A post hoc Tukey test revealed that sample A-A ($M=1.33, SD=.47$) scored a higher mean level of comfort responding to surveys than sample B-A ($M=1.64, SD=.56$). There were no other significant differences found among the subsamples of the Asian Americans participants. The three samples of Asian Americans were similar enough to proceed with further comparison.

One significant difference existed among demographic variables of the Caucasian American samples. There was a significant difference in the mean Comfort score among the three Caucasian samples ($F(2, 87)=4.17, p=.019$). Mean comfort level of responding to surveys was significantly higher for sample A-W ($M=1.07, SD$
= .253) and B-W (M = 1.20, SD = .407). No other significant differences were found. The subsamples of the European American participants were similar enough to pursue further analysis.

An independent sample t-test was performed to compare mean RSES for each ethnic group. Also an ANOVA was performed to compare the mean RSES within each ethnic group. Lower RSES scores are suggestive of depression and could relate to lowered MCSD scores. If one or more subsample were to demonstrate lower levels of self esteem, lower scores on the MCSD may be influenced by self esteem in addition to changes in the measurement. There was no significant difference between the Asian American and European American mean RSES score, collapsed across subsamples. However, the overall ANOVA was almost significant (F(5, 186) = 2.19, p = .057) in post hoc Tukey tests, no significant difference was found among subsamples, as well. However, one relationship may have accounted for the almost significant overall ANOVA. The difference in sample A-A’s mean RSES score (M = 31.21, SD = 5.04) to that of sample A-W (M = 33.30, SD = 5.26) was almost significant, with a p-value of .053.

To identify potential differences between males and females for each variable within ethnic groups, ANOVAs were performed. No significant gender differences were found for the Asian American samples in mean PDFEQ, PSFEQ, NDFEQ, NSFEQ, FEQTOT, and RSES scores. No significant gender differences occurred for mean FES and MCSD scores for samples A-A, B-A, and C-A.
No significant gender differences were found for the European American samples in mean PDSEQ, PSSEQ, NDSEQ, and FEQTOT scores. Females reported significantly higher family expressions negative submissiveness (M=53.61, SD=11.88) than males (M=47.78, SD=8.15) across the European American subsamples (F(1, 88)=7.42, p=.008). Males reported significantly higher self esteem (RSES, M=34.67, SD=4.28) than females (M=31.86, SD=5.83) across the European American subsamples (F(1,88)=6.83, p=.011) No significant gender differences occurred for mean FES for samples A-W, B-W, and C-W. Females scored significantly higher in the need for social desirability or the avoidance of disapproval (MCSD, M=104.37, SD=15.55) than males (M=94.93, SD=6.97) in sample B-W (F(1,28)=4.38, p=.046). The gender differences found in the European American samples are comparable to trends found in the greater population, where currently many women have been socialized to have lower self-esteem and a stronger need for approval than men.

Since these variables were the only gender differences found, the primary analyses were performed without gender as an independent variable. Also, analyzing the data by gender would result in very small cell sizes. For example, for sample B-W, the sample was broken down into 14 males and 16 females. Such group sizes have little power.

An ANOVA was performed to compare the mean age of the two ethnic groups. The mean age for the Asian Americans was significantly higher than the European Americans (F(1,190)=4.48, p=.036). Mean social economic status, education level,
and educational level of father and mother were also compared through ANOVA, but no significant difference existed between Asian Americans and European Americans.

Primary Analysis

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations

Tables 1 through 3 display means and standard deviations from the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA), Moos and Moss' family Environment Scale (FES), Halberstadt's Family Expressiveness Questionnaire (FEQ), The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSD), and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). Table 4 through 6 show the subscale intercorrelations. Tables 7 through 9 display the means and standard deviations of the same scales for the European Americans, excluding the SL-ASIA. Table 10-12 show the subscale intercorrelations.

The following intercorrelations reported are all significant (p<.05 or less). The subscale correlation matrix for the Asian Americans, in sample A-A, showed that acculturation (SL-ASIA) positively correlated with negative dominance (NDFEQ). Family environment expressiveness (FES) positively correlated with positive dominance (PDSEQ), positive submissiveness (PSSEQ) and total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Positive dominance (PDSEQ) correlated positively with positive submissiveness (PSSEQ), negative submissiveness (NSSEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), and self-esteem (RSES). Positive submissiveness (PSSEQ) positively correlated with negative submissiveness (NSSEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), and self-esteem (RSES). Negative dominance positively correlated with negative submissiveness (NSSEQ) and total family expressiveness.
(FEQTOT). Negative submissiveness positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Total family expressiveness positively correlated with self-esteem (RSES).

The subscale correlation matrix for the Asian Americans, in sample B-A, showed that acculturation (SL-ASIA) positively correlated with negative dominance (NDFEQ). Family environment expressiveness (FES) positively correlated with positive dominance (PDFEQ), negative dominance (NDFEQ), negative submissiveness (NSFEQ), and total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Positive dominance (PDFEQ) correlated positively with positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), negative dominance (NDFEQ), negative submissiveness (NSFEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), and self-esteem (RSES). Positive submissiveness (PSFEQ) positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), social desirability, and self-esteem (RSES). Negative dominance positively correlated with negative submissiveness (NSFEQ) and total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Negative submissiveness positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT).

The subscale correlation matrix for the Asian Americans, in sample C-A, showed that family environment expressiveness (FES) positively correlated with positive dominance (PDFEQ), positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), social desirability (MCSD), and self-esteem (RSES). Positive dominance (PDFEQ) correlated positively with positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), negative submissiveness (NSFEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), and self-esteem (RSES). Positive submissiveness (PSFEQ) positively correlated with negative submissiveness (NSFEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), social
desirability (MCSD), and self-esteem (RSES). Negative dominance positively correlated with negative submissiveness (NSFEQ) and total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Negative submissiveness positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Social desirability (MCSD) positively correlated with self-esteem (RSES).

The subscale correlation matrix for the European Americans, in sample A-W, showed that positive dominance (PDSEQ) positively correlated with positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), negative submissiveness (NDFEQ), and total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Positive submissiveness (PSFEQ) positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Negative dominance positively correlated with negative submissiveness (NSFEQ). Negative submissiveness positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Self-esteem (RSES) positively correlated with social desirability (MCSD).

The subscale correlation matrix for the European Americans, in sample B-W, showed that family environment expressiveness (FES) positively correlated with positive dominance (PDSEQ), positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), social desirability (MCSD), and self-esteem (RSES). FES was negatively correlated with NDFEQ. Positive dominance (PDSEQ) correlated positively with positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), negative dominance (NDFEQ), total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), and social desirability (MCSD). Positive submissiveness (PSFEQ) was negatively correlated with negative dominance (NDFEQ), but positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), and social desirability (MCSD). Negative dominance positively correlated with negative
submissiveness (NSFEQ), but negatively correlated with social desirability (MCSD) and self-esteem (RSES). Negative submissiveness positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), but negatively correlated with social desirability (MCSD) and self-esteem (RSES). Social desirability (MCSD) positively correlated with self-esteem (RSES).

The subscale correlation matrix for the European Americans, in sample C-W, showed that positive dominance (PDSEQ) correlated positively with positive submissiveness (PSFEQ), and total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Positive submissiveness (PSFEQ) positively correlated self-esteem (RSES). Negative dominance positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT). Negative submissiveness positively correlated with total family expressiveness (FEQTOT), but negatively correlated with social desirability (MCSD) and self-esteem (RSES). Social desirability (MCSD) positively correlated with self-esteem (RSES).

In standardized samples, depression and MCSD are negatively correlated. Thus the positive correlation of higher MCSD scores with higher self-esteem (RSES) of samples A-A, C-A, A-W, B-W, and C-W are consistent with the standardized samples. Standardized intercorrelations among the subscales of the FEQ were not available.

While it seems counterintuitive for higher PSFEQ scores to be positively correlated with higher NSFEQ scores, higher scores on all four subscales contribute to a higher overall FEQ score and thus higher family demonstrations of expressive behaviors.
Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: Ethnicity, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional Expression.

A 2 x 3 Univariate Analysis of Variance was conducted to compare the three forms of the FES expressiveness scale by ethnicity. Table 13 show the significant relationship was found to exist among the three formats of the FES and ethnicity (F(5, 187)=226.64, p<.001). Tukey post hoc tests revealed that the mean FES score ($M=47.88$, $SD=12.58$) for sample C-A was significantly less than the mean FES score ($M=55.97$, $SD=10.69$) for sample C-W. C-A refers to the Asian Americans answering the FES in the 10 point format, whereas C-W refers to the European Americans answering the FES in the 10 point format. All the other significant differences were due to actual format differences within groups.

A 2 x 3 Multivariate Analysis of Variance was conducted to compare the four subscales, PDFEQ, PSFEQ, NDFEQ, and NSFEQ, of the FEQ by ethnicity. The overall MANOVA was not significant for differences among ethnicity and FEQ subscales.

However, when an one way ANOVA was run, significant differences were found. An ANOVA was performed to compare PDFEQ, PSFEQ, NDFEQ, and NSFEQ by ethnicity at all acculturation levels. A significant difference was found in mean PDFEQ scores ($F(1, 189)=10.56$, $p=.001$), in which European Americans ($M=66.27$, $SD=11.32$) reported higher levels of positive dominant expressions in their families than the Asian Americans ($M=60.01$, $SD=14.80$). A significant difference was also found between the mean NDFEQ scores ($F(1, 190)=4.75$, $p=.03$), in which
the European Americans ($M=45.47$, $SD=16.88$) reported lower levels of negative
dominant expressions in their family than the Asian Americans ($M=50.50$,
$SD=14.85$).

**Hypothesis Two: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, T/F Format.**

An independent t-test was conducted comparing sample A-A to sample A-W.
No significant difference was found between the two sample ($T(68)=1.12$, $p=.52$).

To minimize the possibility of error, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was
conducted to test differences in mean MCSD scores by ethnicity. While the overall
ANOVA was significant, the variance was accounted for almost completely by the
differences in format within groups. No significant difference was found by Tukey
post hoc tests between sample A-A, the Asian American responding to the T/F format,
and sample A-W, the European Americans responding to the T/F format.

As noted in the preliminary statistics, there was almost, but no real significant
difference in mean RSES scores found among these two samples, as tested by a
ANOVA. However, when an independent t-test was performed ($T(68)=-3.138$,
$p<.01$), the mean RSES score of the European Americans in sample C-W ($M=15.52$,
$SD=3.82$) is significantly higher than that of the Asian Americans ($M=14.53$,
$SD=3.48$).

As ANOVA is less prone to variability due to error, the results of the ANOVA
are more likely to be more accurate. Yet, due to the small $N$ for each sample, an
ANOVA comparing all sample, splits the sample sizes into even smaller groups.
Therefore, in a t-test, where only one test is being performed on two sample, a smaller
effect size is necessary.
For this present study, the significant results of the independent t-tests shall be examined further in the discussion to follow. Table 14 displays the results of the t-tests.

**Hypothesis Three: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, 5-Pt. Format.**

By conducting an independent t-test (see Table 14), a significant difference was found between sample B-A and B-W, in which the mean MCSD scores for the Asian Americans in sample B-A ($M=112.07$, $SD=20.87$) were greater than that of the European Americans ($M=99.97$, $SD=13.03$) responding to the same format ($T(55)=2.66$, $p=.02$).

**Hypothesis Four: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, 10-Pt. Format.**

An independent t-test (see Table 14) was conducted comparing mean MCSD scores of Asian Americans in sample C-A ($M=197.45$, $SD=33.78$) and European American in sample C-W ($M=188.93$, $SD=30.28$). There was no significant difference found between the groups ($T(61)=1.05$, $p=.60$).

**Hypothesis Five: Acculturation, Family Expressiveness and Types of Emotional Expression.**

A regression was performed for each Asian American sample, for a total of three regressions with acculturation (SL-ASIA) predicting expressiveness (FES). No significant correlation was found.
Five regressions with acculturation predicting positive dominance (PDSEQ), positive submissiveness (PSSEQ), negative dominance (NDSEQ), negative submissiveness (NSSEQ), and total FEQ (FEQTOT) score were performed. A significant relationship was found, in which as SL-ASIA scores increased, NDSEQ scores increased ($r = .31, p = .015$) for sample A-A. Table 15 illustrates results.

**Hypothesis Six: Acculturation, Ethnicity, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional Expression.**

To determine if acculturation played a role in any difference in among the Asian American and European American groups, an ANOVA was conducted comparing all three formats of FES by ethnicity, with acculturation controlled. Thirty three Asian Americans across groups were considered relatively more acculturated than their within samples peers, with a mean score of higher than 3.00. Table 16 shows the overall ANOVA was significant ($F(5, 119) = 143.38, p < .001$). Most of this significance was accounted for by the difference in FES formats. However, a significant difference was found between the mean FES score of sample C-A and sample C-W ($p = .049$). The mean expressiveness (FES) score of the more acculturated Asian Americans ($M = 46.81, SD = 11.72, N = 11$) in the 10-pt format was lower than that of the European Americans ($M = 55.07, SD = 10.69$) in the same format.
To determine if acculturation played a role in the difference in the mean scores of the total and four types of family emotional expression, an ANOVA was run comparing PDFEQ, PSFEQ, NDFEQ, NSFEQ, and FEQTOT by ethnicity, with level of acculturation controlled. Asian American participants, who had a mean acculturation score of greater than 3, were compared to European Americans. The sample of Asian Americans meeting this requirement was N=33.

A significant difference was found in mean PDFEQ scores (F(1, 121)=10.03, p=.002), in which European Americans (M=66.27, SD=11.32) reported higher levels of positive dominant expressions in their families than the Asian Americans (M=58.97, SD=15.58). Also, a significant difference was found in mean PSFEQ (F(1,123)=4.99, p=.027), in which Asians scored lower than European Americans. A significant difference was also found between the mean NDFEQ scores (F(1, 122)=20.15, p<.001), in which the European Americans (M=45.47, SD=16.88) reported lower levels of negative dominant expressions in their family than the Asian Americans (M=60.50, SD=19.91).

A higher cutoff score of 3.3 was also used and yielded similar results with N =15., with Asian Americans scoring significantly lower on mean PDFEQ than European Americans (F(1, 103)=5.45, p=.021) and significantly higher on mean NDFEQ than European Americans (F(1, 104) = 13.21, p<.001) Raising the acculturation level any higher resulted in a sample size too small to yield significant results.
Hypothesis Seven: Acculturation and Social Desirability.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted, comparing mean MCSD scores by ethnicity and holding acculturation constant. A cutoff score of Accult > 3.00 was used for the Asian Americans. Table 17 shows that while the overall ANOVA was found significant, most of the significance was explainable by the marked difference in mean scores due to the different formats used. Through Tukey’s post-hoc comparisons, no significant differences were between the more acculturated Asian Americans and European Americans’ mean MCSD scores.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

The development of culturally fair assessment tools has recently become a better recognized, important area of research. Presently, a majority of psychological assessment tools have been normed on middle class, European Americans. However, as the face of the United States population changes, there is a need for measures that are sensitive to cultural differences. Evidence shows that members of ethnic and racial minorities tend to respond on social desirability measures in a different manner, specifically more acquiescent, than the European American majority. A few key studies have found that expanding response choice from true/false to a 10 point Likert scale, reducing extreme responding.

Present studies on Chinese in Hong Kong suggest that Asians tend to score higher or comparably on social desirability measures to Westerners. There have been no studies identified on the social desirability scores of Asian Americans. A strong body of research exists on acculturation and family patterns of Asian Americans. Yet, little information is available regarding the influence of acculturation, family communication on response to social desirability measures. The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of acculturation and family expressiveness on the social
desirability scores of Asian Americans, and explore the role of expanding response choice. This study was intended to increase knowledge about Asian Americans and help create more valid measurement tools.

Research Hypotheses and Findings

Hypothesis One: Ethnicity, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional Expression. In this present study, it was hypothesized that Asian Americans would demonstrate lower amounts of family expressiveness and lower amounts of socially affirming behaviors (positive dominant, positive submissive) than European Americans. Asian Americans tend to value collectivism, which emphasizes group harmony over individual expression and pride. This hypothesis was partially supported.

The univariate analysis of variance revealed that Asian Americans responding to the 10 point format of the Expressiveness scale had lower mean scores than European Americans. The lack of significant difference was found between the two ethnic groups for the T/F and the 5-point format is similar to results found in an unpublished master’s thesis (Kao, 1998), where Chinese Americans displayed lower Expressiveness compared to European Americans in the standard T/F format. However, the present sample included a diversity of Asian American ethnic groups, whereas the Asian sample is the master’s thesis was ethnically homogenous.

In the other studies, the measures were used on a more homogenous, larger sample of Asian Americans. Due to ethnic differences within the present Asian American sample and low power due to limited sample size sample, the standard T/F and even the expanded 5-point response scale did not provide enough sensitivity to
pick up differences. However, the 10-point scale perhaps allowed for more freedom in response and thus was sensitive enough to pick up differences in comparisons that may not otherwise be viable due to the need for a very large effect size.

A one way analysis of variance on types of family emotional expression resulted in partial support of the current hypothesis. The Asian Americans were found to display lower levels of positive dominant emotional expressions and higher levels of negative dominance. The lower mean level of positive dominance is consistent with the results found in a study by Kao, Nagata, and Peterson (1997). However in the latter study, mean negative dominance of the Asian American participants was comparable to that of the European Americans'. In the Kao, Nagata, and Peterson (1997) study, the Asian American participants were relatively well-acculturated, of high socioeconomic status, and ethnically homogeneous as compared to participants in the current study. The low acculturation level, lower income level, and diverse cultural values may contribute to scores that appear indicative of high authoritarian, strict, highly stressed households.

Hypothesis Two: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, T/F Format. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans would score significantly lower on social desirability measures in the true/false format than European Americans. Cultural personality traits such as humbleness and restrained emotional expression may factor into the way many Asian Americans answer questions. This hypothesis was not supported by the independent t-test of analysis of variance. The mean social desirability scores of the Asian Americans were not significantly different from the European Americans.

Lai (1996) found that Chinese college students in Hong Kong did not score differently from the standardized norm on the Marlowe-Crowne. Perhaps the concepts humbleness and humility are more cultural behaviors rather than indicators of
depression or low self-esteem. Kao, Nagata, and Peterson (1997) found that although Asian Americans more often displayed explanatory styles indicative of depression as compared to European Americans, they did not display higher rates of depression or lower self-esteem. Furthermore, Paulhus (1991) commented that higher scorers on the MCSD tend to be more socially conforming, have a need for approval, and have higher self-esteem. It seems that those who want to fit in and make an effort to do so are psychologically better adjusted. Asians, such as the Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans traditionally emphasize collectivism, conformity, and avoidance of “loss of face.” In retrospect, it may have been better to hypothesize that Asian Americans would more likely have equal or higher social desirability scores.

Lower social desirability scores have been found to be correlated with depression or low self-esteem. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was included to determine if a confounding variable exists of one sample group having higher rates of depression than the other sample group. As samples were small, a few outliers could skew the data. Furthermore, the low acculturation level of this sample could contribute to lower self-esteem, as members of the present sample may have trouble adjusting to the dominant culture. Perhaps the apparent lower self-esteem reduced the social desirability scores slightly.

It was hypothesized that if a higher rate of depression exists in one group, a significant negative correlation between depression and social desirability will exist. No such correlations were found in the data. It is highly possible that the difference in mean self-esteem was very slight and had little impact on the data.

**Hypothesis Three: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, 5-Point Format.** It was hypothesized that Asian Americans will tend to answer more conservatively on 5-point Likert scales than European Americans. Research has shown that Asian Americans tend to be
less verbally expressive and emotionally demonstrative. These cultural behaviors may
translate into restrained response styles as well. This hypothesis was not supported as
an independent sample t-test yielded significant difference between Asian Americans
and European Americans, where the Asian Americans scored higher in social
desirability than the European Americans. This result supports the concepts that
cultural values of avoidance of shame and conformity would lead to higher social
desirability scores in Asian Americans (Kitano, & Maki, 1996; Uba, 1994).

Hypothesis Four: Ethnicity and Social Desirability, 10-Pt. Format. The effect of
ethnicity on 10-point Likert scales was examined, with the hypothesis that Asian
Americans' response style will not differ significantly from European Americans' on a
longer Likert scale, such as a 10-point scale. Increasing the number of choices on a
Likert scale will allow for greater freedom for Asian Americans to answer honestly yet
in a non-extreme manner. The hypothesis was supported. The first part of the
hypothesis, regarding no significant difference between the ethnic groups, was
supported. Independent t-test did not yield a significant difference between Asian
Americans and European Americans. However, in the 5-point format, a significant
difference was detected. If the 10-point format helped increase sensitivity a
relationship similar to that found in the 5-point format most likely would have been
found.

Hypothesis Five: Acculturation, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional
Expression.

The effect of acculturation on family expressiveness and emotional expression of
Asian Americans was examined through the hypothesis that more acculturated Asian
Americans will display higher levels of family expressiveness and emotional
expression. As Asian American individuals become more acculturated to individualistic Western culture, they will take on values of self-expression and open expressions of high self-esteem. This hypothesis was partially supported.

The three regressions were run with acculturation predicting the 3 formats of FES were all insignificant. The five regressions with acculturation predicting positive dominance, positive submissiveness, negative dominance, negative submissiveness, and total family emotional expressiveness yielded two significant relationships. As acculturation to American culture increased, positive dominant expressions increased. This finding supported the hypothesis.

However, as acculturation increased, negative dominant expressions increased. This finding supports the idea the theory that increased acculturation is related to increased emotional expressiveness. However, the present hypothesis posited that the family styles of more acculturated Asian Americans would closely resemble their European American peers. Yet, analysis for hypothesis one showed that the Asian Americans had a higher mean level of negative dominance. Again, in the present sample, even the higher scorers of acculturation were not very Westernized and overall economic status was as not high.

**Hypothesis Six: Acculturation, Ethnicity, Family Expressiveness, and Types of Emotional**

The general and specific types of family expressiveness of well acculturated Asian Americans were compared to European Americans. It was hypothesized that Asian Americans who are well acculturated will not differ significantly from European Americans in level family expressiveness or amounts of socially affirming (positive dominant, positive submissive) or socially dis-affirming (negative dominant, negative
submissive) behaviors. This hypothesis was not supported, in which the Asian Americans had lower expressiveness than the European Americans for the 10-point format. The more acculturated Asian Americans also scored lower in positive dominance and higher in negative dominance than the European Americans. These finding is inconsistent with the assumption that greater Westernization would lead to similar family expressiveness between the two ethnicities.

However, this finding is consistent with the results of Hypothesis One, where Asian Americans of all acculturation levels are lower in family expressiveness than European Americans for the 10-point format only. As noted before, the 10-point format provides a larger range to capture differences in comparisons that involve very small sample size.

Hypothesis Seven: Acculturation and Social Desirability.

The social desirability scores of well acculturated Asian Americans were compared European Americans, with the hypothesis that Asian Americans who are well acculturated to the dominant European American culture will not differ significantly on social desirability scores, regardless of format. Cultural behaviors may often supersede ethnic background. Individuals who have embraced Western culture completely will thus respond on surveys in a manner consistent with their cultural beliefs and behaviors. This hypothesis was completely supported, as Tukey post-hoc tests from a one way analysis of variance showed no difference in social desirability scores of more acculturated Asian Americans and European Americans.
Implications for Research and Counseling

The present study contributes new information in the realm of multi-cultural assessment. Furthermore it gives additional insight for psychologists who are concerned with using valid assessment tools and interpreting them in a perceptive, accurate manner. Furthermore, the results may dispel outdated beliefs regarding the process of acculturating from a native culture to a new culture. Finally, it may help psychologists, both in the research and applied setting, to gain new understanding on the function and flexibility of certain cultural behaviors.

In hypothesis one and six, the Asian American participants demonstrated consistently lower amounts of positive types of emotions and expressiveness on the 10-point formats. In hypothesis six, the number of people who made up the Asian American sample was as low as eleven, yet a comparison yielding significance was still able to be administered. This occurrence highly suggests that the ten point Likert scale greatly increases the variability between samples and decreases the effect size needed to find significance. Past research has shown evidence that ethnic minorities in this country may answer in a different manner to the dominant culture on forced choice inventories. The 10-point scale allows individuals greater freedom of choice. The freedom of choice may override any cultural variables that may influence someone to answer in an extreme or restrained manner.

The findings of hypothesis one and six also demonstrate that the 10-point scale is extremely useful when performing research with a very small sample size. Researchers of minority individuals often note difficulty in performing research in this area is the small number of available participants. On many an occasion, researcher may feel discouraged when pursuing culturally sensitive research and end up avoiding such a pursuit. The limited amount of research in this area is in part due to the
difficulty establishing sufficient statistical power. However, instead of withdrawing from research, choosing measures that use longer Likert scales may be advisable. Or, as executed in this study, future researchers may want to change the response choice number themselves and compare the results to a control comparison group.

The partial support of hypothesis one reminds researchers and counselors alike, that combining several Asian ethnicities into one sample ignores the great diversity within Asian cultures. The results deviated somewhat from past findings of studies whereas more homogenous sample was used. Researchers and counselors alike may benefit from recognizing the complexity of cultural diversity. Professionals in psychology, like all individuals, may need a reminder not to stereotype individuals on basic characteristics.

Furthermore, the current study yielded results that contradict Western concepts of certain cultural behaviors. For example, self-effacing behavior is traditionally seen as an indicator of low self-esteem and a passive, unhealthy coping style in Western view. However, self-effacing behavior is valued culturally by many Asians and Asian Americans. With a Western view of this behavior, one might conclude that many Asians suffer from low self-esteem.

But as shown in hypothesis two, the self esteem of the Asian Americans was not markedly different from the European Americans, if at all different as significance was barely p<.05. In particular, hypothesis two examined family expressiveness. the Asian American participants’ families appeared to express very little positive emotion, such as hugging and complimenting one another, and quite a bit of negative emotion, such as punishing and crying. From a Western sensibility, these behaviors are indicative of family dysfunction. Indeed, the families in this study may have been more stressed than the European American families. However, many individuals of
Asian ancestry may view these behaviors differently. Perhaps, love and acceptance is implicit, while strict, authoritarianism is a necessary instrument for shaping character.

Counselors may also be enlightened to the view that conformity and avoidance of disapproval may be very healthy. Researchers who examine collectivism, such as Harry Triandis, have long put forth that function and benefit of collectivism. Yet, psychology burgeoned as a field post World War II, where much research examined the role of conformity in Nazi Germany. While these studies are invaluable, they have left many psychologists fearing conformity and need for approval. Furthermore, basic core Western values of individualism are in direct opposition to such collectivist values.

Yet, in this study, examination of the correlates of the Marlowe-Crowne Social desirability Scale revealed that high scores are often associated with high self-esteem, socially affirming behaviors, and overall adjustment. The Asian Americans in the current study scored higher than the European Americans on social desirability. While some clinicians view high social desirability as “faking good, higher scorers on social desirability may be reporting behaviors that are valuable in interpersonal relationships. Such behaviors include politeness, respect, and avoidance of discord.

The present study gives quite a bit of evidence on how cultural behaviors that seem unfamiliar and unhealthy to individualistic, Westerners are not the case for Asians and Asian Americans. However, the fact that misunderstanding exists and these values seem so foreign to may leads to another very important point. Clinicians should recognize the stress that an immigrant of a child growing up with immigrant parents may experience when adjusting to such a different dominant culture, while still upholding cultural traditions.
Finally, this current study demonstrates to clinicians and researchers that acculturation does not necessarily mean complete assimilation into the dominant culture. Immigrants and children of immigrants create their own style of Americanism by incorporating traditional cultural values and behaviors with new ones.

Limitations of the Study

A major limitation of the present study was the small sample size for both ethnic groups. Once the samples were divided into separate cells for analysis, there was very little statistical power. Because of the limited sample size, analysis of gender differences could not be pursued effectively and was not completed. To have optimal power and effect size, about three hundred participants in each ethnic group is necessary. However, only about 2% of the student body identified themselves Asian American. Attaining a sample of this magnitude would pose an enormous challenge.

Another limitation of their study is the demographics of the location from which the samples were taken. In the predominantly European American, Midwestern city where the survey was taken, the Asian Americans may experience more family and acculturative stress than they might in a city where Asians are better represented. In areas with large Asian populations, such individuals may be more likely to feel a sense of community, support, and ethnic pride.

A fifth limitation of this study was the great diversity within the Asian American sample. Different religions, regions, languages, physical appearances, languages, and cultures were all represented. While those of the Asian racial classification may have more in common with each other than those outside their racial group, these individuals were culturally different from one another. The heterogeneity of the sample may have introduced unknown confounding variables.
Optimally, such a study should be performed with one ethnicity or more similar ethnicities. However, despite the variability within group, the study still demonstrated how individuals different from the dominant culture respond differently to measures.

Another limitation of the present research was the homogeneity of acculturation levels of the Asian American sample. This problem is related to the sample size and the demographics of the area. Since there was little variety in acculturation level, correlating acculturation with other variables in the study was difficult. A larger sample may have captured more diversity in acculturation levels. However, geographic location is even more crucial in obtaining a variety of acculturation levels. In areas with large Asian communities there are often residents who have a long history in the area, who live alongside recent immigrants. Most of the Asian Americans in this particular Midwestern city were more recent immigrants.

Another limitation of the experiment was that other ethnic groups such as Hispanic Americans and African Americans were not studied. Existing literature supports expanding response scales to reduce extreme response styles. It would have been interesting to see if the same held true in the current study. It would also have been useful to make additional cross-cultural comparisons.

Finally, in this study, it was not examined if the Asian American participants tended to respond more to the midpoint. Other research studies have published that Asians tend to respond closer to the midpoint. It would have been interesting to explore if this occurred in the 5 point and 10 point conditions.
Suggestions for Future Research

This study leads to several directions for future research. From this study, it is important to look at these same variables with different samples. Also, the present study gives way to new research in the area of survey research.

To reduce confounding variables caused by intra-ethnic differences, it would be useful to repeat this study using a one Asian American ethnic group. Later, the study could be replicated again, with a different Asian ethnic group to increase generalizability of the study to a greater number of Asian ethnic groups.

It may be helpful to repeat this study in a location with a larger Asian American community. Such a location may yield a sample more representative of the Asian American population at large.

Repeating this study on a sample of Asian Americans with a greater differentiation of acculturation levels would be useful. It is more probable to find relationships among acculturation, family styles, social desirability, and self esteem when variability of acculturation is available in the sample.

Examination of gender differences may be useful in a replicant study. Gender differences in self-esteem and social desirability have been found in the established literature. It would be interesting to examine the influence of ethnic culture and response choice format on these measures.

In a repeat of this study, it would be helpful to examine if the Asian American participants tend to respond more to the midpoint despite format changes. Research has suggested that Asian Americans tend to answer in a conservative manner. More studies are needed to support or contradict these findings.
Furthermore, the different response formats of a measure could be compared to each other through transforming the scales. Statistical tools may be utilized to transform the data from different response formats into comparable numbers.

Finally, this study lends itself to researchers in related areas. It should encourage makers of surveys and testing instruments to use a ten point response scale, even if the instrument will not be used on ethnic minorities. There appears to be no detriment to using a sensitive, valid scale for anyone, regardless of background.

Summary

In a multicultural society, psychologists need psychological assessment inventories that produce accurate measurements for individuals of differing backgrounds. Currently, commonly used social desirability scales have forced choice true and false response selections or 5-point Likert type response choices and were normed on predominantly middle class European Americans.

However, evidence has suggested that culturally based behaviors and personality traits affect an individual's response style. Thus, current social desirability scales may not be measuring true levels of social desirability of culturally different people, such as ethnic minorities. The purpose of this study was to examine how the emotional expressiveness of Asian Americans affects response style on a socially desirability measure and how expanding choices to items may improve the sensitivity of the measure.

Cultural characteristics common to many Asian Americans are restrained verbal expression and humbleness, which may translate in conservative responses when reporting socially valued traits and behaviors. Increasing the number of response choices may help respondents to pick a choice that more accurately reflects their
feelings, thus increasing the measure's sensitivity. Asian Americans scored lower in familial expressions of positive emotions and scored higher than European Americans in expressions of negative emotional behavior. The Asian Americans reported less expressiveness in the 10-point condition, only. The Asian Americans scored higher on the 5-point social desirability scale that the European Americans.

Well acculturated Asian American responded significantly differently than European Americans on social desirability (MCSD, 1960) and expressiveness measures (FES, 1987; FEQ, 1986). Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (SES) was used to measure the possible confounding variable that one sample has a disproportionate amount of respondents with low self-esteem. Large differences in self-esteem were not present. However, little variation is acculturation levels existed, as well.

While many hypotheses were not fully supported, the results of this study are still meaningful. For a topic with little background and established research, hypotheses are very meaningful when tested and disproved in order to learn and add more information to the field.
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APPENDIX A

TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$ Possible range</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.74 1-5</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.12 0-9</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td>16.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60.61</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td>12.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>220.02 40-360</td>
<td>13.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.52 0-33</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.21 10-40</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Subscale Cronbach Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for Asian Americans in sample A-A.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.85</td>
<td>14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.04</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>14.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>228.69</td>
<td>50.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>112.07</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>31.21</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Subscale Cronbach Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for Asian Americans in sample B-A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59.78</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>62.72</td>
<td>14.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDFEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td>14.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>223.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>197.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Subscale Cronbach Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for Asian Americans in sample C-A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Possible range</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66.43</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.37</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>10-90</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>230.3</td>
<td>40-360</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>0-33</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>10-40</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Subscale Cronbach Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for European Americans in sample A-W
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65.17</td>
<td>14.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>219.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Subscale Cronbach Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for European Americans in sample B-W
Table 6: Subscale Cronbach Alphas, Means, and Standard Deviations for European Americans in sample C-W.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46.13</td>
<td>19.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>231.57</td>
<td>25.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>188.93</td>
<td>30.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Intercorrelations for Asian Americans in sample A-A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL-ASIA</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>*-.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>starred</td>
<td>starred</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* .91</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQ NDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

(continued)
Table 7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>* .33</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>* .60</td>
<td>*.85</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>* .42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>* .71</td>
<td>*.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>* .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDFSEQ</td>
<td>* .40</td>
<td>*.44</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>* .88</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>* .24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>* .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>* .43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>*.60</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>* .68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>*.41</td>
<td>* .43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

(continued)

Table 8: Intercorrelations for Asian Americans in sample B-A
Table 8 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>* .79</td>
<td>* .80</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>* .75</td>
<td>* .85</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>* .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>* .49</td>
<td>* .70</td>
<td>* .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDFSEQ</td>
<td>* .73</td>
<td>* .83</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>* .92</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>*.55</td>
<td>*.57</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>*.67</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

(continued)

Table 9: Intercorrelations for Asian Americans in sample C-A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SL-ASIA</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>*.42</td>
<td>*.36</td>
<td>*.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>*.48</td>
<td>*.84</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>*.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>*.49</td>
<td>*.72</td>
<td>*.62</td>
<td>*.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NDFSEQ</td>
<td>*.36</td>
<td>*.38</td>
<td>*.36</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>*.80</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Table 10: Intercorrelations for European Americans in sample A-W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  

(continued)
Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td>* .79</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td>* .74</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>* .68</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* .53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSFEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)

Table 11: Intercorrelations for European Americans in sample B-W
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDFEQ</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSFEQ</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSSEQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

(continued)

Table 12: Intercorrelations for European Americans in sample C-W
Table 12 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. FES Expressiveness</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FEQ PDFEQ</td>
<td>*.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FEQ PSFEQ</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>*.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FEQ NDFEQ</td>
<td>*.70</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FEQ NSFEQ</td>
<td>*.62</td>
<td>*-.48</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FEQ TOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MCSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. RSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FES T/F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES 5-Pt.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.71</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES 10-Pt.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.97</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDFEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66.43</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSFEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.37</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDFEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSFEQ</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQTOT</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>220.02</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>230.59</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FES ANOVA(F(5,187)=226.64, p<.001

*p<.05

Table 13: Hypothesis One: Post-hoc tests
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCSD T/F</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSD 5-Pt.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>112.07</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.97</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSD 10-Pt.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>197.45</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188.93</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Table 14: Hypothesis Two, Three, and Four: Independent T-tests
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R$-square</th>
<th>Adj. $R$ sq.</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FES</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDSEQ</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSEQ</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDSEQ</td>
<td>* .31</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSEQ</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQTOT</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<.05$

Note: Adj. $R$ sq = Adjusted R square  
Sig = significance

Table 15: Hypothesis Five: Regressions Analyses with SL-ASIA Predicting FES, and Emotional Types of FEQ
### Table 16: Hypothesis Six: Post-hoc tests to ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FES T/F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES 5-Pt.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.67</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FES 10-Pt.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46.81</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDFEQ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.15</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSFEQ</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58.97</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>64.72</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDFEQ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60.26</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSFEQ</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53.68</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEQTOT</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>230.69</td>
<td>47.76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>227.08</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F(5,119)=143.38, p<.001

*p<.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCSD T/F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSD 5-Pt.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116.35</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.96</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSD 10-Pt.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>186.18</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>188.93</td>
<td>30.27</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(F(5,119)=287.02, p<.001)\]

\(\star p<.05\)

Table 17: Hypothesis Seven: Post-hoc tests to ANOVA, Acculturation and Social Desirability
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS FOR EUROPEAN AMERICANS
FORM A-W

1. Years of age _______ 2. Gender _______

3. Are you a citizen of the United States? ______

4. Are you an international student? ______
   5. Years of education ____________

6. Highest level of education completed by father:
   1. 0-6 years of schooling (elementary school)
   2. 7-9 years of schooling (middle school, junior high)
   3. 10-12 years of schooling (high school)
   4. 12-13 years of schooling (some college)
   5. An associate's degree (2-year college, technical college degree)
   6. B. A. or B. S. degree (college degree)
   7. Graduate education, Master's level
   8. Doctorate (Ph. D.) or professional degree (e.g., J. D., M. D., O. D., etc.)

7. Highest level of education completed by mother:
   1. 0-6 years of schooling (elementary school)
   2. 7-9 years of schooling (middle school, junior high)
   3. 10-12 years of schooling (high school)
   4. 12-13 years of schooling (some college)
   5. An associate's degree (2-year college, technical college degree)
   6. B. A. or B. S. degree (college degree)
   7. Graduate education, Master's level
   8. Doctorate (Ph. D.) or professional degree (e.g., J. D., M. D., O. D., etc.)

8. How many people are in the family with whom you grew up? ______

9. Approximately, what was your family's income while you were growing up?
   1. 0–15,000 dollars a year
   2. 15,001–45,000 dollars a year
   3. 45,001–75,000 dollars a year
   4. 75,001–110,000 dollars a year
   5. 110,001+ dollars a year

10. (Please circle yes or no) Do you consider English your first language? Yes No
10a. If you circled “no:” to 10, what is your first language____________________, and what is the language you prefer to speak?__________________.

11. (Please circle yes or no) Have you ever spent a long period of time (1 or more years) living in a foreign country?  Yes  No

12. Please circle the ethnic or racial description that you feel best describes you:
   1. African American/Black American
   2. Asian American/Oriental American
   3. European American/White American/Caucasian American
   4. Hispanic American
   5. Latino American
   6. Native American
   7. Other

13. Which best describes the neighborhood where you grew up?
   1. Practically all Caucasian American.
   2. Mostly Caucasian Americans.
   3. A racially mixed neighborhood.
   4. Mostly non-White ethnicities (African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, etc.)
   5. Almost exclusively non-White ethnicities.

14. In recent years the friends with whom you associate are:
   1. Practically all Caucasian American.
   2. Mostly Caucasian Americans.
   3. A racially diverse group.
   4. Mostly non-White ethnicities (African American, Hispanic American, Asian American, etc.)
   5. Almost exclusively non-White ethnicities

15. Circle the generation that best applies to you
   1. 1st generation = I was born in a country outside the U.S.
   2. 2nd generation = I was born in the U.S., either parent was born in another country.
   3. 3rd generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and all grandparents were born in another country.
   4. 4th generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and at least one grandparent born in the U.S.
   5. 5th generation+ = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., both grandparents born in the U.S., and at least one great grandparent born in the U.S.
   6. 6th generation or more = My great-grandparents, grandparents, parents, and I were all born in the U.S.
16. Have you ever completed a survey or psychology questionnaire before?
   1. Yes, many times.
   2. Yes, a few times.
   3. Yes, once or twice before.
   4. No, I have never completed a survey before doing this one.

17. How comfortable are you with completing an anonymous survey or psychology questionnaire that may ask some personal questions?
   1. Very comfortable.
   2. Somewhat comfortable.
   4. Not comfortable at all, I prefer not to fill out surveys in general.
APPENDIX C

SL-ASIA
FORM A-A

Cultural Background

What is your ethnicity? _______________________

1. Years of age _______ 2. Gender _______

3. Are you a citizen of the United States? ______
   Are you are a permanent resident? _______

4. Are you an international student? _______ 5. Years of education ______________

6. Highest level of education completed by father:
   1. 0-6 years of schooling (elementary school)
   2. 7-9 years of schooling (middle school, junior high)
   3. 10-12 years of schooling (high school)
   4. 12-13 years of schooling (some college)
   5. An associate's degree (2-year college, technical college degree)
   6. B. A. or B. S. degree (college degree)
   7. Graduate education, Master's level
   8. Doctorate (Ph. D.) or professional degree (e.g., J. D., M. D., O. D., etc.)

7. Highest level of education completed by mother:
   1. 0-6 years of schooling (elementary school)
   2. 7-9 years of schooling (middle school, junior high)
   3. 10-12 years of schooling (high school)
   4. 12-13 years of schooling (some college)
   5. An associate's degree (2-year college, technical college degree)
   6. B. A. or B. S. degree (college degree)
   7. Graduate education, Master's level
   8. Doctorate (Ph. D.) or professional degree (e.g., J. D., M. D., O. D., etc.)

8. How many people are in the family with whom you grew up? ______

9. Approximately, what was your family's income while you were growing up?
   1. 0 - 15,000 dollars a year
   2. 15,001-45,000 dollars a year
   3. 45,001-75,000 dollars a year
   4. 75,001-110,000 dollars a year
5. 110,001+ dollars a year

10. What language can you speak?
   1. Asian only (for example, Chinese Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
   2. Mostly Asian, some English
   3. Asian and English about equally as well (bilingual)
   4. Mostly English, some Asian
   5. Only English

11. How do you identify yourself?
   1. Oriental
   2. Asian
   3. Asian-American
   4. Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, etc.
   5. American

12. Which identification does (did) your mother use?
   1. Oriental
   2. Asian
   3. Asian-American
   4. Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, etc.
   5. American

13. Which identification does (did) your father use?
   1. Oriental
   2. Asian
   3. Asian-American
   4. Chinese American, Japanese American, Korean American, etc.
   5. American

14. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child up to age 6?
   1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans
   2. Mostly Asian, Asian Americans
   3. About equally Asian and Caucasian groups
   4. Mostly Caucasian, African American, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities
   5. Almost exclusively Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities

15. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had as a child from 6 to 17?
   1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans
   2. Mostly Asian, Asian Americans
3. About equally Asian and Caucasian groups
4. Mostly Caucasian, African American, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities
5. Almost exclusively Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, or other non-Asians ethnicities

16. Whom do you know associate with in the community?
   1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans
   2. Mostly Asian, Asian Americans
   3. About equally Asian and Caucasian groups
   4. Mostly Caucasian, African American, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities
   5. Almost exclusively Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities

17. If you could pick, whom would you prefer to associate with in the community?
   1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian Americans
   2. Mostly Asian, Asian Americans
   3. About equally Asian and Caucasian groups
   4. Mostly Caucasian, African American, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities
   5. Almost exclusively Caucasians, African Americans, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnicities

18. What is your music preference?
   1. Asian only
   2. Mostly Asian, some English
   3. Asian and English about equally as well
   4. Mostly English, some Asian
   5. Only English

19. What is your movie preference?
   1. Asian language only
   2. Mostly Asian language movies
   3. Asian and English language movies about equally as well
   4. Mostly English language movies
   5. Only English language movies

20. Circle the generation that best applies to you
    1. 1st generation = I was born in Asia or other country outside the U.S.
    2. 2nd generation = I was born in the U.S., either parent was born in Asian or other
    3. 3rd generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and all grandparents were born in Asia or other.
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4. 4th generation = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., and at least one grandparent born in the U.S.

5. 5th generation+ = I was born in the U.S., both parents were born in the U.S., both grandparents born in the U.S., and at least one great grandparent born in the U.S.

6. Don't know what generation best fits since I lack some information.

21. Where were you raised?
   1. In Asia only
   2. Mostly in Asia, some in the U.S.
   3. Equally in Asia and the U.S.
   4. Mostly in the U.S., some in Asia
   5. In U.S. only

22. What contact have you had with Asia?
   1. Raised one year or more in Asia
   2. Lived for less than one year in Asia
   3. Occasional visits to Asia
   4. Occasional communications (letters, phone calls, etc.) with people in Asia
   5. No exposure or communications with people in Asia

23. What is your food preference?
   1. Asian food only
   2. Mostly Asian food, some other types
   3. Asian and other foods about equally
   4. Mostly other types of food (Italian, American, etc.), some Asian
   5. Only American food

24. If you consider yourself a member of an Asian group (Asian, Asian American, Chinese American, etc.) how much pride do you have in this group?
   1. Extremely proud
   2. Moderately proud
   3. Little pride
   4. No pride but do not feel negative toward group
   5. No pride and do feel negative toward group

25. How would you rate yourself?
   1. Very Asian
   2. Mostly Asian
   3. Bicultural
   4. Mostly Westernized
   5. Very Westernized
26. Do you participate in Asian occasions, holidays, traditions, etc.?
   1. Nearly all
   2. Most of them
   3. Some of them
   4. A few of them
   5. None at all

27. Have you ever completed a survey or psychology questionnaire before?
   1. Yes, many times.
   2. Yes, a few times.
   3. Yes, once or twice before.
   4. No, I have never completed a survey before doing this one.

28. How comfortable are you with completing an anonymous survey or psychology questionnaire that may ask some personal questions?
   1. Very comfortable.
   2. Somewhat comfortable.
   4. Not comfortable at all, I prefer not to fill out surveys in general.
APPENDIX D

FES
Family Environment

The following are statements about families. You are to decide which of these statements are true of your family and which are false.

You may feel that some of these statements are true for some family members and false for others. Circle True if the statement is true for most members. Circle False if the statement is false for most members. If the members are evenly divided, decide what is the stronger overall impression and answer accordingly.

Remember, we would like to know what your family seems like to you. So do not try to figure out how other members see your family, but do give us your general impression of your family for each statement.

1. Family members often keep their feelings to themselves. True False

2. We say anything we want to around home. True False

3. It's hard to "blow off steam" at home without upsetting somebody. True False

4. We tell each other about our personal problems. True False

5. If we feel like doing something on the spur of the moment we often just pick up and go. True False

6. Someone usually gets upset if you complain in our family. True False

7. Money and paying bills is openly talked about in our family. True False

8. We are usually careful about what we say to each other. True False

9. There is a lot of spontaneous discussion in our family. True False
APPENDIX E

FEQ
This is a questionnaire about family expressiveness. We'd like to know more about the degree of expressiveness shown in different families. Therefore, we'd like you to tell us about the frequency of expression in your family while growing up. By frequency we mean, "How often did this situation occur in your family, relative to other families?"

Try to think of the following scenarios in terms of how frequently they occurred in your family, compared to other families, while you were growing up. Circle a number on the rating scale from 1 (not at all frequently in my family) to 9 (Very frequently in my family) that indicates how frequently that activity occurred. Some items may be difficult to judge. However, it is important to answer every item. Try to respond quickly, but not randomly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Showing forgiveness to someone who broke a favorite possession.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Thanking family members for something they have done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exclaiming over a beautiful day.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Showing contempt for another's actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expressing dissatisfaction with someone else's behavior.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Praising someone for good work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expressing anger at someone else's carelessness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sulking over unfair treatment by a family member.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blaming one another for family troubles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Crying after an unpleasant disagreement.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Putting down other people's interests. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12. Showing dislike for someone. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
13. Seeking approval for an action. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
14. Expressing embarrassment over a stupid mistake. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
15. Going to pieces when tension builds up. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
16. Expressing exhilaration after an unexpected triumph. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
17. Expressing excitement over one's future plans. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
18. Demonstrating admiration. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
19. Expressing sorrow when a pet dies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
20. Expressing disappointment over something that didn't work out. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
21. Telling someone how nice they look. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
22. Expressing sympathy for someone's troubles. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
23. Expressing deep affection or love for someone. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
24. Quarreling with a family member. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
25. Crying when someone leaves. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
26. Spontaneously hugging a family member. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
27. Expressing momentary anger over a trivial irritation. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
28. Expressing concern for the success of other family members. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
29. Apologizing for being late. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
30. Offering to do somebody a favor. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
31. Snuggling up to a family member. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Crying for being punished.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Trying to cheer up someone who is sad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Telling a family member how hurt you are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Telling family members how happy you are.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Threatening someone.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Criticizing someone for being late.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Expressing gratitude for a favor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Surprising someone with a little gift or favor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Saying &quot;I'm sorry&quot; when one realizes one was wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Attitudes and Traits

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. True False
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. True False
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. True False
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. True False
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. True False
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way. True False
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. True False
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out at a restaurant. True False
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. True False
10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. True False
11. I like to gossip at times. True False
12. There have been times when I felt rebelling against people of authority even though I knew they were right. True False
13. No matter whom I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener. True False
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. True False
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. True False
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. True False
17. I am always trying to practice what I preach. True False
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people. True False
19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget. True False
20. When I don't know something I don't mind at all admitting it. True False
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. True False
22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. True False
23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. True False
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings. True False
25. I never resent being asked to return a favor True False
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. True False
27. I never make a long trip with out checking the safety of my car. True False
28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. True False
29. I almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. True False
30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. True False

31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. True False

32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only get what they deserved. True False

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. True False
APPENDIX G

RSES
Please answer the following questions.

1. I feel that I am a person of worth at least on an equal plane with others.
   ______ 1. Strongly agree
   ______ 2. Agree
   ______ 3. Disagree
   ______ 4. Strongly disagree

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
   ______ 1. Strongly agree
   ______ 2. Agree
   ______ 3. Disagree
   ______ 4. Strongly disagree

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
   ______ 1. Strongly agree
   ______ 2. Agree
   ______ 3. Disagree
   ______ 4. Strongly disagree

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
   ______ 1. Strongly agree
   ______ 2. Agree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3. Disagree</th>
<th>4. Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Strongly agree</td>
<td>2. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>4. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Strongly agree</td>
<td>2. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>4. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>On the whole I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Strongly agree</td>
<td>2. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>4. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I wish I would have more respect for myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Strongly agree</td>
<td>2. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Disagree</td>
<td>4. Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Strongly disagree

9. I certainly feel useless at times.

1. Strongly agree

2. Agree

3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree

10. At times I think that I am no good at all.

1. Strongly agree

2. Agree

3. Disagree

4. Strongly disagree
APPENDIX H

NOTICE OF DEBRIEFING
Thank you for participating in the “Family Expressiveness, Ethnicity, and Response Styles” study. The lead experimenter is interested in examining how people of different cultures may respond differently to certain types of response scales. Culturally influenced family behaviors may also be a factor in response styles. Understanding cultural variation in response styles is important in making accurate questionnaires. If you would like to know more about the study, you may contact the lead experimenter at erikakao@hotmail.com.