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The purpose of this emic study was to enhance the understanding of one specific Asian ethnic group, the people of Chinese descent, by exploring the saliency of Asian heritage culture to their well-being. Adherence to Asian cultural values as a predictor of psychological well-being was examined. Psychological well-being was operationalized using a composite index extracted from the combination of three indices: life satisfaction, quality of life, and symptoms of depression. Past empirical evidences that suggest one’s identification with one’s heritage culture would have positive influences on one’s life. What are less known empirically are the interconnections between value adherence, collective self-esteem and processes of acculturation/enculturation. The potential moderating effects of collective self-esteem, acculturation, and enculturation were examined.

A total of 167 individuals of Chinese descent took part in the study. Participants were recruited from an undergraduate course in Introductory Psychology and Asian student organizations on three college campuses within the same Midwest region. A web-based survey service was used for the data collection of this study. Principal components statistical analysis was used to extract the composite index for psychological
well-being. Simple linear regression analysis was used on the predictor Asian cultural value adherence on the criterion variable of psychological well-being. Hierarchical regression analyses were used to explore potential moderating effects of collective self-esteem and the bidimensional construct of acculturation on the relationship between the predictor and the criterion.

As predicted, Asian cultural value adherence was found to be a significant predictor of psychological well-being. Participants who had higher adherences to Asian cultural values exhibited higher sense of positive psychological well-being than those with lower value adherences. This supported the notion that identification with one’s heritage culture can be a positive resource for one’s wellness (Cross, 2003). Collective self-esteem and enculturation were not found to be significant moderators while acculturation demonstrated significant moderating effects. The data indicated a negative effect of this moderator. The less one acculturated to the mainstream American culture the more predictive their adherence to Asian cultural values was of their psychological well-being.

Results are discussed in light of the insights they provided regarding saliency of heritage culture for people of Chinese descent. Implications of the results for mental health service providers are presented. Limitations of the present study are discussed and various directions for future research are also proposed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“If Asianness was contagious, then surely I had caught it. I imagined that this ‘condition’ affected the way I walked, talked, danced, and at its most advanced stage, the way I looked at the world and at other people” (modified, Senna 1998, Caucasia).

There are currently over 10 million Asian Americans in the United States and that number is projected to reach approximately 20 million by the year 2020 (U.S. Department of Health and Services, 2001). Representing a large proportion of the U.S. population, much research focus has been devoted to understanding the intricate nature of this population, the culture that is embedded, and the lives of its members. Such culture-specific research is necessary in order to build an appropriate knowledge base from which effective services are offered. A cultural specific approach, known as the emic perspective, takes into account culturally relevant factors such as values and worldviews, which influence the thoughts and behaviors of the individuals of a given cultural group (Sue & Sue, 2003). While the contrasting etic perspective focuses on the cultural universals, the emic approach accounts for the heterogeneity across different cultures. Heterogeneity is particularly important to address when it comes to an ethnic group such as Asians which comprises approximately 43 different ethnic subgroups with over 100
languages and dialects represented (U. S. Department of Health and Services, 2001). Without accounting for the differences that exist within Asian ethnic subgroups, errors of omission are inevitable. The error of omission refers to the failure of research studies to account for culture, ethnicity, cultural differences, and false generalizations of individuals within a given culture (Marsella & Leong, 1995). Unfortunately, there is evidence of a scarcity of published articles focused on specific Asian ethnic groups in the past decade as researchers continue to lump Asian ethnic groups into large generic samples such as an all-inclusive ‘Asian American’ group (Kim, Yang, Atkinson, Wolfe, & Hong, 2001). With the demographic changes and the need to account for heterogeneity, emic research specific to Asian ethnic subgroups warrants additional research attention and studies should be conducted to meet this need (Sue & Sue, 2003).

The emic perspective not only accounts for heterogeneity amongst different ethnic groups, it also emphasizes the importance of culture. A proponent of cultural specific research and one who has made immense contribution to the study of racial/ethnic individuals, Dr. Terry Cross, stressed the role of culture as a resource for mental health and wellness of people of color (Cross, 2003). In his keynote address at the 2000 National Multicultural Conference and Summit, he argued that culture is the greatest asset for healing and should be recognized as such. This positive relationship that he proposed to exist between one’s identification with one’s heritage culture and the maintaining of a sense of well-being has supportive evidence in the research literature (e.g., Lewin, 1948; Phinney, 1990; Helms, 1990; and Cross, 1991). No longer should culture be used as a mere identifier of one’s heritage, he argued, but as a key factor
within one’s life that contributes to the well-being of an individual. Further, Dr. Cross
highlighted that to truly appreciate the strength and other positive assets provided by
one’s heritage culture it is important to examine the role of culture from the perspective
of individuals of that given culture. In other words, the emic perspective ought to be used.

To investigate the notion that one’s heritage culture is a salient resource for
mental health and wellness, this study was designed to provide initial insights into how
the Asian heritage culture impacts the well-being of one particular Asian ethnic
subgroup, the Chinese. The Chinese ethnic subgroup was of focus because it is the largest
Asian ethnic group in the United States with individuals of Chinese descent representing
about 23.7% of the Asian population in the U.S. (U. S. Department of Health and
Services, 2001). The research question posed by this study was in essence, *is the Asian
heritage culture a salient factor in the lives of the people of Chinese descent by way of
how it impacts their well-being?* To explore for an answer to this research question, the
saliency of the Asian heritage culture was operationalized by measuring one’s level of
adherence to the Asian cultural values embedded within the culture. It was
conceptualized that if an individual identified with his/her heritage culture, it would not
only implicitly demonstrate the saliency of that culture in his/her life, it may also be
inferred that he/she adheres to the cultural values embedded within that culture to which
he/she identifies with. This is because within each culture, there are said to exist cultural
characteristics that uniquely define that culture (Lee, 2003). A major part of the cultural
characteristics that define a culture are the embedded values which by definition serve as
the guiding principles for the particular culture (Schwartz, 1996). Therefore, if a person
identifies with his/her culture, it would indicate the saliency of that culture and the cultural values which define it.

To explore the impact of heritage culture on one’s sense of well-being, the criterion (dependent) variable in this study was the construct of psychological well-being. There are some evidences in the literature for the connection between culture and psychological functioning of people of Asian descent. For example, it had been found that the Asian value of preserving harmony in interpersonal relationships (i.e., upholding the collectivistic nature of this cultural group) accounted for the levels of anxiety and guilt experienced in situations of conflict by Asian Americans (Zane, Sue, Hu, & Kwon, 1991). It was suggested that such anxiety and guilt constitute a threat to interpersonal harmony and as a result manifest into non-assertive behaviors and reactions. Furthermore, such experiences may lead individuals to accept prevailing stereotypes of one’s cultural group and cause maladaptive social functioning and less sense of satisfaction with life. However, such inferences had not been tested empirically.

Unfortunately, some of the literatures on the connection between culture and psychological functioning of people of Asian descent have provided a rather negative portrayal of Asian cultural values. This is because Asian cultural values have often been proposed as the potential barriers which prevent Asians from seeking professional psychological services. More specifically, Asian cultural values (e.g., interpersonal harmony, loss of face, collectivistic self) have been used to explain the patterns of underutilization and dropout rates in usage of mental health services exhibited by Asian Americans (Sue & Sue, 1974; Tracey, Leong, Glidden, 1986; Atkinson & Gim, 1989).
For example, the value of being collectivistic leads Asian individuals to place high emphasis upon the family unit and to honor and maintain harmony within the family (Tata & Leong, 1994; Parkes, Bochner, & Schneider, 2001). Within that context, Asians may be sensitive to how their individual behaviors, for example, seeking professional psychological support, may be negatively reflected upon the family. Therefore, personal problems are often kept hidden from the public eye which in turn makes seeking professional services an inappropriate option (Sue & Sue, 1974).

However, rather than viewing values such as collectivism as barriers preventing Asians from seeking support, Yeh and Wang (2000) postulated that this same cultural value of collectivism actually provides Asian with alternative resources for support. They found that with the high emphasis on the family unit and the community, Asian Americans tended to seek help from family and friends. Further, they noted that being interdependent was actually aligned with the norm and social expectations within the Asian culture. Similarly, Chang (1996) found evidence to support that while Asian Americans utilize different coping strategies than Caucasian Americans (i.e., use of resources other than professional psychological services) that did not necessarily equated to a lack of resources or psychological maladjustment for Asian Americans (Chang, 2001). Just as Dr. Cross proposed, cultures ought to be explored for the positive effects they may have on the well-being of the people who identifies with them because cultures may be great assets for healing. Unfortunately, the Asian culture and the values embedded within that culture have not been examined empirically for their potential positive effects on the psychological well-being of Asian individuals.
The construct of psychological well-being is an encompassing one because different aspects could all reflect upon one’s sense of well-being. Three indices that have been widely used as operational definitions of various components of this larger construct were included in this study: satisfaction with life, quality of life, and symptoms of depression. These indices have been found to be effective in the assessment of one’s psychological well-being though they tap into seemingly different aspects of the larger construct. While each of the three indices were designed to provide information on a specific variable (i.e., presence of depressive symptoms), taken together, the information gathered from all three indices would provide a more general sense of psychological well-being. The focus of this study was the effects of cultural value adherence on the psychological well-being in a general sense rather than in any one particular aspect (i.e., depression) alone. Therefore, psychological well-being as the criterion variable was operationalized using a composite index extracted from the combination of the three separate indices.

Due to the complexity of culture, other culture relevant factors may also have impact on the relationship between one’s identification with one’s heritage culture by way of value adherence and one’s psychological well-being. To account for the interaction effects of two widely studied factors relevant to the Asian population, this study also examined the potential moderating effects of the bidimensional construct of acculturation (acculturation/enculturation) and collective self-esteem. Based on the implications of these two factors by their definitions, doing so may further shed light on
the saliency of culture to members of this ethnic group and the dynamic relationships that may exist amongst these variables.

Acculturation historically had been understood as a unidimensional construct defined as *the differences and changes in values and behaviors that individuals make as they gradually adopt the cultural values of the dominant society* (Graves, 1967). However, this unidimensional approach overlooks the process of enculturation, which refers to the process of maintaining one’s indigenous culture and values (Kim & Abreu, 2001). This study examined acculturation as a bidimensional construct by accounting for both processes. By examining how much one may uphold their Asian heritage culture while exposed to the influences of a new culture with its own set of values, this would provide insight to the saliency of the Asian heritage culture to individual of Chinese descent. Collective self-esteem had been defined as, *the value one places on one’s social group* (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). By examining the amount of importance placed on their ethnic group, it was expected that this would also indicate the saliency of culture and its embedded values to individuals of Chinese descent.

Furthermore, Markus and Kitayama (1991) proposed that the sense of connectedness to one’s cultural group was particularly important for individual of collectivistic cultures like that of Asian cultures. In fact, the importance of collectivism had been found to be one of the values Asians uphold (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999). There is also strong empirical evidence in support of Markus & Kitayama’s (1991) theory of the interconnected nature of the self and the saliency of culture for Asians. Studies had found that strong connection and identification with one’s cultural group was
significantly related to constructs such as self esteem (e.g., Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2001) and general life satisfaction (e.g. Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994; Bettencourt, Charlton, Eubanks, Kernahan, & Fuller 1999; Constantine, Donnelly, & Myers, 2002; Zhang & Leung, 2002). As Luhtanen & Crocker (1992) articulated, the sense of affirmation and belonging to the ethnic group and other support systems can enhance collective self-esteem and overall well-being for collectivistic individuals. Thus, not only may collective self-esteem be indicative of the saliency of culture for the Chinese, it may also further the potential positive impact heritage culture has on the well-being of the Chinese. For example, it may be inferred that if one feels positive about one’s cultural group and identifies with the culture, one is likely to adhere to the embedded cultural values and reap the benefits. Therefore, exploring the potential moderating effects of collective self-esteem would be aligned with efforts to understand the salient role of culture on the well-being of the Chinese.

Racial Categories: Chinese or Chinese American?

To fully actualize the notion of the emic perspective, this study ventured to look beyond the racial categories to which many research efforts have been limited by. For example, while one body of research appears to focus on “Asian Americans” another focuses on “Asians”. Separated by use of different racial categories, these research efforts are suggestively distinct while what is meant by these categories is often unclear. For example, some racial categories are historically used to denote legal status of an individual living in the United States (Banks & Eberhardt, 1998). A person labeled as an
“Asian American” would imply the possession of U. S. citizenship and U.S. as that individual’s birth place, while a person labeled as “Asian” would imply a foreigner status. It has also been argued that race is not a naturally occurring phenomenon and that there are not genetic differences to justify categorizations of racial groups. In fact, the categories of racial groups stem from matters of social, political, and historical contingencies making them products of social construction, rather than hereditary factors. Eberhardt & Randall (1997) stated that racial categories did not emerge simply as the products of energy and time-saving cognitive devices, but as functional entities constructed in the service of social power and cultural domination. While conclusions and consensus are yet to be reached about the existence and meaning of these categories such dialogues are important to keep in mind. Just as one should attend to factors such as immigration experiences, acculturation levels, education achievements, and socioeconomic status so as to not make flawed homogenous assumptions (e.g., “all Chinese are alike”), such is the case for making stereotypes based merely on country of birth, legal status, or any potential socially driven categorization system.

In light of these dialogues on race categories, this study did not use the potential social categories (e.g., Chinese, Chinese Americans) to filter out individuals during the data collection process. It has been proposed that when social categories are used, they have direct implications of how the self is perceived, evaluated, and categorized (Murrell, 1998). Therefore, using such categories may have impeded the ability to examine fully the perspectives of individuals of the Chinese cultural group. Self-labeling and self-identification may be more valid measures of ethnic identity orientation when studying
the psychological aspect of ethnic identity than category selection or placement (Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997; Suzuki-Crumly & Hyers, 2004). Thus, it was important that flexibility for self identification was allowed to be exercised rather than setting confining categories. Such categories would not have reflected a person nor been sufficient for one to make inferences about the saliency of culture. The broad term “people of Chinese descent” was used in the recruitment of participants and only self-identified individuals of Chinese descent were invited to take part in this study.

Purpose of Study

The purposes of this study was be to move beyond social categorizations and homogeneity assumptions in order to continue work toward a fuller understanding of one specific Asian ethnic group, the Chinese. More specifically, this study explored the saliency of culture by examining adherence to Asian cultural values as predictors of psychological well-being as indicated by the composite index extracted from the combination of three indices: life satisfaction, quality of life, and symptoms of depression (see Figure 1). Very few studies had empirically examined the influences of adherence to Asian cultural values and none had done so with its impact on psychological well-being. Based on past findings, there are evidences that would suggest one’s identification with one’s heritage culture would have positive influences on one’s life. While the important roles that collective self-esteem and the processes of acculturation/enculturation play in the lives of people of Asian descent are well supported by past research efforts, what is less known empirically are the interconnections between value adherence, collective self-
esteem and processes of acculturation/enculturation. Therefore, the complexity of culture with its dynamic relationships with other culturally relevant factors, specifically, collective self-esteem and the bidimensional nature of acculturation (acculturation/enculturation) were explored in this study. To accomplish this, the moderating effects of collective self-esteem, acculturation, and enculturation upon adherence of Asian cultural values as predictor of psychological well-being were examined (see Figure 2).

In essence, the goals of this study were three-fold: first of all, to contribute emic research on individuals of Chinese descent; secondly, to examine the saliency of one’s heritage culture as having a positive effect on psychological well-being; third, to explore the complex nature of culture by examining the interconnections amongst Asian cultural value adherence, collective self-esteem, acculturation, and enculturation as related to psychological well-being. The motivation behind this study was not only to address the gaps that exist in current cultural specific literatures but also to help further along the progress toward a more complete understanding of the people of Chinese descent.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following section will review the relevant literature on Asian cultural values, psychological well-being, collective self-esteem, and the bidimensional perspective of acculturation. As a caveat, due to the limited literature specifically focused on the Chinese, most of the literature review will reflect work focused on the Asian American ethnic groups as a whole. However, acknowledging the literature that exists will provide groundwork to move forward with greater understanding of this Asian ethnic group.

ASIAN CULTURAL VALUES

“Desirable, transsituational goals, varying in importance, that serves as guiding principles in people’s lives” (Schwartz, 1996)

Cultural values can be defined in numerous ways but the essence of them remains as crucial elements of a culture that influence one’s dynamic behavior. Researchers from various disciplines have been interested in the construct of values: sociologists (e.g., Williams, 1968); anthropologists (e.g., Kluckhohn, 1951); and psychologists (e.g., Rokeach, 1973, Schwartz, 1992). The work from across disciplines has made important
contributions to our understanding of values not only through the conceptualization of the construct, but also with regard to the measures that have been developed to operationalize values. Researchers have designed ways in which one can quantitatively assess values so we can critically and scientifically examine the role this construct play in the lives of people.

Past research have noted the differences between Asian cultural values and Western cultural values. For example, Asian values focus on collectivity and interdependence while Western values focus on individuality and independence (Hu & Chen, 1999). Other values such as harmony, keeping of family honor, and modesty, are also found within the Asian cultural heritage. It has been said that much of the Asian cultural values were influenced by the teaching of Confucius (Robertson & Hoffman, 2000). Confucius’s teachings were predominantly exposed to groups such as the Chinese, Taiwanese, Vietnamese, and Korean. Further, influences of Confucius’s teachings can be found in religious beliefs of Buddhism, Taoism, and Shintoism, religions that are common in the cultures of East Asians, inclusive of the Chinese (Kim, 1997). In brief, Confucius (551-479 BC) taught that the universe and all living things a manifestation of the unifying force of *Tao* (Truth, Unity, or The Way) and the essence of life perpetuates order, goodness, and righteousness.

Until recently, researchers have examined the role cultural values play in the lives of Asian Americans as part of a larger construct called acculturation. Acculturation by definition is *the differences and changes in values and behaviors that individuals make as they gradually adopt the cultural values of the dominant society* (Graves, 1967) thus
conceptually it encompasses both behaviors and cultural values. In other words, the effects of cultural values have historically been operationalized as one part of the process of acculturation. The effects of cultural values had not been examined directly and the saliency of heritage culture values had not been treated as a stand-alone construct. While exploring acculturation highlights the process of behavior and value changes that may take place as one adapts to a new culture, merely exploring acculturation does not sufficiently examine cultural values or their influential effects.

The need to examine cultural values directly has received much recent research attention, particularly catalyzed by the development of the Asian Value Scale (Kim, et al., 1999), a measure designed to assess directly Asian American’s adherence to Asian cultural values. Until the development of this measure, the widely used measure to assess acculturation had been the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987). Measures of acculturation such as the SL-ASIA are unidimensional in nature and only assess the behavior changing aspects (e.g., food preferences) of acculturation. They do not adequately assess the value changing aspect of acculturation as the definition would suggest. Given this, they may have provided misleading results particularly because there had been evidence that the two aspects (i.e., behavior and value change) are separate processes that can occur at different rates (Kim, Atkinson, Umemoto, 2001). As the authors have highlighted, not only is it important to make the distinction between behavior-focused and value-focused measures of acculturation, cultural values ought to be examined directly rather than as part of a
larger process as that may not provide a clear enough understanding of the role cultural values may play in the lives of those who adhere to them.

The Asian Values Scale (AVS) was developed based on four studies by the Kim and his colleagues in 1999. Value was operationally defined as “universalistic statements about what we think are desirable or attractive” based on the definition of Smith and Schwartz (1980). Starting with 112 Asian values statements, the value statements were rated by European American and Asian American college and graduate students. Only statements that received higher ratings by Asian Americans than European Americans were included. This was done to identify cultural values salient to Asians and culturally specific to people of Asian descent (Kim, et al., 2001). The final scale consisted of 36 items with six factors: conformity to norms, family recognition through achievement, emotional self-control, collectivism, humility, and filial piety. Collectivism reflected the importance of thinking about one’s group and its needs before thinking about oneself and one’s own needs. Conformity to Norms reflected the importance to conform to familial and social expectations and to not deviate from those norms. Emotional Self-Control reflected the importance of having control of one’s emotions and having inner resources to resolve emotional concerns. Family Recognition Through Achievement reflected the importance of not bringing shame to the family. Filial Piety reflected the importance of caring for one’s parents and finally, Humility reflected the importance of being humble. Levels of adherence to the cultural values were measured by self-reported ratings of agreement to each value statement. High agreement ratings denoted the importance of the value as it related to the respondent’s life. Internal consistency and construct validity of
the instruments was evaluated and the stability of the scale across time was also examined. The AVS was found to have evidence of concurrent validity, discriminant validity, face validity, and internal consistency (Kim et al., 1999).

Kim, Yang, Atkinson, Wolfe, and Hong (2001) focused on examining specific Asian American ethnic groups and the relationship between within group differences and adherence to Asian cultural values. Although conceptually Asian cultural values are shared among different subgroups, the degree to which each subgroup adheres to these values may differ. As expected, results of their study indicated that while all four ethnic groups shared similar meanings attributed to the six value dimensions, the levels of adherence to each value dimension differed. For example, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean Americans had shown more adherences to five of the six dimensions of AVS than Filipino Americans. Filipino Americans indicated fewer adherences to Emotional Self-Control than the other three groups and fewer adherences to Family Recognition Through Achievement and Filial Piety than Japanese and Korean Americans. Differences were also found among Chinese, Korean, and Japanese Americans in their levels of adherence compared to that of Filipino Americans. Findings of this study highlighted the need to emphasize within group differences in order to provide most effective and culturally sensitive psychological services to members of these ethnic groups.

Kim, Atkinson, and Umemoto (2001) provided a review of literature on Asian cultural values and explored the 14 domains empirically identified by Kim, et al., (1999). The authors sought to enhance the understanding of cultural values and their impact on the counseling process with Asian Americans. The literature provided evidence that
Asian cultural values dictated several aspects of the lives of Asian Americans. Such values included family structures (Ho, 1987; Sue & Sue, 2003) self-worth, and self-identity tied to family’s achievements (Fernandez, 1988; Kitano & Matsushima, 1981; Tomita, 1994). Their review showed that while some cultural values had been identified in the literature, such as loss of face, filial piety, and modesty, the number of studies that empirically examined Asian cultural values remained scarce.

The utilization of the AVS had also contributed toward the understanding of Asian Americans and the relationships between adherence to Asian cultural values and counseling utilization, process, and outcome. Kim & Atkinson (2002) examined the relationship between Asian American client adherence to Asian cultural values, counselor expression of cultural values, counselor ethnicity, and Asian American client evaluation of career counseling process. It was hypothesized that Asian American clients would view career counseling process more favorably when a counselor expressed similar cultural values than dissimilar values. It was also hypothesized that Asian American clients would view the counseling process to be more favorable when exposed to Asian American counselors. Contrary to the authors’ hypotheses, Asian American clients did not evaluate the counseling process to be more favorable when exposed to either Asian American counselors or non-Asian counselors who expressed similar cultural values. However, a significant interaction effect between client adherence to Asian cultural values and counselor ethnicity on counselor empathic understanding and counselor credibility was observed. Those adherent to Asian cultural values rated ethnically similar counselors as more empathic and credible than those low in Asian values adherence.
Thus, not only did Asian values appeared to impact various aspects of the counseling process, the impacts were positive rather than the often proposed negative view of Asian cultural values are barriers to the counseling process.

In Li and Kim (2004) effects of Asian cultural values and counseling styles on career-focused counseling process were explored. Counselors who applied directive or nondirective styles were evaluated on basis of counselor credibility, counselor empathic understanding, client-counselor working alliance, session depth, and cross-cultural competence exhibited on the part of the European American counselors. Significant main effects of empathy, competency, working alliance, and session depth in the directive counselor condition were found. However, significant main effects were not found in the nondirective counselor condition and Asian cultural values adherence was also not found to be a significant factor. While the significant main effects of the various counseling variables supported past findings, the nonsupport of the hypothesis that Asian cultural values adherence play part in the counseling was contrary to previous findings in studies described earlier (e.g., Kim & Atkinson, 2002).

Effects of adherence to Asian cultural values on client expectation for counseling success and client-counselor worldview match on the counseling process with Asian Americans were examined by Kim, Ng, and Ahn (2005). Adherence to Asian cultural values was found to be positively related to working alliance and session depth. Results also indicated that in worldview matched European American counselor-Asian American client dyads, working alliance and counselor empathy was stronger than in worldview mismatched dyads. These results along with some past findings further supported the
theory on the positive effects of Asian values and the counseling process; for example the association between working alliance and cultural value of maintaining interpersonal harmony and deference to authority figures (Kim, et al., 2005).

Based on this body of research and the findings thus far, it may be inferred that Asian cultural values do play a significant role in the lives of people of Asian descent though more research are still needed. More specifically, adherence to Asian cultural values appeared to impact behaviors, interpersonal relationships, and interpretation of situations as demonstrated by the various aspects of the counseling process that have been explored. Findings of this body of literature appeared to be aligned with that which have shown evidence for the positive relationship between identification with one’s culture (which conceptually implies the inclusion of adherence to the values of that culture) and one’s well-being (e.g., Phinney, 1990, Helms, 1990; Cross, 1991). Given this connection between the two sets of research, further inference could be made that not only are Asian cultural values important, adherence to these values may have a positive impact on one’s well-being.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING INDICES**

The construct of psychological well-being had recently received much research attention. This construct is an encompassing one that consists of many aspects that would indicate the overall well-being of an individual. Many factors have been proposed to operationalize psychological well-being, to capture the various aspects within the larger
construct. In this study, psychological well-being was operationalized by three widely used indices of psychological well-being: satisfaction with life, quality of life, and symptoms of depression. As shown in the literature review below, these three indices have been found to be particularly relevant for the connection between culture and various aspects of well-being.

Satisfaction with life has been used in research as an index for assessing one’s subjective well-being, an analysis of how people evaluate their lives (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003). This included emotional reactions, moods, and judgment about life satisfaction and fulfillment. To operationalize the construct of subjective well-being, Diener and colleagues constructed the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS: Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Life satisfaction was defined as a global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his/her chosen criteria. It was important to the researchers that subjects made their own judgment of criterion for evaluation and not based on what were made by the researcher. In review of the scale, it had been found that the items were global rather than specific in nature so people could assess various domains of their lives based on their own values and definition of life satisfaction (Pavot & Diener, 1993). In a study Oishi and Diener (2001b) factors such as wealth, self-enhancement vs. self-criticism, approach vs. avoidance approaches, definition of happiness, and internalized cultural values all contributed to how individuals expressed their sense of well-being.

One factor particularly relevant to this discussion of psychological well-being is the construct of self-esteem. The explanatory power of self-esteem had been examined
and had been found to be a strong predictor of life satisfaction. For example, Asian Americans who reported lower levels of self-esteem also reported lower life satisfaction when compared to European Americans (Benet-Martinez & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2003). Some researchers have taken on the *emic* perspective and proposed that the notion of self-esteem is not a universal construct. They argued that when focusing on cultures like that of the collectivistic natured Asian cultures, one should focus on a more culturally relevant understanding of this notion of self-esteem by the use of collective self-esteem. Indeed, in an examination of life satisfaction of people across various nations, (31 nations including Canada, Germany, Kenya, Philippines, Spain, and United States) it was found that life satisfaction is not a universally relevant concept (Diener & Diener, 1995). While self-esteem was a strong predictor of life satisfaction, the influence on self-esteem on life satisfaction was found to differ by culture depending on how the self is defined, for example, individualistically or collectivistically.

Presence of depressive symptoms had also been used as an indicator of one’s sense of psychological well-being. Despite the often endorsed model minority myth, Asians are not immune to psychological distress (e.g. Sue & Morishima, 1982; Uba, 1994). The U.S. Department of Health and Services (2001) reported that the prevalence of mental health problems among Asian Americans was not significantly different from that of other Americans. For example, it had been documented that there is a high level of depressive symptoms among various segments of the Asian American population such as college students (Okazaki, 2000). The Chinese American Psychiatric Epidemiological Study (CAPES), the largest community psychiatric epidemiological study of an Asian
American ethnic group provided further evidence of this. The study showed that approximately seven out of every 100 Chinese Americans have experienced a major depressive episode in their life time. While the prevalence rate may be lower than the rate of other Americans (17 out of every 100), reported in the National Comorbidity Survey (cited in Blazer, Kessler, McGonagle, & Swartz, 1994), the lower prevalence should not be interpreted as a lesser need for research attention. Moreover, from a review of literature on acculturation, Salant and Lauderdale (2003) reported that there appeared to be a complex relationship between acculturation and health outcome in Asian immigrant populations. In fact, several studies noted the health effects of acculturative stress which by definition is the stress related to transition and adapting to a new environment.

To enhance current understanding of this complex relationship between acculturation and health outcomes, Hwang, Chun, Takeuchi, Myers, and Siddarth (2005) examined the effects of age, gender, and acculturation on the age of first onset Major Depression in Chinese Americans. In light of those findings, the author proposed that as immigrants acculturate, culturally protective factors of their heritage culture may be lost and result in an increase of risk for depression. While gender and age were not found to be risk factors independently as the authors had anticipated, when acculturation was factored in, those who immigrated to the U.S. at an earlier age were found to be at greater risk of experiencing depression than those who immigrated at a later age. It appeared that one’s level of acculturation may account for risk for experiencing depression. As the authors recommended, more research is needed to further explore the complex relationship between experiences of racial/cultural groups and mental health within the
cultural context. Furthermore, in the spirit of exploring culturally relevant protector factors, perhaps adherence to cultural values should be a direction for future research efforts.

Based on the above literature review, it is clear that the question is not whether or not culture and health interact but more importantly how do they interact and along what measurable domains (Salant & Lauderdale, 2003). Further, to obtain a more complete understanding of the effects of culture, the various aspects of culture should be accounted for when examining the relationship between culture and health outcomes. More specifically, based on the literature, examining the effect of value adherence as part of one’s identification with one’s heritage culture on health outcomes (i.e., psychological well-being as the criterion variable) warrant research attention. Furthermore, given the dynamic nature of culture, it may be important to also explore the effects of other culture-relevant factors that are involved in the relationship between value adherence and psychological well-being.

COLLECTIVE SELF-ESTEEM

“That part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group(s) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255).

The above quote exemplifies one aspect of one’s identity captured by the social identity theory proposed by social psychologists Tajfel and Turner in 1986. Social identity theory states there are essentially two elements of the identity: personal identity and social identity. Personal identity represents how one perceives themselves and their
personal attributes, which includes attributes of the individual such as competence, talent, and sociability (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). Social identity on the other hand represents how one perceives the social groups they belong to.

In an evaluation of this social identity theory, Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) examined the specific constructs were accounted for by this theory. The authors argued that the term social identity could be defined differently. In essence, they extended the original social identity theory by distinguishing how one relates interpersonally with others (social identity), and how one relates to their community as a whole, it be race, ethnic background, or religion (collective identity). The also proposed that there ought to be three elements of identity proposed: self, social, and collective. Incorporating the evaluative dimension of the self-concept, individuals can feel esteemed toward their own personal identity (self-esteem) and an individual can feel esteemed toward the social group in which he/she is a member (collective self-esteem).

Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) designed the *Collective Self-Esteem Scale* (CSE), a measure designed to assess levels of one’s perception of their social group and their membership within this group. The motivation behind this scale construction was rooted in the fact that until then, existing measures were primarily focused on the individual’s self-evaluation and did not capture an essential part of one’s self-concept, that being one’s membership to a social group. Without examining how one evaluates this part of their self-concept, an individualistic thinking was assumed. As a measure of collective self-esteem, the CSE was also viewed to be helpful in the advancing of research and applicability to practice.
The CSE consists of 16 items that captured four different aspect of collective self-esteem: 1) Membership esteem: how one judges oneself as a member of the group, 2) Private esteem: how one judges the group itself, 3) Public esteem: how one judges how others evaluate this group, and 4) Identify esteem: how one judges the importance of one’s membership in this social group to one’s self-concept. Theoretically, the measure was shown to contribute to the field of research, psychometrically, the measure was shown to be reliable and valid. While this scale was designed to assess collective self-esteem globally, studies have shown that the psychometric properties of the measure was not compromised when the measure was tailored to identify one particular group membership such as collective self-esteem based on Hispanic identity (Ethier & Deauz, 1990), African American identity (Constantine, et al., 2002), or Chinese identity (Zhang & Leung, 2002).

Since the development of CES, numerous studies have utilized this measure to extend the knowledge base on how this element of the self-concept influenced various aspects of individuals. One area of research where collective self-esteem had been incorporated is the study of psychological well-being (Blaine & Crocker, 1995; Crocker, et al., 1994; Kwan, Bond, & Singelis, 1996). Crocker, et al. (1994) examined the relationship between personal self-esteem, collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among 238 White, Black, and Asian college students. Their results showed that collective self-esteem was a significant predictor of several aspects of psychological well-being for the entire sample. For example, subjects with high levels of collective self-esteem demonstrated a positively correlated relationship to improved psychological well-bei-
being. Further, high levels of collective self-esteem were found to be related to decreased levels of depression and hopelessness. Ethnic differences were also found in study. While collective self-esteem was found to be associated with higher life satisfaction and lower hopelessness among all participants, when personal self-esteem was held constant, collective self-esteem was no longer associated with higher life satisfaction for White participants. Based on these results, it appeared that for people of color (Asian and Black participants in that study) ascribed group membership was more salient and central to their esteem compared to White participants who found their personal self-esteem to be more salient (Crocker, et al., 1994).

Influences of group membership to psychological adjustment and subjective well-being were also examined in specific contexts such as the academic arena (Bettencourt, et al., 1999). As proposed by Ethier and Deaux (1990, 1994), to fully understand changes in identity and its influences one must take into account the environmental context. A college environment was believed to be ideal in examining one’s identity because identity development is a critical task for individuals of that age group (Bettencourt, et al., 1999). This study examined changes in collective self-esteem as it related to improvement in adjustment from first year to second year of college. The authors’ results suggested that the development of collective self-esteem had a direct predictive relationship to one’s enhanced adjustment to college.

A recent study by Utsey, Chae, Brown, and Kelly (2002) examined the effect of ethnic group membership on ethnic identity, race related stress, and quality of life. Supporting the literature, ethnic identity was found to be a significant predictor of overall
quality of life, self-esteem and psychological adjustment and functioning of African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans. Further supporting the literature (e.g., Phinney, 1990), they found that African Americans reported higher ethnic identity scores than Asian and Latino Americans. More specifically, African Americans reported better psychological well-being than Latino and Asian Americans. Constantine et al., (2002), examined how collective self-esteem was related to Africultural coping styles. They found that adolescents who reported higher collective self-esteem were more likely to use Africultural coping styles, including spiritual and collectivistic natured practices such as attending church and utilizing community networks. The authors proposed that the behaviors of those that positively identified with their culture were more consistent with the norms and values of their cultural groups which included how they cope.

Findings of this body of literature not only signified the importance of collective self-esteem to psychological well-being, but one could also make the inference that a better identification with one’s culture and one’s cultural self, the better enhanced one’s overall well-being would be. However, what is less known from an empirical standpoint is the actual relationship between collective self-esteem and cultural values adherence as indicators of culture saliency. This is primarily due to the fact that Asian cultural values have not been examined directly until recently. Given the interconnection that seems to exist, it could be hypothesized that collective self-esteem is not only correlated with adherence to cultural values but the interaction of the two constructs could also impact the lives of people of Asian descent. In other words, collective self-esteem could interact with adherence to Asian cultural values in a way that would change the effects of value
adherence on a criterion variable. If collective self-esteem does in fact change the effects
either by intensifying or attenuating the relationship between the predictor and the
criterion, then collective self-esteem would be shown to be a moderator for the
relationship. This relationship was explored in this study.

**BIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVE OF ACCULTURATION**

In the literature, acculturation had historically been viewed as the process by
which values, attitudes and behaviors of an individual of one culture changes over time as
result of being in contact with a different culture (Moyerman & Forman, 1992). In this
traditional view of acculturation, adaptation to the dominate host culture was viewed to
be an inevitable process. As ties with the dominate culture increases it was assumed that
the individual’s ties with his/her heritage culture decreases (Abe-Kim, Okazaki, & Goto,
2001). This linear gradient relationship had been challenged in recent years as more
knowledge about the process of acculturation is gained through research. The primary
criticism for the traditional and often referred to unidimensional approach of
understanding acculturation is that it assumes the impossibility of an individual
maintaining the attitudes, values, and behaviors of his/her heritage culture upon exposure
to a host culture. In this approach, one’s ethnic culture is pitted against the host culture
with the implication that one is either assimilated into the host culture or not (Nguyen &
Eye, 2002). Aside from the mutual exclusion assumption, other criticisms of this
traditional model included the bias the approach has toward the dominate culture and the
failure to change with the changing times. As Nguyen and Eye (2002) highlighted, with
the diverse society of today, there is now more appreciation for diversity and more opportunities to maintain one’s ethnic culture. Therefore to be functional within the society, assimilation is not the only choice of adaptation as it perhaps once was.

What the traditional approach seems to ignore is the process of maintaining one’s heritage culture and values. To be distinguished from the traditional definition of acculturation, this process has been referred to as “enculturation” (Kim & Abreu, 2001). As a result, a different approach has been proposed for the understanding of the process of acculturation by which acculturation and enculturation are both accounted for. The new bidimensional approach suggests that cultural involvements between heritage culture and host culture are not necessarily of polar opposites. In other words, an individual “can have either strong or weak identification with both their own or the dominant culture, and a strong relationship with one culture does not necessarily imply a weak relationship or low involvement with the dominate culture” (Phinney, 1990, p. 502). The bidimensional model does not assume mutual exclusion as the unidimensional model does. In fact, recent research has shown that not only does identification with both heritage culture and host culture possible, the processes by which one adapts to the host culture and maintaining one’s heritage culture are unique, independent, and can happen at different rates (Kim, et al., 2001).

Since the emergence of the bidimensional approach to understanding acculturation/enculturation, much research efforts have been placed on empirically demonstrating the model. For example, researchers have compared the unidimensional model and the bidimensional model to benchmark the empirical distinctions between the
two. Flannery, Reise, and Yu (2001) compared a unidimensional measure, the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) with a bidimensional measure, the Asian American Acculturation Inventory (AAI; Flannery, 1996). They found that while both are important and good predictors of Asian American preferences, cultural knowledge, ethnic identification, and generational status, the utility of the two approaches depends on the research question at hand. More specifically, while the unidimensional measure was a better predictor of generational status, the bidimensional measure was a better predictor of Asian preference, cultural knowledge, and ethnic identification. In sum, they suggested that unidimensional measures to be used when an economical proxy measures of acculturation is needed. Whereas, bidimensional measures are more appropriate if a full theoretical investigation of acculturation/enculturation is of focus.

As researchers continue to explore the complexity of the Bidimensional nature of acculturation process (acculturation/enculturation), new measures have been developed as result in hopes to better capture the dynamic process. For example, Nguyen & Eye (2002) developed the Acculturation Scale for Vietnamese Adolescents (ASVA) which examined both acculturation and enculturation. Not only did ASVA demonstrate good reliability and validity, confirmatory factor analyses showed ASVA’s excellent fit to data, but more importantly, the study also showed the this bidimensional model was superior to a unidimensional model. Recently, the Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS) was developed to distinguish between the dimensions of acculturation and enculturation (Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004). This measure accounted
for the domains of cultural identity, language, cultural knowledge, and food
consumptions. What made AAMAS unique was the incorporation of a pan-ethnic Asian
American dimension. More specifically, the measure yielded three dimensions: culture of
origin, European American, and Asian American. The authors proposed this third
dimension to account for the cultural involvement among racial/ethnic subgroups through
external forces (e.g., imposed social categorizations of minority groups) and internal
forces (e.g., coming together of collectivistic groups) (Chung, et al., 2004). Not only did
AAMAS show good psychometric properties, more importantly, it contributed to the
ongoing exploration of the complex process of culture adaptation, culture maintenance,
and cultural exchange.

This body of literature on acculturation/enculturation highlighted the importance
of examining the role of cultural values directly. The role of cultural value adherence is
part of the larger constructs or processes of acculturation and enculturation, much like
that of collective self-esteem. What is less known from an empirical standpoint is the
actual relationship between acculturation/enculturation and cultural values adherence.
This is primarily due to the fact that Asian cultural values had not been examined directly
until recently. Given the interconnection that seemed to exist between these constructs, it
could be hypothesized that acculturation and enculturation not only correlate with
adherence to cultural values but that the interactions of the constructs could impact the
lives of people of Asian descent. In other words, acculturation and enculturation could
interact with adherence to Asian cultural values in a way that would change the effects of
value adherence on a criterion variable. If found that acculturation and enculturation do
change the effects either by intensifying or attenuating the relationship between the predictor and the criterion, then the two would be shown to be moderators for the relationship. The nature of these relationships was explored in this study.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Below are the research questions and hypotheses of this study. The dependent outcome variable was psychological well-being. Psychological well-being was operationalized by a composite index representing three indices: life satisfaction, life quality, and symptoms of depression. Life satisfaction was indicated by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), life quality was indicated by the Quality of Life– BREF version (WHOQOL-BREF; World Health Organization, 1998). and presence of depressive symptoms was indicated by Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977). Wherever there was not empirical evidence to guide direction of a hypothesis, null hypothesis was proposed.

1. Does adherence to Asian cultural values as indicated by Asian Values Scale (Kim, et al., 1999) predict the psychological well-being of people of Chinese descent? Hypothesis: high adherence to Asian cultural values would predict positive psychological well-being. This hypothesis was based on the conceptual proposal that one’s heritage culture could be a resource for well-being as well as the initial empirical evidence found in the literature of the positive relationship between identification with one’s heritage culture and one’s psychological well-being (Cross, 2003). This hypothesis was also made based on related studies that have
shown the positive effect of heritage culture identification (i.e., ethnic identity) on adjustment and well-being of Asian Americans (e.g., Alvarez & Helms, 2001, Lee, 2003). Asian cultural values being part of the cultural characteristic of the heritage culture, it was expected that it would exhibit similar positive effects.

2. Is collective self-esteem as indicated by the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) a significant moderator for the predictive effect of Asian cultural value adherence on psychological well-being? For example, would adherence to Asian cultural values positively predict psychological well-being for someone with a higher level of collective self-esteem more so than for someone with a lower level of collective self-esteem? Null hypotheses: Collective self-esteem is not a significant moderator for the predictive effect of Asian cultural values adherence on psychological well-being.

3. Is acculturation (i.e., adopting the mainstream American culture) as indicated by one subscale of the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA: Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 1999b), a significant moderator for the predictive effect of adherence to Asian cultural values on psychological well-being? For example, would adherence to Asian cultural values more positively predict psychological well-being for someone with a higher level of acculturation to mainstream host culture than for someone with a lower level of acculturation? Null hypotheses: acculturation is not a significant moderator for the predictive effect of Asian cultural values adherence on psychological well-being.
4. Is enculturation (i.e., maintaining the heritage Chinese culture), as indicated by a subscale of the *Vancouver Index of Acculturation* (VIA: Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 1999b), a significant moderator for the predictive effect of adherence to Asian cultural values on psychological well-being? For example, would adherence to Asian cultural values more positively predict psychological well-being for someone with a higher level of enculturation of with their heritage culture than for someone with a lower level of enculturation? Null hypotheses: enculturation is not a significant moderator for the predictive effect of Asian cultural values adherence on psychological well-being.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

This sample of Chinese participants was recruited from various channels on and around a large Midwestern university campus (The Ohio State University). Aligned with the normative samples used in the constructions of the measures used in this study, college students were the target for participant recruitments. Only self-identified individuals of Chinese descent were eligible to participate in the study. All participation in the study was voluntary and identities of participants were not linked to their responses.

On the university campus, students taking the Introductory Psychology course and members of Asian student organizations were recruited. The participation of students in the introductory course fulfilled their research experience requirement for the course as credit hours were given for their participation. Experiments were posted through the Research Experience Program website and followed the set operations of that program. Students solicited from Asian student organizations (e.g., Chinese Student Association, Asian American Association, and Asian Pacific American Caucus) participated voluntarily without any secondary incentives. Recruitments were done using university
published student organization contact information. More specifically, presidents of each organization were contacted via email with request to solicit members at large along with details of the research study. All of the organizations that approved the dissemination of information and recruitment of participation provided access to the organization’s electronic list serve. Emails were then sent to the members of each organization. A total of 160 students from campus participated in this study.

Off campus recruitment was done using published contact information of local area universities (e.g., Capital University, Columbus State University). Presidents of Asian student organizations on each university campus were contacted via email with request to solicit their members to participate in this study. Out of the three organizations contacted, the only organization that responded was the Asian American Association at Capital University. At the request of the faculty advisor of that organization, the primary investigator of this study attended one of the organization’s meetings and recruited participants in person. A total of 9 students participated.

A total of 169 individuals of Chinese descent took part in the study. Responses from 167 were used because two participants indicated heritages that were not Chinese so their responses were omitted. This sample size fell slightly short of the projected sample size of 200. A sample size of 200 was determined a priori by power analysis (Cohen, 1992) to detect a moderate effect size of $r = .3$ with power of .80 and with statistical significance set at .05. Given the specific focus of this study, college students of Chinese descent, obtaining the projected sample size was a challenge.
The sample only included self-identified individuals of Chinese descent. Representing the major countries/geographic locations 53.9% of the sample originated (directly or through lineage) from China, 23.4% from Taiwan, 13.8% from Hong Kong, 0.6% from Malaysia. A total of 8.4% of the sample reported being from other countries/geographic locations such as Indonesia, Thailand, and combinations of two locations (e.g., China and Taiwan). There were 37.1% males and 62.9% females. The total mean age was 25.21 years of age, $SD = 8.86$ with a range of 18 to 35. Majority of the participants were seniors in college with the majority of the sample reported family income to be within the $100,000-$124,999 bracket. The sample consisted primarily of first generation individuals, meaning the majority of the participant were born in a different country and had immigrated to the United States. When asked to identify their racial identity as either ‘Chinese’, ‘Chinese American’, or ‘Other’, over half of the participants indicated their identity as Chinese. This was found despite the fact that over 75% of the participants in this sample were U.S. citizens and would have by definition fell under the social category of ‘Chinese American’. A small percentage (17.4%) reported other identifications such as Asian American, Chinese Thai, Taiwanese American, and Chinese Taiwanese. The rest of the sample indicated their identity as being Chinese American. It was clear from the range of racial identities reported under the category of ‘Other’ that while all were of Chinese descent, individuals could identify ethnically in various ways.

Aside from the forced-choice question on ethnic identification, participants were also asked to report the varying level of their ethnic identification as being ‘Chinese’ and
also as being ‘Chinese American’. This was done for two reasons: first of all, to not assume that by their choice of one particular racial category (e.g., Chinese) in response to the forced-choice question that it necessarily equated to the impossibility of them also identifying with another category (e.g., Chinese American), and secondly, to not be limited by the inherent flaws of racial categories which had been proposed to potentially impede the full understanding of the perspective of ethnic individuals. Therefore, participants were asked to indicate their levels of identification as being Chinese and also as being Chinese American on a scale ranging from ‘very low identification’ to ‘very high identification’. Forty-nine percent of the participants indicated very high identification with being Chinese while 10.8% indicated very low identification. From the same sample of respondents, 17.4% also reported having a high identification with being Chinese Americans and 21.6% reported very low identification. As the results showed, it was possible for individuals to identify as being both Chinese and as Chinese Americans. Furthermore, the levels of identification varied, which demonstrated that ethnic identification was not an either-or phenomenon. To further support this, when prompted, over 57% of the participants reported being ‘bicultural’ rather than exclusively ‘westernized’ or ‘not-westernized’. Together, the sample in this study demonstrated the limiting representation of racial/ethnic individuals by way of racial categories because ethnic identification is a dynamic construct and ought not to be treated as mutually exclusive variables. In essence, it was important to allow participants to indicate their most representative ethnic identification as that was the best way to assess the worldview of the targeted sample.
Procedures

A commercial survey service (www.surveymonkey.com) was used for this study. The survey service provided a secure webpage and server which housed the set of measures used in this study and facilitated the administration of the measures through its capability for collecting and storing data. Once participants logged on to the URL of the study, they were presented with an information page, followed by an informed consent page which required their consent to participate in the study. Once consent was given, participants completed the measures of the study which consisted of six measures totaling 123 items. Once participants had completed the set of measures, they were presented with a debriefing statement that described the purpose of the study and provided follow-up resources. This web-based study consisted of the following measures: Asian Values Scale (AVS; Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999), Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977), Quality of Life – BREF version (WHOQOL-BREF; World Health Organization, 1998), and Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA: Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 1999b). (See appendices)

Instruments
Asian Values Scale. (AVS; Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999) This scale was developed to assess adherence to Asian cultural values. The scale contained 36 statements reflecting Asian cultural values (e.g. collectivism, conformity to norms, emotional self-control, family recognition through achievement, filial piety, and humility). Respondents had to indicate their level of agreement to each value statement on a 7-point Likert type scale (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree). High level of agreement indicated high level of adherence to Asian cultural values. The reported internal consistency (coefficient alpha) by the scale designers was .81 and the two-week test-retest reliability was reported as .82. A sample statement would be: “Following familial and social expectations are important.”

Collective Self-Esteem Scale. (CSES; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). This measure was designed to assess individuals’ evaluation of his/her membership to a specific social group. A total of 16 items on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) was used and four different subscales of collective self-esteem were extracted. The four subscales are: membership esteem (how good one is as a member); private self-esteem (how good one’s social group is); public esteem (how others evaluate one’s social group); and identity esteem (importance of one’s social group to one’s self-concept). While the subscales can be used, the measure was primarily designed to produce a total score which would indicate the general level of collective self-esteem. A total score was obtained by combining responses on all 16 items with higher scores indicating greater levels of collective self-esteem (Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994). The reported internal consistency (coefficient alpha) ranged from .71 to
.88 for all subscales with a test-retest reliability coefficient of .68 for the entire scale. A total score was calculated and used in the analyses in this study. A sample statement would be: *In general, I am glad to be a member of the social group I belong to.*

In this study, a modified version of the CSES was used to specify social group as being one’s racial/cultural group. This specification was noted in the instructions. The instruction for this measure in this study read:

> We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class. We would like you to consider your membership in your *Chinese ethnic group* and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about this group and your memberships in it.

Modification like this had been used in previous research studies and was found to be effective for use with racial/cultural groups (e.g. Crocker, et al., 1994; Constantine, et al. 2002). The race specific version has a coefficient alpha of .72 to .88 for all subscales and a total scale coefficient alpha of .68. A sample modified statement would be: *In general, I am glad to be a member of the cultural group I belong to.*

**Psychological well-being.** The psychological well-being of participants was operationalized by the combination of three widely used indices of this construct: (a) global satisfaction with life, (b) quality of life, and (c) symptoms of depression. A composite index was extracted from the responses from the three indices. This was done because the three indices were meant to capture various aspects of the larger construct psychological well-being which together would reflect a general sense of psychological well-being. It was this general sense of psychological well-being that this study focused on rather than on any one particular aspect of the larger construct. Using the extracted
component index maximized the predictability of the combination of the three indices with minimal loss of the information provided by each of the indices alone.

Global satisfaction with life was measured using the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). This 5-item Likert-type measure was designed to evaluate a person’s judgment about their overall satisfaction with life. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strong agree). Higher overall score indicates higher overall life satisfaction. The reported internal consistency (coefficient alpha) was .82 and the coefficient alpha was .87. Authors of this scale also reported the measure to be free from social desirability influences. A sample statement would be: *In most ways my life is close to my ideal.*

Quality of life was measured using The World Health Organization Quality of Life – BREF version (WHOQOL-BREF; World Health Organization, 1998). This 26-item Likert-type scale was a subset taken from the WHOQOL-100, the full version consisting of 100 items total. This version produced four domains of quality of life: physical health, psychological, social relationships, and environment. The initially reported Cronbach’s alpha for the four domains were: physical health (.86), psychological (.76), social relationships (.66), and environment (.80). Test-retest reliabilities for the four domains reported were: physical health (.66), psychological (.72), social relationships (.76), and environment (.87). The reported internal consistency (coefficient alpha) for the entire scale is .90. While the subscales can be used, the measure was primarily designed to produce a total score which would indicate the general level of life quality. A higher overall score indicted higher quality of life.
experienced. A total score was calculated and used in the analyses in this study. A sample statement would be: *How satisfied are you with the condition of your living space?*

Depression was measured using the Center for Epidemiologic Studies – Depression Scale (*CES-D*; Radloff, 1977). This 20-item Likert-type measure was designed to measure depressive mood and symptomatology and was intended for the general population. All items were rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = rarely or none of the time, less than 1 day, 4 = most or all of the time, 5-7 days). Items were reversed scored so the higher overall score indicated less symptoms of depression thus a more positive reflection of the general well-being. The CES-D is a well validated measure on the general population with the reported internal consistency (coefficient alpha) as .85. CES-D had also been found to be an appropriate valid measure for screening of depressive disorders for individuals in Taiwan (Yang, Soong, Huo, Chang, & Chen, 2004). A sample statement would be: *I thought my life had been a failure.*

**Vancouver Index of Acculturation.** (*VIA*: Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 1999b). This 20-item measure was designed to measure one’s acculturation to mainstream host culture and one’s enculturation to heritage culture. All items were rated on a 9-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree to 9 = strongly agree). The reported internal consistency (coefficient alpha) was .79 for the Heritage subscale and .75 for the Mainstream subscale. Given the two dimensions have been proposed as separate constructs and demonstrated as separate processes that happened at different rates, the scores of the two dimensions, acculturation and enculturation, were designed to be examined separately for their individual effects. Higher overall score indicated higher adherences to the host and/or the
heritage culture. A sample statement indicating acculturation would be: *It is important for me to maintain or develop American cultural practices.* A sample statement indicating enculturation would be: *I believe in the values of my heritage culture.*

**Demographic Information.** A demographic questionnaire was given to gather information on age, gender, country of origin, generation level, socio-economic status (SES), and prior counseling experiences. The demographic questionnaire also asked participant to indicate their varying levels of ethnic identification with being Chinese and being Chinese American: “*How much do you identify yourself as being Chinese?*” and “*How much do you identify yourself as being Chinese American?*” Responses to these two questions were measured on a 6-point scale that ranged from 1 (very weakly identify) to 6 (very highly identify). Participants were also asked to indicate coping resources that they tended to utilize when faced with challenges (e.g., family, friends, religious beliefs, and professional psychological help). This information provided further insight to how individuals of this sample maintained their sense of wellness in light of resources they have available and they utilize.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Descriptive analysis was conducted of all the variables examined in this study. The internal consistency reliability was also calculated for each of the measures used to operationalize those variables. The means, standard deviations, and Cronbach alphas are reported in Table 1. Table 2 reported the inter-correlations of the variables. As the results showed, all the measures used in this study yielded comparable and high alpha levels to that which were reported in the literature. Conducting these preliminary analyses allowed the researcher to compare the sample used in this study to those used in the original studies. Further, examining the internal consistencies of measures also determined whether or not minor changes of wordings (e.g., changing heritage culture to Chinese culture) affected the reliabilities of those scales. Based on the results, these wording changes did not compromise the validity or the reliability of the measures used.

Although not a primary focus of this study, possible gender differences on the variables were examined as part of preliminary analysis. T-tests were conducted on male versus female scores on each of the measures used in this study. The results are reported in Table 3. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. The only significant
gender difference found was on collective self-esteem, \( t = -2.09, p = 0.04 \). Men reported lower levels of collective self-esteem (\( M = 89.97, SD = 14.29 \)) than women (\( M = 94.85, SD = 14.69 \)). Gender differences were not further explored in the primary analyses. Reasons for this were not only that gender differences were not the primary focus of this study but the representation of males and females was disproportional within the sample. Separating the sample by gender would have further limited the predictive power of the already small sample. Also, the mean scores on the measures used in this study were comparable between the two groups. Examining them as one whole sample of participants was more appropriate than had the mean scores on the measures between men and women been significantly different.

In this study, psychological well-being was operationalized using a composite index extracted from three separate indices often used in this body of research: satisfaction with life, quality of life, and symptoms of depression. These three indices have been used to capture some of the different components encompassed within this larger construct of psychological well-being. While each of the three indices were designed to provide information on one specific variable (i.e., presence of depressive symptoms), taken together, the information gathered from all three indices provided a more general sense of psychological well-being. This general sense of psychological well-being tapped into how satisfied an individual was with his/her life, the quality of his/her life pertaining to factors such as living environments and interpersonal relationships, and whether or not this individual exhibited symptoms of depression. The
focus of this study was on the general sense of psychological well-being rather than any one particular aspect (i.e., depression) alone.

The composite index (component score) was extracted using principal components statistical analysis. For each participant, one composite index was calculated from the scores on the three indices. Using principal component analysis, the composite index extracted maximized the average of predictability of the three independent variables with minimal loss of information each index provided independently concerning the variable it was designed to measure (Mulaik, 1990). In this study, the component index score accounted for 77.54% of the total variance in the predicted psychological well-being outcome. The composite index was used for all analyses of the dependent variable of this study.

Primary Analysis

Research Question 1: Does adherence to Asian cultural values predict the psychological well-being of people of Chinese descent? Simple linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictability of adherence to Asian cultural values on psychological well-being. The results indicated that this regression model was significant, meaning, adherence to Asian cultural values was a statistically significant predictor of psychological well-being, F(1, 158) = 8.76, p = 0.004. Adherence to Asian cultural values accounted for 23% of the variance in psychological well-being as indicated by the component index (see Table 4).
Research Questions 2-4: Are collective self-esteem, acculturation, and enculturation significant moderators for the effect of adherence to Asian cultural values on psychological well-being? Tests of moderation model were conducted for the three proposed moderators of this study: collective self-esteem, acculturation, and enculturation. A statistical procedure to examine interaction effects using multiple regression analyses proposed by Aiken and West (1991) was followed to test the potential moderators’ impacts the effects of Asian cultural value adherence on psychological well-being. Using this model, information about the interaction between the predictor and the moderators as they impacted the outcome variable were explored. This was important because by definition, a moderating effect is an interaction, where the effects of one variable (i.e., adherence to Asian cultural values) depend on the presence of another (i.e., collective self-esteem). By using multiple regression analyses, Type I error was also minimized.

Hierarchical regression analyses were performed for each of the moderators. The rationale behind using hierarchical regressions was the nature of the statistical analysis tool. Hierarchical regression analyses examine the stepwise change by the steps in which multiple product terms (variables) are entered (Frazier, Tix, & Barron, 2004). Each set of product terms entered are examined for the amount of variance on the criterion variable that they account for beyond what was already accounted for by the variables entered in the previous step. To test for moderating effects, the interaction of the product terms were examined for the change in variance that the interaction accounted for beyond what was accounted by the product terms alone. For a variable to demonstrate moderating effects,
this variable must alter the direction or strength of the relationship between a predictor and an outcome by way of its interaction effects (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Holmbeck, 1997; James & Brett, 1984).

In this study, separate hierarchical regression analyses were performed with each of the moderators (collective self-esteem, acculturation, enculturation). Adherence to Asian cultural values and the possible moderating variable was entered in Step 1 and the interactions between the predictor and the possible moderator was entered in Step 2 of the regression model. Doing so examined the significance of the interaction between the potential moderators and the predictor adherence to Asian cultural values on the effect on the criterion variable of psychological well-being. For example, for collective self-esteem to be a moderator, its interaction with the variable Asian cultural value adherence must alter the relationship between Asian cultural value adherence and psychological well-being outcome.

From the hierarchical regression analyses, the results indicated that collective self-esteem was not a significant moderator for the predictive relationship between adherence to Asian cultural values and psychological well-being outcome. The interaction between collective self-esteem and Asian cultural value adherence accounted for only 1.7% of additional variance in psychological well-being over and above the 28.0% explained by the first order effect of value adherence and collective self-esteem alone. However, the unstandardized regression coefficient for collective self-esteem was 0.04 (p < 0.0001), meaning there still was a significant positive relationship between collective self-esteem and psychological well-being. One may infer from this and from
previous studies that have shown the important role of collective self-esteem in the lives of people of collective cultures that although not a moderator, collective self-esteem may still be an important construct to explore.

The results indicated that acculturation to the main stream American culture was a significant moderator for the predictive relationship between adherence to Asian cultural values and psychological well-being outcome. Acculturation accounted for 7.4% of the variance in psychological well-being over and above the amount of variance already accounted for by the first order effect of value adherence and acculturation alone. Statistically speaking, when acculturation was present, adherence to Asian cultural values accounted for more variance in psychological well-being than when predicting alone, and the added variance was due to the interaction between value adherence and acculturation (see Table 5). Furthermore, the negative beta value (-1.78) found indicated that it was the lower adoption to the mainstream American culture that interacted with adherence of Asian cultural value that predicted psychological well-being. The less one acculturated, or adopted the mainstream American culture, the more predictive their adherence to Asian cultural values was of their psychological well-being.

Enculturation, the maintaining of the heritage culture, was not found to be a significant moderator on the predictive effects of Asian cultural value adherence on psychological well-being. The interaction between enculturation and adherence of Asian cultural values only accounted for 0.7% over and above the amount of variance already accounted for by the first order effect of cultural value adherence and enculturation alone (see Table 5). However, the unstandardized regression coefficient for enculturation was
0.007 (p < 0.0001), which suggested that there was a significant positive relationship between enculturation and psychological well-being. Together, it may be interpreted that given the relationship between enculturation and cultural value adherence both may account for psychological well-being of people of Chinese descent. Since this study already showed that value adherence is a significant predictor for psychological well-being, it may be that enculturation ought to be explored as an independent predictor as well rather than as a moderator. The significant moderating effect of acculturation and the insignificant moderating effect of enculturation further supported the notion that acculturation should be examined bidimensionally.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the proposed study was to move beyond social categorizations and homogeneity assumptions and continue work toward a fuller understanding of people of Chinese descent. More specifically, this study explored the saliency of culture by examining adherence to Asian cultural values as predictor of psychological well-being. Psychological well-being was operationalized by a composite index extracted from the combination of three indices: life satisfaction, quality of life, and symptoms of depression. To account for the complexity of culture with its dynamic relationships with culturally relevant factors, collective self-esteem and the bidimensional acculturation (acculturation/enculturation) were examined as possible moderators of the relationship between cultural value adherence and psychological well-being. As noted in previous chapters, until recently, very few studies have empirically examined the potential impact of cultural value adherence by Asians, let alone by a specific Asian ethnic subgroup. Furthermore, to date, no studies have empirically examined cultural value adherence and its impact on psychological well-being.
Positive effects of Asian cultural values

In this study, it was found that adherence to Asian cultural values significantly predicted psychological well-being reported by the sample of Chinese individuals. More specifically, the data supported the hypothesis that people of Chinese descent who have higher adherence to Asian cultural values exhibited higher sense of positive psychological well-being. From the combined information provided by the three indices, this general sense of psychological well-being was reflective of perhaps more satisfaction with life, higher quality to life, and less symptoms of depression for those with higher adherence to the Asian culture values. This significant finding highlighted the notion that identification with one’s heritage culture and its embedded values can be an asset for individuals who have a culture that is different from the mainstream American culture while living in the U.S. (Cross, 1991).

Asian cultural values as a significant predictor of psychological well-being also supported past findings that demonstrated the positive relationship between identification with one’s ethnic heritage and the maintaining of a sense of well-being (e.g., Lewin, 1948; Phinney, 1990; Helms, 1990; and Cross, 1991). While adherence to cultural values had not been examined directly in these past studies, by way of examining larger cultural relevant factors such as ethnic identity and acculturation, effects of identification with one’s heritage cultural values were explored indirectly. For example, ethnic identity, is defined as an individual’s acquisition and retention of cultural characteristics that are incorporated into one’s self-concept and developed in the context of the individual’s belong to a minority ethnic group within the larger society (Phinney, 2003). The cultural
characteristics extend beyond behaviors and preferences but include other aspects such as values and attitudes (Lee, 2003). With cultural values implicitly noted, studies have found that ethnic identity impacts adjustment and psychological well-being of racial/ethnic individuals. For example, Suzuki-Crumly and Hyers (2004) reported that ethnic identity was predictive of one’s psychological well-being and that psychological well-being along with experiences of anxiety varied as a function of ethnic identity.

While the impact of ethnic identity had been well documented in research, recently, researchers are beginning to focus on the interactions of ethnic identity with other culturally relevant factors. For example, Lee (2003) explored the moderating effect of ethnic identity as a protector against the negative impacts of discrimination faced by Asian Americans. It was found that despite the often mistaken belief that Asian Americans face less severe or minimal discrimination than other ethnic and racial minority groups, Asian Americans in that study did report high occurrences of discrimination. As predicted, discrimination was found to correlate negatively with psychological well-being and positively with distress. However, ethnic identity was not found to moderate the effects of discrimination as the author had hypothesized it would. Lee (2003) suggested that perhaps ethnic identity does contribute to well-being but does not in and of itself protect against the large impact of discrimination. He suggested that other cultural factors and possible moderators may be present and called for future explorations on the dynamic nature of ethnic identity and the cultural characteristics that are embedded.
More specifically to the current study, ethnic identity may be the encompassing construct while adherence to cultural values is one of the cultural characteristics within that construct. This is especially possible because a major part of the cultural characteristics that define a culture are the embedded values which by definition serve as the guiding principles for that particular culture (Schwartz, 1996). Accounting for the saliency of these characteristics, such as by adherence of cultural values, a more in-depth understanding would be possible on just how much an individual identifies with his/her culture and the effects of that identification. This is particularly important to explore given the initial data found in this study for the positive effects of Asian cultural value adherence on psychological well-being.

Moderating effects of collective-self-esteem

Collective self-esteem was explored for its moderating effect on the relationship between predictor cultural value adherence and psychological well-being outcome variable. In this study, collective self-esteem was not found to be a significant moderator. Thus the null hypothesis was maintained. While very little is known about collective self-esteem as a moderator for the life experiences of racial/ethnic groups such as the Chinese, based on the literature, conceptually one would expect to find collective self-esteem to play a role in the dynamic relationship of cultural identity and psychological well-being. As shown in a set of research studies, (e.g., Katz, Joiner, & Kwon, 2002; Yeh, 2002), the collective self is important particularly for individuals of collectivistic cultures in predicting emotional well-being, preferred resources for support, and attitudes toward
seeking professional psychological help. Studies have found collective self-esteem to moderate the relationship between perceived discrimination of ethnic minorities and indicators of psychological distress (Operatio & Fiske, 2001; Barry & Grilo, 2003). In Cassidy, O'Connor, Howe, and Warden (2004) among the Chinese, Indians, and Pakistanis participants in their study, symptoms of depression and reports of anxiety were reduced with collective self-esteem. Findings like these demonstrated the mental health consequences of perceived discrimination by minority groups and the importance of identification with one’s ethnic group particularly for those of collectivistic cultures.

While collective self-esteem was not a significant moderator in this study, the significant beta value found did indicate collective self-esteem to be an important culturally relevant construct to explore. Aligned with what was conceptualized to be true at the start of this study, if an individual has a high level of collective self-esteem, one would expect this individual to feel positively toward his/her cultural group and part of that identification would mean the saliency of the culture and the embedded values. The data showed that there was a significant positive correlation between value adherence and collective self-esteem. Further, the data showed there was a significant positive relationship between collective self-esteem and psychological well-being. While not a moderator, collective self-esteem may still play a role in predicting psychological well-being of individuals of Chinese descent. More research on the effects of collective self-esteem is certainly warranted.

Finally, the lack of significant moderating effect on collective self-esteem may be due to the case that the proposed direction of effect and the initial understanding of
collective self-esteem were wrong. In other words, it may be possible that value adherence moderated the effect of collective self-esteem on psychological well-being instead of what this study explored, the moderating effect of collective self-esteem on the relationship between value adherence and psychological well-being. Results from this study and findings of past studies showed that there is a relationship between collective self-esteem and culture identification (e.g., ethnic identity, value adherence) but the nature of that dynamic relationship is still unclear. In one study that examined for the moderating effects of collective self-esteem on in-group bias, identification, and status, collective self-esteem was not a found to be a significant moderator. It was reported that the relationship between these constructs was a complex one and rather than a moderator, collective self-esteem may have been a mediator in the relationships that were explored (Aberson & Howanski, 2002). While moderating effects focus on the interactions, mediating effects focus on explaining the relationship between the predictor and the outcome variable (Frazier, et al., 2004). A mediator is not only related to the predictor and the outcome but is necessary for the effect of the predictor on the outcome to be shown. Therefore, just as Aberson and Howanski (2002) proposed, in future studies, perhaps both the mediating and moderating effects of collective self-esteem ought to be explored.

**Moderating effects of bidimensional construct of acculturation: acculturation/enculturation**

In this study, acculturation was examined as a bidimensional construct where
acculturation referred to the adoption to the mainstream American culture and enculturation, an often ignore component, referred to the maintaining of heritage culture, in this case, the Chinese heritage culture. Therefore, two separate moderator effects were explored within this construct.

Acculturation was found to be a significant moderator in this study. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. More specifically, acculturation was found to be an enhancing moderator because it moderated the effect of the predictor on the outcome variable. Statistically speaking, when acculturation was present adherence to Asian cultural values accounted for more variance in psychological well-being than when acculturation was not accounted for. The added variance was due to the interaction between value adherence and acculturation (see Table 5). The negative beta value found also indicated that the negative effect of acculturation. Meaning it was the lower adoption to the mainstream American culture that interacted with adherence of Asian cultural value that further accounted for the psychological well-being outcome. This interpretation was also supported by the significant negative correlation found between Asian cultural value adherence and acculturation.

In light of the positive effects of Asian cultural value adherence, these finding together suggested that adopting mainstream American culture may lessen the positive psychological effect found from identification with one’s heritage culture if by adapting to U.S. culture one does not still maintain adherence of one’s cultural values. For example, in a study by Hwang et al., (2005), they found that those who immigrated to the U.S. at an earlier age were found to be at greater risk of experiencing depression than
those who immigrated at a later age. Based on their findings, the author proposed that as immigrants acculturate, culturally protective factors of their heritage culture may be lost and result in an increase of risk for depression.

Based on these data, one interpretation may be that it is not ideal for individuals of Chinese descent to adopt to mainstream American culture because doing so may lessen the impact of heritage culture. However, this author proposed that the data not to be interpreted necessarily as reasons to forgo adoption of the American culture. Instead, the data should be interpreted as an encouragement for people of Chinese descent to identify with their heritage culture and the cultural values embedded within that culture. Again, the assumption that adopting the host culture equated to an automatic decline of saliency of the heritage culture must not be made. As the data also showed, the process of adapting to mainstream culture and maintaining one’s heritage culture is not necessarily a mutually exclusive one. More specifically, within the sample of this study, nearly 60% of the participants identified as being bi-cultural (see Table 6). This demonstrated that it is possible for an individual to adhere to the values of both heritage and host culture.

Enculturation was not found to be a significant moderator in this study. The predictive effect of value adherence on psychological well-being was not influenced by the presence of enculturation and the interaction between enculturation and value adherence. The null hypothesis was maintained. However, the data did show there was a significant positive correlation between adherence to Asian cultural values and enculturation. This made conceptual sense because if an individual held onto the values of his/her heritage culture, one would expect that to mean the individual had maintained
his/her identification to the heritage culture. While not a moderator, enculturation still appeared to be an important factor to account for. It may be that the predictability of Asian cultural value adherence was strong enough to account for the variances in the psychological well-being outcome found that the additional variance accounted for by the interaction between the predictor and moderator was insignificant by comparison.

The different moderating effects or the lack thereof of acculturation and enculturation highlighted the importance to examine acculturation bidimensionally. As Chung, Kim, & Abreu (2004) noted, acculturation/enculturation should be viewed as independent, orthogonal constructs. Allowing someone to indicate their identification to one culture, both cultures, or neither culture, their worldview and experiences would be best represented. This also supported the notion that racial categories may not be the best way to assess the relevancy of culture.

A note on gender differences

While gender differences were not examined in the primary analyses of this study, the one significant gender difference found may still be important to mention. Noting this difference may perhaps provide some additional context to the findings described above and also call for future follow-up studies. The only significant gender differences found in this study was that Chinese men and women differed on levels of collective self-esteem. Chinese men were found to have lower sense of collective self-esteem than their female counter parts. This finding supported past research that reported the same gender difference in collective self-esteem. In Zhang and Leung (2002), it was found that gender
and age both accounted for gender differences in collective self-esteem and life satisfaction in Chinese individuals from China. The authors proposed that the gender differences were due to life task differences as well as differences in social expectations between men and women, young and old. In deed, women in general have been found to be more open toward seeking support at times of distress than men (Fischer & Turner, 1970; Gim, Atkinson, & Whiteley, 1990; Tata & Leong, 1994; Leong & Zachar, 1999). Women tend to be more interpersonally open and more favorable of expressing one’s emotions than men. Socialization of gender appropriate roles may also help to explain these differences. Past studies indicated that men in general tend to hold more negative attitudes about seeking help due to the social expectation to be masculine. Openly expressing one’s emotions or expressing one’s need may challenge that masculinity expectation (Yeh, et al., 2001). Women on the other hand do not appear to face the same social pressures. As members of collectivistic culture, when seeking support, Asian women are more likely to reach out to family, friends, and religious outlet than Asian men (Yeh, 2002). Based on these findings, one would have expected that Chinese women to report higher connectedness with their ethnic group simply by way of increased opportunities for interdependence as those are the resources they depend upon.

Limitations of Study

The same caution for heterogeneity among Asian ethnic (e.g., Chinese and Japanese) can also be extended to account for differences within any one particular Asian ethnic group (e.g., the Chinese). As the largest Asian ethnic group (U. S. Department of
Health and Services, 2001), this group also represents within it many different national
groups. As highlighted by the sample in this study, individuals of Chinese descent
originated from countries or geographic regions such as China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and
Malaysia. While it may be generalized that cultural values of the Chinese are
commonalities shared amongst the Chinese regardless of geographic regions and
nationalities, differences in regards to adherence of specific values are certainly possible.
For example, Bond (1987) explored differences in adherences to a set of work value
dimensions identified by Hofstede (1980) (i.e., power distance, uncertainty avoidance,
individualism, and masculinity) among four Chinese national groups. Individuals from
China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore were compared and differences in levels of
work value adherence were found. While Chinese from Singapore and Hong Kong were
high on the individualism dimension, individual from Taiwan were high on uncertainty
avoidance dimension. Further, it was reported that Chinese students from China were
predominantly inclined toward a ‘mastery-over-nature’ orientation (Lin, 1978; and Yang
& Chang, 1975) while others reported that Chinese students from Hong Kong valued a
‘submission-to-nature’ orientation (Liu, 1966). To account for potential differences in
adherence to Asian cultural values, multiple measures of Asian values ought to be used.
A composite score based on multiple measures of Asian values may provide a more
generalizable understanding of value adherence than one single measure.

Changes in the political context could also account for heterogeneity amongst
individuals from different nations and regions despite the fact that all may identify as
ethnically Chinese (Huang, Liu, & Chang, 2004). For example, in 1997, Hong Kong was
returned to China after years of English sovereignty; and there continues to be a debate over the national independence of Taiwan. While Chinese and Taiwanese individuals share common roots, in the past 100 years have become separate politically (Li, 2003). Due to the political context, some researchers have proposed ways to better understand the dynamic life experiences of ethnic Chinese individuals by proposing theories such as ‘theory of double identity’ for Chinese and Taiwanese individuals (Huang, et al., 2004). In essence, generalizability of the finding in this study may be limited due to the heterogeneity that exists even within this specific sample of Chinese college students in the Midwest.

Another limitation of this study was the use of self-reported measures as opposed to other research designs such as analogue studies. Typical concerns that are associated with this type of data collection include accuracy of responses, social desirability concerns, appropriate understanding of the scale items (e.g., definition of terms used), and fatigue due to length of testing material. Due to use of the web-based survey service, order of measures presented was not changed during the data collection process. As a result, concerns such as effects of participant fatigue and declined attention toward the end of the study were not accounted for. In light of the social and political context, the author also questioned whether social and political issues may have biased some of the responses. More specifically, participants may have had a negative reaction to geographic regions (particularly China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan) being listed as independent countries of origin. Particularly, if their political stance is that China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, for example, all ought to be considered as one national entity. Similarly,
depending on the participant’s political stance, a positive reaction to the same demographic questionnaire as it appeared also may have resulted.

Finally, the nature of the sample used posed limitations to this study. The sample was collected in Midwestern universities where Asians were of minority in population size. Therefore, despite recruitment efforts, the sample size of college students of Chinese descent obtained over the course of a 6-month data collection period was less than ideal and fell below what was projected. Further, the life experiences and worldviews of the participants in this study may very well be different than Chinese individuals living on the coasts (e.g., San Francisco) where Chinese individuals are not necessarily of a minority status by representation. Therefore, applicability of the results may be limited and caution must be exercised when generalizing findings of this study.

*Implications for counseling*

When working with individuals of Chinese descent, counselors should keep in mind several important factors. One particular factor shown to be especially important to account for is the bidimensional nature of acculturation: acculturation/enculturation. Counselors should be aware that while some clients may have adjusted well to the mainstream American culture and appeared to be highly acculturated (e.g., dress, behaviors), that does not necessarily mean these clients no longer identify with their heritage cultures (e.g., cultural characteristics such as cultural values). Making such assumptions could make counselors vulnerable to the fallacies of stereotypes and biases. Furthermore, such assumptions could cause counselors to overlook the saliency and
positive effects of heritage culture for individual of Chinese descent. The same caution is to be made for counselors to not assume clients who do identify with their heritage culture would not be able to adjust well within the mainstream culture. Identifications with both cultures are certainly possible as the process of acculturation/enculturation is a dynamic one.

Counselors should also assess the levels of adherence to Asian cultural values of their Chinese clients. As shown in this study, high adherences to Asian cultural values predicted positive levels of psychological well-being. Not only would assessing levels of adherence to the cultural values shed light on how much clients identify with their Chinese culture, it may also help direct the process of therapeutic change for these clients. Counselors might discuss the meaning of Asian cultural values and encourage their Chinese clients to explore those values in hope to reap the benefits of the values.

Finally, counselors should take into consideration that individuals of Chinese descent may prefer to utilize coping resources outside of professional psychological services. For example, participants were asked to indicate their use of six resources. Use of friends, self, family, cultural values taught, religious outlets, and counseling were proposed and the frequency of use indicated were in that respective order. Seeking help from friends was ranked as the most used resource (92.25%) while seeking professional services was ranked least used resource with 23.30% of the participants indicated preference for that resource. Such preferences are consistent with the cultural norm and expectation of the Chinese heritage. In sum, data from this study showed that adherence to Asian cultural values was an asset to one’s psychological well-being. Adherence to these values should
not necessarily be viewed as barriers to seeking psychological services but focus should be on how they may provide avenues toward other more culturally appropriate resources.

Similarly, it is important for researchers and practitioners alike to note that although seeking professional help is one resource option for people of Asian descent, not choosing to utilize it does not necessarily mean there are no other more appropriate coping methods available (Yeh & Wang, 2000). Thus in light of the cultural norm and the embedded culture values, counselors may encourage their Chinese clients to also seek support from members of their ethnic community such as friends and family. While the relationship between collective self-esteem and adherence to cultural values is still unclear, encouraging interactions between members of the ethnic group may help foster the learning of cultural values and connectedness amongst the members as well.

Counseling centers should attend to employ counselors with strong cultural ties and affiliations who may better able to understand the cultural adjustment and issues faced by racial/ethnic clients (Wilton & Constantine, 2003). Having counselors with similar cultural backgrounds, values, and experiences may help foster stronger therapeutic relationships. For example, studies have found that if counselors demonstrated cultural competency, their perceived credibility and the therapeutic relationship was positively influenced (Constantine, 2001; 2002). Counselors willing and able to discuss culturally specific and relevant aspects of one’s life experiences would certainly highlight the counselors’ levels of multicultural competency. In essence, counselors should view cultural values held by clients as an avenue for connection, mutual learning, and a window toward a more complete understand of their clients.
Finally, there is a new trend in the literature of researchers focusing on examining how existing psychotherapy theories and techniques may be modified to become applicable for individuals who the theories and techniques were not necessarily developed for. Leong & Lee (manuscript submitted for publication, 2005) proposed the Cultural Accommodation Model (CAM) based upon the integrative model proposed by Leong (1996). CAM highlights the cultural uniqueness of each racial and ethnic minority group, as culture is an explicitly important factor in understanding not only their behaviors, but also their beliefs and attitudes. The authors proposed that through careful analyses, “cultural gaps” that are missing from existing theories could be found and accommodated for to enhance those theories’ applicability to ethnically and culturally diverse groups. While not all theories may be culturally valid for populations different from the normative group, one should not automatically conclude that all models are invalid. As an example of how the CAM approach could be applied, Chen & Davenport (2005) proposed ways in which cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) may be modified for use with Chinese American clients. The authors proposed that some Asian cultural values were aligned with the philosophy of CBT. For example, CBT focuses on changing cognition in order to produce changes in behavior and affect. Similarly, Confucianism which is believed to have strong influence in the values upheld by the Chinese (Huang & Charter, 1996) teaches emotional control, use of rational thought, and importance of perception. The authors proposed that through the existing compatibilities along with few modifications and caution on the part of the therapist, CBT could be a viable model for therapy for clients of Chinese descent.
Future directions

Continued exploration of the effects of Asian cultural value adherence is important. As this study demonstrated, adherence to Asian cultural values is an asset for individuals of Chinese descent in regards to their sense of psychological well-being. Future studies may explore other ways in which adherence to Asian cultural values may impact the lives of the Chinese. One’s culture can influence one’s thoughts, behaviors, and emotions (Chang, 2001). Thus, adherence of these values may influence other culturally salient factors and examining them would provide additional insights in the potential for positive effects of Asian cultural values on those factors. Given the dynamic relationships that appeared to exist among many culturally salient factors, interaction effects of those variables should also be explored.

While the three indices of psychological well-being used in this study were shown to capture the general sense of psychological well-being with indications of physical, psychological, and emotional functioning, other indices should also be considered and explored. Given that psychological well-being is a large encompassing construct, it would be false to assume that one comprehensive measure would sufficiently encapsulate all possible aspects that would translate directly to one’s overall well-being. Furthermore, future studies should also explore how the notion of psychological well-being is defined by different cultures. Depending on how psychological well-being is defined and operationalized, findings in the study of psychological well-being may differ (Diener & Diener, 1995).
Future studies may also explore the same constructs examined in this study with another Asian subgroup (e.g., the Japanese, the Filipinos). While groups such as the Chinese, Japanese, and South Asians have received much research attention due to their large representations, it is predicted that Filipinos will soon become the largest Asian ethnic subgroup thus research focus ought to reflect that (Sue & Sue 1994). As we continue to increase our understanding of specific subgroups, we are simultaneously enriching our understanding of Asians as a whole. Similarly, the more contextualized our understanding of Asians and its subgroups become, the better equipped researchers would be to engage in discussions such as the differences amongst Asians, South Asians, South East Asians, and so forth.

The role of regional locations within the United States may also be interesting to explore and would further enhance our contextual understanding of the Chinese. Cross-region comparisons between the coasts and the Midwestern states could be the focus of future research efforts. As described above, future research should account for context factors that may account for the experience of the Chinese. Not only are U.S. regional differences important to control for, countries of origin or nationality of a Chinese descent should also be accounted for. Social and political backdrops can certainly impact the results obtained. Having proposed these potential research directions, the author would like to note that while it is critical that research efforts focus on exploration of specific Asian ethnic groups and account for various factors that denotes the heterogeneity of the Asian population, it is even more critical that the knowledge gained are not used as divisive means. The struggle between multiplicity and specificity is one
that researchers will continue to face. Multiplicity leaves researchers vulnerable to flawed
generalizations while specificity leaves researcher vulnerable to the complexities of
human being. Ultimately, individual researchers would need to take a stand and decide
which approach he/she will take while being well aware of the pros and cons to either end
of the spectrum.

Finally, future studies should allow participants the flexibility to identify the
ethnic category that best represents their identity. As shown in this study, a range of
valence in ethnic identification was found within the same sample. Of the same sample,
participants indicated varying levels of identification with being Chinese and with being
Chinese American. As shown, ethnic identification is not dichotomous but a much more
complex and dynamic phenomenon. Allowing participants the flexibility to identify
themselves outside of the constraints of social categories would provide a more accurate
view of groups of interest, in this case, people of Chinese descent.

Concluding thoughts

The ultimate goal of this study was to call to attention the saliency of heritage
culture in the lives of one particular racial/ethnic group, the people of Chinese descent.
As a starting point to examine the saliency of culture, this study explored the effects of
adherence to heritage cultural values on psychological well-being. This ultimate goal of
the study was met with significant finding which showed that individuals who adhered
highly to Asian cultural values reported higher positive levels of psychological well-
being than those who adhered less to Asian cultural values. Based on this finding,
researchers and counselors were reminded to account for the positive effects of the heritage culture on the lives of people of Chinese descent. Furthermore, not only should researchers and counselors be reminded of the importance and positive effects of the heritage culture, people of Chinese descent should also be reminded of the same and be encouraged to gain appreciation for their Chinese heritage culture. Understanding and acknowledgment of one’s heritage is a process in which each individual can engage. Just as others should not assume that by living in the United States that the impact of the Chinese heritage culture diminishes, people of Chinese descent should be encouraged to maintain/increase their identification, understanding, and appreciation of their heritage culture. Doing so may result in the reaping of apparent benefits that the Asian heritage culture provides.

One call for future \textit{emic} research that coincided with the examination of this study was made by Sue and Sue (1994) when they suggested research efforts to focus on the traditional healing systems of Asian cultures. Based on the findings of this study, it may be the case that the notion of traditional healing systems could include quite simply the adherence to the cultural values embedded within the Asian culture. Of course, more research is warranted for more in-depth understanding of the positive effects of cultural value adherence. With the initial exploration and the existing research initiatives, new theories and practices in counseling across cultures may emerge. With these goals in place and with the contribution of studies such as this one, we are certainly moving toward an enhanced understanding for the betterment of the Chinese community.
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APPENDIX A

Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures &amp; Subscales</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Reported Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>171.98</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93.04</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOQOL - BREF</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.11</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>134.76</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enculturation - Heritage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.93</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation - American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Internal Consistency Reliabilities of Variables (N = 167)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AVS</th>
<th>CSE</th>
<th>SWLS</th>
<th>WHOQOL BREF</th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>Accult - Heritage</th>
<th>Accult - American</th>
<th>Accult - Total</th>
<th>Psychological Well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOQOL BREF</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accult - Heritage</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accult - American</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accult - Total</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 2. Intercorrelations of study variables: Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males (N =62)</td>
<td>Females (N = 105)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>172.63</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>171.61</td>
<td>35.92</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>89.97</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>94.85</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWL</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOQOL- BREF</td>
<td>97.87</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>100.15</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>67.34</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>137.72</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>133.08</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation - Heritage</td>
<td>70.25</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>71.32</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation - American</td>
<td>66.07</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>62.21</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being Index</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3. T-Tests of Gender Differences (N = 167)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Cultural Values</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 4. Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Psychological Well-Being From Asian Cultural Values Adherence (N = 167)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Square Change</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.591***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS X CSE</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Square Change</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.275**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-American</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>.061**</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS X ACC-American</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.779***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.074***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Square Change</th>
<th>sig.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.152*</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-Heritage</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.372***</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.183***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVS X ACC-Heritage</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
***Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed)

Table 5: Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Predicting Psychological Well-Being From Asian Cultural Values Adherence with Moderators Collective Self-Esteem and Acculturation/Enculturation (N = 187)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>Identification with Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>Identification with Chinese American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Citizen</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>Cultural Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westernized</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-westernized</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither Westernized or Non-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College first year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Sophomore</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Junior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Senior</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate Student</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Baccalaureate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under $24,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$49,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Selected Demographic Information (N = 187)
Figure 1: Nomological network: Saliency of heritage culture as predictor of psychological well-being.
Figure 2: Adherence to Asian cultural values as predictor of psychological well-being with moderators collective self-esteem, acculturation, and enculturation.
Thank you for your interest in this study. Before beginning, here is some information regarding this study. Please read this carefully.

**What is the purpose of this study?**
The following study focuses on exploring the role adherence to Asian cultural values plays in the live of individuals of Chinese descent. The purpose of the study is to explore whether adherence to Asian cultural values is related to one’s overall psychological well-being.

**What will this study involve?**
This study contains several questionnaires that ask a variety of questions regarding one’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. The study contains approximately 120 one-sentence items to respond to, which altogether should take around 30 minutes of your time.

**Who can participate in this study?**
This study is designed only for individuals of Chinese descent. If you do not identify yourself as a person of Chinese descent, please do not complete this study.

**What are possible disadvantages of taking part in this study?**
Given that this study will take about 30 minutes of your time, you may find this inconvenient. Please take this into account before beginning, and choose a convenient time for yourself to complete it if you wish to do so. Also this study may ask some questions that you find personal, or may make you feel uncomfortable. If this happens, you can simply leave any question blank if you do not wish to answer it. Furthermore, you can end the study at any time simply by closing your web browser.

**What are the possible benefits of taking part in this study?**
The main benefits of participating in this study lie in the contribution you would make towards further understanding the important of adherence to Asian cultural values for individuals of Chinese descent. There are likely no direct benefits you would receive.

**Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?**
Yes. This study will not request any identifying information from you, such as your name or address. Therefore, your responses are anonymous.

**What if I am interested in the results of this study?**
You may contact the researchers for this study, listed at the bottom of this page, for more information.

**Who has reviewed this study?**
The procedures for this study have been reviewed by the Behavioral and Social Sciences Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University.

Thank you.
If you have any other questions, you may contact:

*Don Dell, Ph. D.*

[Email]

Don.Dell.1@osu.edu

614-688-8287

*Szu-Hui Lee, M.A.*

[Email]

szu.huilee.1978@osu.edu

(614) 459-7489

Office of Responsible Research Practices (ORRP)

The Ohio State University
Third Floor Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio
43210-1063

(614)688-8457

To continue with this study, you will be presented with a brief informed consent form, which describes that you understand several points discussed in this information.

To go to the informed consent form and continue with this study, please click here: ____.
By clicking to continue, I indicate that I understand the procedures involved in this study.

I am aware that I have the right to ask questions and receive answers related to this study by contacting the investigators: Dr. Don Dell, dell.1@osu.edu, (614) 688-8287; Szu-Hui Lee, M.A., lee.1978@osu.edu, (614) 459-7489. Furthermore, if I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I can call the Office of Research Risks Protection at (614) 688-4792.

I am aware that I have the right to refuse to participate and may withdraw at any time without any penalty, simply by closing my web browser. Furthermore, I know I do not have to answer any question that I do not wish to, and can merely skip such questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary.

I am also mindful of the rules/regulations set by the location (e.g., work) related to use of internet. My participation in this web-based study is not in violation of any such rules set.

Click here to indicate your consent and eligibility to continue with this study: 

______
APPENDIX D

DEBRIEFING LETTER
Dear Students:

Thank you for your participation in this experiment. The purpose of this experiment was to assess how adherence to traditional Asian cultural values impacts the psychological well-being of people of Chinese descent. We were also interested in finding out how your sense of connectedness with your culture and your acculturation level may further influence your well-being as they too are relevant cultural factors and indicative of the importance of Asian culture and values in your life. We hope to learn whether adherences to Asian cultural values influences how people of Chinese descent think and behave. This information would provide a more complete understanding of people of Chinese descent.

Should you have any questions regarding the study, concepts presented, or like to find out the results of this study, you can contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Don Dell, at (614) 688-8287 or dell.1@osu.edu or the Co-Investigator, Szu-Hui Lee, at (614) 459-7489 or lee.1978@osu.edu. If the participation of this experiment has led you to think about issues you would like to explore with someone, you may consider contacting either Psychological Services Center in Townshend Hall at (614) 292-2059 or The Ohio State University Counseling and Consultation Service located on the 4th of Younkin Success Center at (614) 292-5766 for further support.

Your help has been greatly appreciated. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Szu-Hui Lee, M.A.
Co-Investigator, Doctoral Candidate
INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the following questions about yourself. DO NOT PROVIDE YOUR NAME OR OTHER IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

1. Gender:  
a) Male  
b) Female  
2. Age:  
__________ (in years)

3. Ethnic Identification:  
a) Chinese  
b) Chinese American  
c) Other: ____________ (please specify)

4. Citizenship:  
a) U. S. Citizen  
b) U. S. Permanent Resident  
c) Other: ____________ (please specify)

5. Number of years living in the United States:  
__________ (in years)

6. Education  
a) College First-Year  
b) College Sophomore  
c) College Junior  
d) College Senior  
e) College Graduate Student  
f) Post-Baccalaureate Student

7. Family Yearly Income  
a) Under $24,999  
b) $25,000-$49,999  
c) $50,000-$74,999  
d) $75,000-$99,999  
e) $100,000-$124,999  
f) $125,000 or more  
g) Don’t know

8. Generation level:  
a) First (you were born in a different country and immigrated to the United States)  
b) Second (you were born in the United States; parents immigrated from another country)  
c) Third (you and your parents were born in the United States; grandparents immigrated from a different country)  
d) Fourth or more (you, your parents, and your grandparents were all born in the United States)

9. What is the country of origin that roots your Chinese heritage?  
a) China  
b) Taiwan  
c) Hong Kong  
d) Singapore  
e) Malaysia  
f) Other: ____________  
(please specify)
10. Using the scale, please indicate the extent to which you identify with being Chinese and being Chinese American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very weak identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very strong identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I identify with being Chinese.” .................... 1 2 3 4 5 6

“I identify with being Chinese American’. ........ 1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Based on your cultural experience and self-identity, which of the following do you believe yourself to be? (please check one)

a. ___ Westernized
b. ___ Bicultural
c. ___ Non-Westernized
d. ___ Neither Western or Non-Western

12. Which of the following resources have you utilized in the past in face of life difficulties? Check all that apply:

a. ___ family
b. ___ friends
c. ___ religious outlets (e.g., church, temple)
d. ___ self
e. ___ professional psychological help (e.g., counseling)
f. ___ cultural values taught
g. ___ other (please specify: __________________________)
APPENDIX F

ASIAN VALUES SCALE
INSTRUCTIONS: Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with the value expressed in each statement. Click the number to the right of each question that represents your response.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Moderately Disagree
3 = Mildly Disagree
4 = Neither Agree or Disagree
5 = Mildly Agree
6 = Moderately Agree
7 = Strongly Agree

1. Educational failure does not bring shame to the family.
2. One should not deviate from familial and social norms.
3. Children should not place their parents in retirement homes.
4. One need not focus all energies on one's studies.
5. One should be discouraged from talking about one's accomplishments.
6. One should not be boastful.
7. Younger persons should be able to confront their elders.
8. When one receives a gift, one should reciprocate with a gift of equal or greater value.
9. One need not follow one's family's and the society's norms.
10. One need not achieve academically in order to make one's parents proud.
11. One need not minimize or depreciate one's own achievements.
12. One should consider the needs of others before considering one's own needs.
13. Educational and career achievements need not be one's top priority.
14. One should think about one's group before oneself.
15. One should be able to question a person in an authority position.
16. Modesty is an important quality for a person.
17. One's achievements should be viewed as family's achievements.
18. Elders may not have more wisdom than younger persons.
19. One should avoid bringing displeasure to one's ancestors.
20. One need not conform to one's family's and the society's expectations.
21. One should have sufficient inner resources to resolve emotional problems.
<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>22</td>
<td>Parental love should be implicitly understood and not openly expressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The worst thing one can do is to bring disgrace to one's family reputation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>One need not remain reserved and tranquil.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The ability to control one's emotions is a sign of strength.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>One should be humble and modest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Family's reputation is not the primary social concern.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>One need not be able to resolve psychological problems on one's own.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Following familial and social expectations are important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>One should not inconvenience others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Occupational failure does not bring shame to the family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>One need not follow the role expectations (gender, family hierarchy) of one's family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>One should not make waves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Children need not take care of their parents when the parents become unable to take care of themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>One need not control one's expression of emotions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>One's family need not be the main source of trust and dependence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

COLLECTIVE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE
**INSTRUCTIONS:** We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class. We would like you to consider your membership in your Chinese ethnic group and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about this group and your memberships in it.

There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully and respond by using the following scale. Click the appropriate number to the right of each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>4 Neutral</th>
<th>5 Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>6 Agree</th>
<th>7 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am a worthy member of the ethnic group I belong to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I often regret that I belong to the ethnic group I to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overall, my ethnic group is considered good by others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overall, my ethnic group membership has very little to do with how I feel about myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel I don’t have much to offer to the ethnic group I belong to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In general, I’m glad to be a member of the ethnic group I belong to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most people consider my ethnic group, on the average, to be more ineffective than other ethnic groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The ethnic group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am a cooperative participant in the ethnic group I belong to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Overall, I often feel that the ethnic group of which I am a member is not worthwhile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>In general, others respect the ethnic group I am a member of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The ethnic group I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I often feel I’m a useless member of my ethnic group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel good about the ethnic group I belong to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>In general, others think that the ethnic group I am a member of is unworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>In general belonging to my ethnic group is an important part of my self-image</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

SATISFACTION WITH LIFE SCALE
**INSTRUCTIONS:** Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement. Click the number to the right of each question that represents your response.

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Disagree Somewhat  
4 = Neutral  
5 = Agree Somewhat  
6 = Agree  
7 = Strongly Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION QUALITY OF LIFE SCALE

- BRIEF VERSION
**INSTRUCTIONS:** This questionnaire asks how you feel about your quality of life, health, or other areas of your life. Please answer all the questions. If you are unsure about which response to give to a question, please choose the one that appears most appropriate. This can often be your first response. Please read each question, assess your feelings, and click the number on the scale that gives the best answer for you for each question.

1. How would you rate your quality of life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neither poor nor good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How satisfied are you with your health?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>An extreme amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent do you feel that physical pain prevents you from doing what you need to do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How much do you need any medical treatment to function in your daily life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How much do you enjoy life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. To what extent do you feel your life to be meaningful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How well are you able to concentrate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How safe do you feel in your daily life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How healthy is your physical environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Do you have enough energy for everyday life?  
11. Are you able to accept your bodily appearance?  
12. Have you enough money to meet your needs?  
13. How available to you is the information that you need in your day-to-day life?  
14. To what extent do you have the opportunity for leisure activities?  
15. How well are you able to get around?  
16. How satisfied are you with your sleep?  
17. How satisfied are you with your ability to perform your daily living activities?  
18. How satisfied are you with your capacity for work?  
19. How satisfied are you with your abilities?  
20. How satisfied are you with your personal relationships?  
21. How satisfied are you with your sex life?  
22. How satisfied are you with the support you get from your friends?  
23. How satisfied are you with the conditions of your living place?  
24. How satisfied are you with your access to health services?  
25. How satisfied are you with your mode of transportation?  
26. How often do you have negative feelings, such as blue mood, despair, anxiety, depression?
APPENDIX J

CENTER FOR EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES – DEPRESSION SCALE
INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of some of the ways you may have felt or behaved. Please indicate how often you have felt this way during the past week by using the scale provided.

1 = Rarely or none of the time (Less than 1 day)
2 = Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)
3 = Occasionally or a moderate amount of the time (3-4 days)
4 = Most of all of the time (5-7 days)

1. I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me………………..1 2 3 4
2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor…………………….....1 2 3 4
3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends……………………………………………….. ………………..1 2 3 4
4. I felt that it was just as good as other people. ………………….……….. 1 2 3 4
5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing. …………………1 2 3 4
6. I felt depressed. ………………………………………………………..1 2 3 4
7. I felt that everything I did was an effort. ……………………………...1 2 3 4
8. I felt hopeful about the future. ………………………………….……..1 2 3 4
9. I thought my life had been a failure. …………………………………..1 2 3 4
10. I felt fearful. ……………………………………………….…………..1 2 3 4
11. My sleep was restless. …………………………………………..……..1 2 3 4
12. I was happy. ………………………………………………..………...1 2 3 4
13. I talked less than usual. ………………………………………………..1 2 3 4
14. I felt lonely. ……………………………………………….…………..1 2 3 4
15. People were unfriendly. ………………………………………………1 2 3 4
16. I enjoyed life. ………………………………………………..………...1 2 3 4
17. I had crying spells. ………………………………………………..……..1 2 3 4
18. I felt sad. ……………………………………………….…………..1 2 3 4
19. I felt that people disliked me. ……………………………………….……. 1 2 3 4
20. I could not get “going.” ………………………………………………..……..1 2 3 4
APPENDIX K

VANCOUVER INDEX OF ACCULTURATION
**INSTRUCTIONS:** Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with the statements. Click the number to the right of each question that represents your response. Many of these questions will refer to your *heritage culture*, meaning your Chinese heritage culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral/Depends</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I often participate in my heritage cultural traditions………………………………………………………………..
2. I would be willing to marry a person from my heritage culture……………………………………………………..
3. I enjoy social activities with people with the same heritage culture as myself…………………………………..
4. I enjoy social activities with typical American people……………………………………………………………….
5. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture…………………………..
6. I believe in the values of my heritage culture……………………………………………………………………..