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REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Assertiveness

Assertiveness is the open and honest expression of feelings and thoughts and socially appropriate responses which seek to balance the serious consideration of others' feelings and needs with one's own needs and feelings (Masters, Burish, Hollon, & Rimm, 1987). Assertiveness is distinguished from nonassertive behaviors which involve compliance to others' needs, requests, and feelings while violating or ignoring one's own needs and feelings. Assertiveness is also distinguished from aggression, which involves hostile, forceful behaviors that violate or ignore others' needs and feelings while gratifying one's own needs and feelings (Callahan, 1980). There has been increasing awareness that the assessment of assertiveness and the training of assertiveness, particularly with ethnic minorities such as Asian-Americans, requires examination, consideration, and use of situation-specific environmental and contextual factors including culture, gender, and role status (Chiauzzi, Heimberg, & Doty, 1982; Comas-Diaz & Duncan, 1985; Fukuyama & Greenfield, 1982; Sue, Ino, & Sue, 1983; Wood & Mallinckrodt, 1990).
Indeed, the literature on assertiveness has unduly emphasized the power of the individual to behave assertively while neglecting the power of the environment to promote or stymie assertive behavior (Comas-Diaz & Duncan, 1985). Further, there is a general paucity of research literature on Asian-Americans that has focused on a wider and more diverse population (most studies have focused on Japanese and Chinese-Americans) and in locations outside of California and Hawaii (Leong, 1986).

There continues to be a widespread view that Asian-Americans lack assertiveness skills (Maykovich, 1971; Sue et al., 1983; Sue & Kitano, 1973; Sue & Morishima, 1982). This has been supported by studies using written measures of assertiveness and personality. Asian-Americans tend to score lower on written measures of dominance and aggression than Caucasian college students (Fenz & Arkoff, 1962; Johnson & Marsella, 1978). Asian-American students also score higher than Caucasian students on written measures of passivity, introversion, deference, and self-restraint (Abbott, 1976; Bourne, 1975; Connor, 1974, 1977; Meredith & Meredith, 1966; Sue & Kirk, 1972). Personality studies have found that Asian-Americans tend to display lower levels of verbal and emotional expressiveness than do whites (Ayabe, 1971; Fukuyama & Greenfield, 1983; Johnson & Marsella, 1978; Kim, 1973; Meredith, 1966; Sue, 1981; Sue & Kirk, 1972; Sue & Kitano, 1973; Sue & Morishima, 1982; Wood & Mallinckrodt,
1990). Often, Asian-Americans self-rate themselves and are described by Caucasians as quiet (Li-Repac, 1980). In addition, personal counselors and therapists describe Asian-American student clients as repressed, nonexpressive, and verbally inhibited (D.W. Sue & D. Sue, 1977).

Furthermore, there is also a belief that Asian-Americans have speech anxiety due to low self-esteem and low confidence, lack of social skills, and reduced social and sexual attractiveness (Cambra, Klopf, & Oka, 1978). Submissiveness, passivity, and self-restraint are discussed as originating from as well as being congruent with and sustained by Asian cultural norms and values (Chun-Hoon, 1971; Fong, 1973; Sollenberger, 1968; D. Sue, D.W. Sue, and D.M. Sue, 1983; Toupin, 1980; Young, 1972). Minatoya and Sedlacek (1979) found that even Asian-Americans who had minimal contact with other Asian-Americans of their racial group still hold to Asian values and feel more self-conscious and inhibited than their Caucasian peers.

There is contention, however, that the attribute of global nonassertiveness in Asian-Americans is erroneous or perhaps a myth which is perpetuated by judgment according to American standards. Passivity and quietness may be due more to specific situational factors rather than to personality traits (Sue & Morishima, 1982; Tong, 1971). That is, Asian-Americans are assertive in certain situations such as when interacting with Asian-American friends and associates and
less assertive in others such as when interacting with authority figures such as professors. Sue, Ino, & Sue (1983) found that Chinese-American males did as well as their Caucasian-American peers in demonstrating assertiveness in role-play situations and in behavioral measures, regardless of the race of the experimenter. However, there were still highly significant differences on self-report measures consistent with previous studies. The written measures indicated that certain specific situations are responded to with greater submissiveness, greater discomfort, considerable reluctance, anxiety, and less assertiveness by Asian-Americans than Caucasians. These situations usually involve dealing with authority figures including professors, parents, and employers, being with a group of Caucasians, and situations involving seeking help outside of family and friends (Ayabe, 1971; Hwang, 1977; Patterson & Sedlacek, 1979).

Wood and Mallinckrodt (1990) present a compelling rationale for cultural sensitivity in both the assessment and training of assertiveness in Asian-Americans and other ethnic minorities. They discuss how what seems like assertiveness skill deficits may be attributed to a host of variables which include cultural values and experiences of racism. They discuss how assertiveness is usually defined by the dominant White middle-class cultural values which pose significant disadvantages for ethnic minorities trying to cope in the majority society. Thus, ethnic minorities must learn
assertiveness skills valued by the dominant culture in order to interact more effectively with the majority culture. Research findings on how misunderstandings due to cultural differences in communication or values can impair a client's ability to develop trust and rapport with a therapist (D.W. Sue, 1981) are cited as a central reason for cultural sensitivity in the assessment and training of assertiveness skills in ethnic minorities. In other words, it may be necessary for ethnic minorities to learn assertiveness skills along with the underlying dominant cultural values in order to successfully negotiate and interact with the majority culture, but it would be remiss and ineffective to not include and attempt to integrate this with the client's own cultural values.

Comas-Diaz and Duncan (1985) state that the "cultural meaning" of behavior may be an essential "mediator" of assertive behavior. For example, Asian-Americans may express feelings, make difficult requests, and acknowledge and accept compliments less than Caucasian-Americans because of the cultural values of reserve, harmony, and modesty. Asian-Americans may also be less likely to be assertive in public situations because of cultural values of not calling attention to oneself and not "shaming" another. Asian-Americans may sometimes be "put off" at times by Caucasian middle-class norms of assertiveness including spontaneity, confrontation, and openness of expression (Tyson & Wall, 1983). Other cultural values inhibiting assertiveness in Asian-
Americans include the subordination of the individual to the larger group, particularly the family (Hong, 1988), disapproval of an individual who insists on his or her own way (Kaneshige, 1973), and deference to authority figures. Authority figures include instructors, employers, and the family hierarchy which is designated by age, generation, and gender. The primary rule is that the younger submit to the older in the family and secondarily, females submit to males (Ho, 1976). Thus, Asian culture models and rewards nonassertive behaviors and punishes assertive behavior, as defined by American standards (Wood & Mallinckrodt, 1990). However, one cannot assume that Asian culture influences all Asian-Americans similarly or to the same degree. Acculturation and ethnic identity would be useful constructs to examine in determining the level of influence cultural values have on individual Asian-Americans.

Acculturation and Ethnic Identity

The psychological study of acculturation examines and attempts to measure the process and state of an individual's behavior and personality traits changing as a result of continuous first-hand contact between distinct cultural groups; acculturation is the process and state of moving toward adopting more of a dominant culture's values and behaviors (Berry, Kim, & Boski, 1987; Graves, 1967; Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). Ethnic identity, an aspect of social identity, more specifically refers to a part of an individual's self-
concept that derives from his or her knowledge of membership in an ethnic group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership (Phinney, 1992; Tajfel, 1981). Ethnic identity is the degree of adherence to one's culture-of-origin's values and behaviors. Ethnic identity is often used as an antonym, an opposite, to acculturation. Acculturation, as a broad construct, encompasses ethnic identity. Acculturation also more commonly refers to the process while ethnic identity refers to a state within that process.

Berry (1984) has proposed four modes of acculturation: (1) integration, (2) assimilation, (3) separation, and (4) marginalization. Each strategy or modality is shaped by different sets of values around two key issues. First is the value of maintaining culture-of-origin identity and characteristics. Second is the value of maintaining relationships with other groups. Integration affirms both of the above values, while assimilation considers only the maintenance of relationship with other groups and the majority culture as valuable. Separation refers to the exclusive value of maintaining the culture-of-origin identity, and marginalization is the state whereby there is no value of one's culture-of-origin or maintaining relationship with other culture groups.

Members of a group do not experience acculturation in the same way (Berry, Trimble, & Olmeda, 1986) nor do they
experience the same psychological consequences (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987). Acculturated individuals are presumed to be moving toward adopting more of a dominant culture's values and behaviors whether that be assimilative or integrative, that is, excluding or including culture-of-origin values. Individuals with stronger ethnic identity, on the other hand, have maintained culture-of-origin values and behaviors, whether this be integrative or separatist in relation to the dominant culture. Psychological consequences may include feelings of stress and conflict while assimilating or integrating the dominant cultural values, emotional rigidity and stress in maintaining a separatist stance when confronted with the majority culture, and detachment, depression, loss of identity and anti-social behavior with marginalization (not valuing either the native or dominant culture).

Studies of acculturation have explored "acculturative stress" and psychological adjustment of individuals (Abe & Zane, 1990; Graham, 1983; Padilla, Wagatsuma, & Lindholm, 1985; Yu, 1984; Yu & Harburg, 1980), acculturation's correlations with personality variables and behaviors (Gim, Atkinson, & Whiteley, 1990; Leong, 1986; Lin, Inui, Kleinman, & Womack, 1982; Louie, 1980), and comparing different groups' and subgroups' rates of changes due to acculturation (Connors, 1974a, 1974b; Fong, 1965, 1973; Spiro, 1955; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). Acculturative stress refers to individual states and behaviors
that are mildly pathological and disruptive, including psychosomatic symptoms and mental health problems (Berry, 1979). Greater acculturation, regardless of change in ethnic identity, has been correlated with decreased stress in Chinese-American undergraduates in the Midwest (Yu, 1984; Yu & Harburg, 1980). Increased acculturation is associated with less severe psychosocial concerns (based on self-ratings on 24 problems which were evaluated by mental health professionals) in Asian-Americans at a West Coast university (Gim, Atkinson, & Whiteley, 1990). In Japanese and Japanese-American students, Padilla, Wagatsuma, and Lindholm (1985) found that self-esteem and acculturation level were good predictors of stress in all generations with the least acculturated and those of lower self-esteem experiencing the greatest stress. Chinese-American women acculturate much faster than their male counterparts (Louie, 1980), while there are significant generational differences with younger generations being much more acculturated than older generations (Fong, 1965, 1973; Masuda, Matsumoto, & Meredith, 1970).

Differential Treatment, Ethnic Discrimination, and Racism

In regards to differential treatment, racism, and ethnic discrimination, the majority culture may reward nonassertiveness and punish assertiveness in Asian-Americans (Libet & Lewinsohn, 1973; Wood & Mallinckrodt, 1990). Asians may be fearful of being singled out or
stereotyped (Fukuyama & Greenfield, 1983). Asian-Americans, similar to other ethnic minorities, may have been frequently denied opportunities to develop the necessary effective assertiveness skills by the dominant culture such as being able to serve in positions of leadership and management (Caldwell-Colbert & Jenkins, 1982). Comas-Diaz and Duncan (1985) have commented that the interactions between ethnic majority persons and ethnic minorities often involve a more powerful majority figure and a less powerful minority individual. They conclude that the perception and reality of unequal power be addressed in assessing and training assertiveness skills with ethnic minority individuals.

Differential treatment and racism's relationship to ethnic identity and to assertiveness in Asian-Americans has not been systematically researched (Leong, 1986). Current overt manifestations of racism include employment discrimination, educational discrimination, and racially-motivated anti-Asian sentiments and violence. (Hsia, 1988). While 1980 U.S. Census data and beyond (Kan & Liu, 1986) show that Asian-American groups have the highest percentage of college graduates compared to all other ethnic groupings, Asian-Americans' socioeconomic status and earning power have not been commensurate with whites of similar educational levels (Hsia, 1988). There are increased rates of qualified Asian-American students denied admission to prestigious universities and colleges as Asian-American applicants have increased. There
has been controversy over quota limits on Asian American students accepted into select institutions of higher learning (Sue, 1985). The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1986) documents numerous occurrences of physical assault, violence, harassment, and intimidation including the 1982 murder of Vincent Chin in Detroit, Michigan and the 1989 murder of Jim Loo in Raleigh, North Carolina. Both men, without provocation, were mistakenly identified to be members of Asian ethnic groups (Japanese and Vietnamese, respectively) who were feared and hated because of economic and job competition in their communities. Both men were attacked by groups of white males.

The Organization of Chinese-Americans (1984) identified a paradox for Asian-Americans. They state that as Asians become more mainstream and a greater economic force, there is a trend of increased anti-Asian and anti-foreign sentiment due to resentments over the perceived successes, fears of competition, and perceptions that Asian-Americans might not be "real Americans." The historical experiences of racism and discrimination experienced by Asian-Americans within the United States must also be taken into account (Barth, 1964; Hsu, 1953; Kitano, 1969; Kung, 1962; Lee, 1960; Lyman, 1970; Sung, 1967; Tachiki, Wong, Odo, & Wong, 1971).

Previous studies of assertiveness in Asian-Americans have not systematically assessed assertiveness in relationship to acculturation or ethnic identity. While the previous
literature suggests some definite conflict between traditional Asian cultural values and the dominant Western value of assertive thoughts and behaviors, a measure of adherence to Asian cultural values (ethnic identity) has never been included with a measure of assertiveness. Ethnic identity and acculturation have generally been measured limitedly in some of the previous literature by individuals' designation of their ethnic group, their generational level, length of time residing in the United States, and ethnic group(s) preferred for friendship and affiliation. Situations of racism and ethnic discrimination have also not been systematically included in previous studies of assertiveness in Asian-Americans. The study of midwestern populations of Asian-Americans that is inclusive of specific ethnic groups in addition to the more widely studied Chinese and Japanese Americans has also been limited in previous research. Indeed, this study's primary purpose was to explore and empirically substantiate how "cultural meaning" (as measured by ethnic identity) is an essential "mediator" of assertive behavior (Comas-Diaz & Duncan, 1985) in a midwestern sample of Asian-American college students. That is, does acculturation affect and influence assertive behavior in Asian-Americans? This study was also designed to explore the environmental and contextual factors of differential treatment (potential ethnic discrimination and racism experiences) and its relationship to ethnic identity and assertiveness.
This study was purposely designed not to include a comparison sample of Caucasians as has been the case with much of cross-cultural research studying Asian-Americans. This decision was based on the recommendations for cross-cultural research put forth by Sue and Sue (1987). They critique point research, the most frequently used approach, which uses an instrument developed in one culture with members of another culture. They caution against the danger of imposing an emic (culturally specific) measure and using it as it were etic (universally applicable). They express particular concern over reliability and validity not having been established for instruments in use with a new culture. Sue and Sue (1987), instead, recommend the strategies of linear and multimethod models and parallel research. The linear model involves testing construct-originated hypotheses with a series of studies. These multiple studies provide more points of reference to compare cultural groups; if the various studies support the hypotheses, the construct can be considered to be etic and used for cultural comparisons (Zane & Sue, 1986). A multimethod approach uses several modalities of measurement to see if differences occur across the various modalities. If these differences are consistently found and fit theory-generated hypotheses, then "real" differences are said to exist. Parallel research attempts to study a possibly etic concept with an emic approach, that is, studying a construct from within specific cultural viewpoints.
The usual process involves: (a) identifying an etic construct that may have universal status, (b) developing and validating emic methods for assessing the construct for each culture, and (c) making cross-cultural comparisons from the "emically defined etic construct" (Hui & Triandis, 1985). This study attempted to study the presumably etic constructs of assertiveness, acculturation, and discrimination with some emic methods. The assertiveness measure was developed and normed with a primarily Caucasian population, but has been used with ethnic minority populations. The measure has shown good reliability and validity in its use with ethnic minority populations and is a widely-used measure with college-aged populations. The ethnic identity measure and discrimination measure were developed with Asian-Americans and ethnic minorities, respectively. This study attempted to cover a small area in the process of parallel research—that of validating emic means for measuring the constructs of assertiveness, acculturation, and discrimination for the Asian-American culture. This approach moved backward a bit to attempt parallel-type research after most preceding research has involved point, linear, and multimethod approaches.

**Hypotheses**

With the goal of conducting a culturally-sensitive assessment of assertiveness in Asian-Americans, this study had several hypotheses.
Hypothesis 1. Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity (in other words, lower acculturation) will have a lower level of assertiveness than Asian-Americans with a lower ethnic identity (higher acculturation). It is presumed that Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity hold to traditional Asian values more than dominant mainstream American values and therefore, value and practice assertiveness less.

Hypothesis 2. Consistent with previous research, Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity (lower acculturation) will have more difficulty with assertiveness within the specific contexts of dealing with authority figures such as parents and professors than their peers with lower ethnic identity.

Hypothesis 3. Consistent with previous research, Asian-Americans of generational status further removed from the point of immigration will have lower ethnic identity and higher acculturation according to most acculturation models. That is, Asian-Americans who are first generation (immigrants) will have higher ethnic identity than second-generation Asian-Americans (American-born children of immigrants). Also, second-generation Asian-Americans will have higher ethnic identity than third-generation Asian-Americans (Americans born to non-naturalized United States citizens who are themselves the children of immigrants).
Hypothesis 4. Situations of differential treatment (potential ethnic discrimination experiences) will be more often identified and indicated by individuals with lower ethnic identity (higher acculturation) than those with higher ethnic identity. It is unclear whether differential treatment would serve to enhance or inhibit ethnic identity. While the quality and quantity of actual differential treatment experiences may not differ for persons of differing ethnic identity levels, the hypothesis is posed based on the assumption that individuals with lower ethnic identity ascribe more to the mainstream Western values of individual rights and equality and thus, will be more ready to identify situations of prejudice which have violated these values.

Hypothesis 5. Situations of differential treatment will be cited more often by individuals with higher levels of assertiveness than individuals with lower levels of assertiveness. This is based on the assumption that more assertive individuals will be more apt to openly self-disclose about these incidents and are more attentive to and directly responsive to situations which overlook their needs and feelings. It is not assumed persons with differing levels of assertiveness necessarily have more or less actual experiences of differential treatment because of assertiveness.
METHOD

Subjects

A total of 103 volunteer subjects were obtained from mailings and distributions to Asian-American undergraduates from Loyola University of Chicago, University of Illinois in Chicago, and Northwestern University in Evanston. The subjects, drawn primarily from a private Catholic Midwestern university, were mostly from middle- to upper-class socioeconomic backgrounds and had highly educated parents.

Surveys were mailed out and distributed to a total of 462 Asian-American college undergraduates from the three midwestern universities during the summers of 1992 and 1993. The majority of the students were enrolled for summer session classes at Loyola University of Chicago during the Summers of 1992 and 1993 (n = 267). The summer of 1993 mailings (n = 42) were conducted with a random selection from a pool of ninety-one possible subjects (some subjects had been contacted the summer before or were on the list obtained from the Office of Multicultural Affairs), while the summer 1992 mailing was made to all Summer Session I enrollees (n = 225). In addition, mailings were made to Loyola University Asian-American college undergraduates' at their Summer 1993 addresses who had been enrolled sometime in
the Academic Year 1992-1993 (n = 153), a listing obtained from the Office of Multicultural Affairs. Subjects were also recruited from Northwestern University and University of Illinois of Chicago campus Christian student organizations where there were a significant number of Asian-American members. A total of 42 of the surveys were mailed out or distributed to these students at one of their meetings.

The mailings and distributions to the three universities were not conducted in an equivalent fashion. The study was designed to focus on the Loyola University of Chicago Asian-American college undergraduate population, but subjects were also recruited from Northwestern University and University of Illinois at Chicago student groups to increase the sample size.

Procedures

The surveys consisted of twelve pages. These pages included an introductory letter, a demographic questionnaire, an assertiveness instrument, an ethnic identity measure, and a survey of differential treatment experiences. With mailed surveys, there were follow-up reminder postcards between three weeks to two months after the initial mailing date to nonrespondents. For the summer of 1992 mailings, a least two to three months after the first mailing date, a phone call prompt was made to nonrespondents. Surveys were mailed out again at the request of subjects responding to the prompts. To provide further incentive for response, Loyola University summer 1992 survey respondents were eligible for two
twenty-dollar cash prize raffle drawings that were awarded within six months after the initial mailing date. Loyola University summer 1993 survey respondents were eligible for two ten-dollar cash prize raffle drawings also to be awarded within six months after the initial mailing date. While no cash incentives were made to subjects attending the other universities, they were given a short introduction about the main purposes of the study ("to study assertiveness and acculturation in Asian-Americans") and were asked for their assistance in filling out questionnaires. Cover letters included general information about the study, about the confidentiality of the results, the raffle incentive (for Loyola students only), and ways to contact the researcher for further information. All surveys included a postage-paid envelope for the return of the completed questionnaire and a postcard to request research results at the study's completion.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. The demographic questionnaire consisted of 33 items asking for standard demographic information such as age, gender, marital status, family size, year in school, major, and grade point average. In addition, the questionnaire involved ethnic identity-sensitive questions such as the birthplace of the subject and the subject's parents, citizenship/immigration history of family, reasons for immigration (if applicable), current living arrangements, primary languages spoken and written, and the
ethnic backgrounds of the people the subject interacted the most with at work, school, and while socializing. The demographic questionnaire for the sample collected in the summer of 1993 included an additional qualitative question: "What is your ethnic identity? (How do you see yourself)" The Demographic Questionnaire is titled as "Part 1: Information about You" and is presented in Appendix A.

**College Self-Expression Scale (CSES).** The CSES is a reliable and valid measure of assertiveness in college populations (Galassi & Galassi, 1974 1979, 1980; Gough & Heilbrun, 1965). The CSES has been shown to have test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from 0.89 to 0.90 in several samples (Galassi et al., 1974). Gough and Heilbrun (1965) found the CSES correlated positively with a number of scales on the 24 scale Adjective Check List (ACL). These scales included defensiveness, favorable, self-confidence, achievement, dominance, exhibition, autonomy, and change. The CSES also showed significant negative correlations with ACL scales of unfavorable, succorance, abasement, deference, and counseling readiness. The scale of aggression was not significantly related to CSES responses; this is particularly important as this distinguishes assertiveness from aggressiveness. It was also found that there was a low but significant correlation (.19, p < .04) between 121 student teacher subjects' CSES scores and their immediate supervisors'
behavioral ratings of their in-classroom assertiveness. This lends support for CSES's concurrent validity.

Factor analyses support that the CSES assesses situational and specific components of assertiveness rather than a unilateral personality trait (Galassi & Galassi, 1979). There is evidence that the CSES has some cross-cultural applicability (Kipper & Jaffe, 1970).

The CSES (Galassi, Delo, Galassi, & Bashien, 1974) was adapted and expanded to address cultural contexts such as dealing with members of the dominant ethnic group, other ethnic groups, or one's own ethnic group. The CSES was designed specifically to measure assertiveness in college students. It is a 50-item self-report measure using a five-point Likert scale (0-4) with 21 positively worded items and 29 negatively worded items. The scale measures positive assertions, negative assertions, and self-denial. Positive assertions include expressing feelings of "love, affection, admiration, approval, and agreement." Negative assertions consist of expressing "justified feelings of anger, disagreement, dissatisfaction, and annoyance." Self-denial refers to overapologizing, great interpersonal anxiety, and inflated concern for others' feelings. The CSES also examines a subject's level of assertiveness with a variety of people who differ in degree of familiarity, relationship to the subject, and in relative power—strangers, authority figures, business associates, family members, and like- and opposite-gender
peers. By summing up all positively worded items and reverse scoring and summing all negatively worded items, a total score can be obtained. Low scores indicate a generalized nonassertive response pattern. The CSES is titled "Part 2: Self-Expression Survey" and is shown in Appendix B.

**Ethnic Identification Questionnaire (EIQ).** The measure of acculturation or more specifically, ethnic identity, is an adaptation of Gerald Meredith's Ethnic Identification Questionnaire (EIQ) originally developed for use with Japanese-Americans to measure generational differences (Meredith, 1967). The EIQ consists of 50 items where the respondent could agree or disagree on a five-point scale. The items include preferences for a variety of cultural values, behaviors, beliefs, items, and activities. For example, items ask about family relationships, beliefs about discrimination, food and entertainment preferences, view of personality characteristics such as spontaneity, child-rearing customs and philosophy, community social relationships, cultural heritage, sex roles, and interracial attitudes. Highest ethnicity (that is a high identification with one's culture-of-origin) for an item is given a score of 5; the lowest, 1. The total ethnic identification score for an individual is the sum of the scores on the 50 items which can range from 50 to 250. Higher scores indicate stronger ethnic identification.

The EIQ was used to evaluate the acculturation of Japanese-Americans in the United States and was based on
the premise that the more acculturated into the American mainstream an individual was, he/she would show less Japanese traits. Initial use of the EIQ found that it could significantly distinguish second and third-generation Japanese-Americans in that the third-generation Japanese-Americans sampled had significantly lower EIQ scores than second-generation Japanese-Americans (Meredith, 1967). Various researchers have used the EIQ as a measure of acculturation with college student and adult groups (Conner, 1967; Masuda, Matsumoto & Meredith, 1970; Matsumoto, Meredith, & Masuda, 1970; Newton, Buck, Kunimura, Colfer, & Scholsberg, 1988; Oana, 1981). In fact, Newton et al. (1988) assert that the attitudes and behaviors assessed by the EIQ are similar for many Asian groups living in Hawaii. The EIQ has been used with populations in Hawaii and Washington state and could be used with a wider Asian population living in the United States.

Oana (1981) found the test-retest reliability of the EIQ to be .92 with a lapse time of one week. The EIQ's validity has not been studied as widely. There exist few reliable and valid measures of acculturation and ethnic identity for Asian-Americans (Leong, 1986). The other measure similar to the EIQ is the 21-item multiple choice Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) which inquires about friendship choice, language, behaviors, generation, geographic history, and attitudes (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil,
1987) which is less comprehensive a measure in exploring cultural values and beliefs than the EIQ although both measures have comparable psychometric merit. Phinney's Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) is a 23-item instrument assessing other-group orientation, ethnic self-identification, an individual's ethnicity and that of each parent, and attitudes and attachment toward one's ethnic group(s) in adolescents and young adults (Phinney, 1992). The MEIM items, while exploring interest in, value of, knowledge of, and practice of cultural customs and activities in one's ethnic group in a general sense, do not inquire about specifics relevant to Asian-American culture that the EIQ does. Thus, the EIQ was chosen for use in this study.

It is acknowledged in the literature that the measurement of acculturation is problematic. Studies have typically used indices such as generation, place of birth (foreign or American-born), self-identification of ethnicity, ability to speak an ethnic language, and ethnicity of one's friends (Leong, 1986). Quantifying acculturation along multiple dimensions has been more promising an approach than generating arbitrary group or generational typologies (Olmedo, 1979). The major dimension emerging from factor analytic studies about the multidimensional process of acculturation is language proficiency, preference, or use. Closely related are items that measure differential knowledge and behavior in the other presumedly dominant culture such
as tradition, customs, cultural identification, and preference.
A second dimension which is less clearcut and more complex,
appears to involve culture-specific value orientations and
attitudes. This dimension measures the extent to which an
individual affiliates with their original culture and adheres to
its traditional values, especially in regard to family roles and
structures. The third dimension is socioeconomic status which
is related to educational level and occupational status. All of
the dimensions, as discussed by Olmedo (1979) are relatively
independent of each other. This is highly supportive of a
measure like the EIQ which contains items encompassing the
first two dimensions. The demographic questionnaire attends
to items not addressed by the EIQ such as socioeconomic
status.

One salient limitation of the EIQ and indeed, all other
acculturation measures thus far developed, is that it is easily
assumed that high ethnic identity and low ethnic identity
necessarily mean low acculturation and high acculturation,
respectively (Meredith, 1967). Ethnic identity and
acculturation into the dominant culture are quantified and
measured as if they are on one continuum and as if they are
bipolar ends of a single dimension. Mendoza (1984) has
labelled this a "monocultural approach" which looks at the
process of acquiring the customs of the dominant society as
opposed to a multicultural approach where the process of
incorporating customs from the dominant and original culture
is examined. He argues against a single acculturative score. Berry's (1980) model, and indeed, other models of acculturation assert that orientation toward the culture-of-origin and orientation toward the dominant culture are two independent continua. If these two orientations can be teased out from existing measures, there would be a methodology for quantifiably classifying individuals by different modalities of acculturation—assimilation, integration, separatism, and marginalization. However, this is beyond the purpose of this current study. The revised EIQ which is titled "Part 3: Opinion Survey" is in Appendix C.

**Ethnic and Cultural Diversity among College Students Survey.** The measure of differential treatment experiences and responses used was an abbreviated version of a preliminary Ethnic and Cultural Diversity Among College Students survey developed by Yolanda Suarez-Balcazar of Loyola University of Chicago that is in the pioneering and development stages. The survey's purpose was to assess the experiences of differential treatment among college students of various ethnic backgrounds. This survey was developed using the behavioral-analytic model of situational analysis proposed by Goldfried and D'Zurilla (1969). This survey was developed through consultation with university faculty, administrators, and other staff who have a high degree of personal contact with college students at Loyola University of Chicago and from extensive interviews with ethnic minority
students. It has not yet been validated. It has been used with students across all ethnic groups.

The abbreviated version of this survey poses five hypothetical situations students might encounter. These situations include being overlooked in receiving service from a college office receptionist, receiving a compliment from a non-minority classmate on how well one speaks English (assuming one is foreign), being called on by a professor to comment and represent the opinions of one's entire ethnic group, facing hostility at a party where other partygoers believe that people from one's ethnic background have been taking jobs away from these partygoers' friends and relatives, and hiding an interracial dating relationship from parents. Summer of 1993 mailings to which 49 subjects responded included two additional hypothetical situations of interest and a section at the end asking open-ended questions about experiences of discrimination and communication around these experiences with parents. These two additional hypothetical situations included being assumed to be a "foreigner" and not a legitimate American and one's distinctive Asian group being viewed as "the same" as all other Asian ethnic groups. For all the hypothetical situations, students are asked to respond to questions on how often they have experienced a similar situation, the extent to which they would find this situation personally offensive, and to what extent do they think ethnic discrimination was being manifested by the situation. The
abbreviated survey titled "Part 4: College Situation Survey" is shown in Appendix D.

Data Analyses

The data were analyzed in several ways. First, chi square tests of contingency, Pearson correlations, unpaired one-tailed and two-tailed t-tests, one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVA) were used to test differences between general assertiveness attributable to subjects' gender, ethnic group, other demographic features, ethnic identity and differential treatment. Significant ANOVAs were further explored with protected t-tests such as the Fisher protected least significant difference (PLSD) and post hoc comparisons such as the Scheffe F-test. Two-way ANOVAs were conducted to explore any interaction effects.

Second, unpaired one- and two-tailed t-tests, Pearson correlations, chi square tests of contingency, one-factor analyses of variance (ANOVA) with appropriate follow-up with protected t-tests and post-hoc comparisons were used to test differences in ethnic identity that might be attributed to subjects' assertiveness level, ethnic discrimination, ethnicity of social group, gender, and other demographic variables. Two-way ANOVAs investigated the possibility of any interaction effects.

Assertiveness scores were divided at the median to develop a high assertiveness group and a low assertiveness group. Further, ethnic identity scores were divided at the
median to develop a high ethnic identity (low acculturation) group and low ethnic identity (high acculturation) group.

Specific assertiveness items were grouped and individual and added scores were used to analyze and explore three specific assertiveness situations: (1) assertiveness with parents and professors (six items), (2) assertiveness in speaking up in class (two items), and (3) assertiveness when teased about ethnicity (one item).

Because only 49 of the 103 subjects had access to the two additional discrimination scenarios (added in summer 1993 surveys), a total score of frequency of the original five differential treatment scenarios (on both 1992 and 1993 surveys) happening was used as a measure of frequency of reported racism experiences encountered. Individual item analyses of the differential treatment survey was used in order to more closely examine the specific situations and experiences of discrimination encountered by subjects. Analyses were run, therefore, with individual item scores (primarily frequency of encounter items) and the sum of frequency of the five original scenarios. Degree of personal offense felt by subjects about the various scenarios and the extent to which subjects felt the scenarios represented discriminatory practices were explored with descriptive statistics.

In addition to investigating the specific hypotheses of the study, gender and ethnicity (membership in specific
Asian-American ethnic groups) were examined in relationship to assertiveness as well as acculturation. The background literature states that specific contextual factors, such as gender and culture, are important in assessing assertiveness.

The qualitative data from the open-ended discrimination questions presented on the 1993 surveys (respondent n = 49) were examined and tabulated as more descriptive data.
RESULTS

Descriptive Profile of Subjects

The total response rate was 22.8%. Seven of the respondents attended the University of Illinois in Chicago, while six of the respondents attended Northwestern University. The rest of the respondents were Loyola University students.

The subjects ranged in age from 16 to 33 with a mean age of 20.13 years and a modal age of 20 years. There were 37 male respondents and 66 female respondents. The mean annual family incomes of respondents fell in the $35,001 to $50,000 while the modal annual family incomes were over $50,000 consisting of 55.7% of the respondents. The mean grade point average was 3.14 on a 4 point scale. Respondents' year in college were pretty evenly distributed among the sophomore, junior, and senior years (n = 33 for each group), while only three freshmen were represented in this sample. The respondents represented at least twenty-four diverse majors with the most popular being biology (n = 27), psychology (n = 15), and accounting, finance, and math (n = 9). Virtually all of the respondents (n = 100) were single, while two were married, and one listed their marital status as other. 42.72 % of the subjects were born in the United States,
followed by: 13.6% born in Korea; 11.65% born in the
Philippines, 6.8% born in India, 6.8% born in Pakistan, 3.9% born in Taiwan, and the rest born in other Asian, Middle-Eastern, and other countries. Modal birthplaces for parents were the Philippines (30.4%) followed by India (19.5%) and Korea (14.4%). The rest of the parents were born in a variety of Asian and other countries including China and Pakistan. Only two fathers and three mothers were born in the United States. Subjects' modal spoken language was English (89.32%) with nine other Asian languages representing the remaining 10.68%. Primary written language for subjects was English (94.2%) with five Asian languages listed by the remaining 5.8%. Primary reasons for subjects' families immigrating to the United States had to do with a combination of economic and educational reasons (63.7%). Subjects' fathers' educational levels were most concentrated with bachelor's degrees (42.7%) and master's/professional degrees (27.1%) followed by some college or trade school (10.42%), and high school degrees (8.3%). The rest of the fathers completed Master's degrees (7.3%), some high school (3.13%), or completed only grammar school (1.05%). Subjects' mothers' educational levels were also heavily concentrated with bachelor's degrees (45.92%) and master's/professional degrees (22.5%) followed by high school degrees (17.35%) and some college or trade school (10.2%). The remainder of mothers completed some or all of grammar school or some high school (4.03%). Subjects' fathers were
most often in professional occupations (68.1%) followed by 16% self-employed and 9.6% doing skilled work. The rest of the fathers (6.3%) worked in either white-collar positions, unskilled positions, or were unemployed. Similarly, mothers of subjects were professionals (44.9%) followed by 22.5% working as full-time homemakers, 14.3% in white-collar positions, and 11.2% self-employed. The other mothers (7.1%) were doing skilled or unskilled work.

In terms of distribution by ethnic group, the study is somewhat representative of the population distribution in the United States. The two largest Asian ethnic groups in the United States, the Filipinos (27.2% of this sample) and the Chinese (12.6% of this sample), are well represented in this study. However, there was minimal representation of the third largest Asian ethnic group, the Japanese (3.9% of this sample). Experts predict that within 25 years, the Filipinos will be the largest group (as is the case with this study), followed by the Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese, Asian Indians, and Japanese in that order (Doerner, 1985; Sue and Sue, 1990). Our subjects were distributed according to ethnicity from the largest group to smallest as follows: Filipino (27.2%), Asian Indian (20.2%), Korean (16.5%), Chinese (12.6%), Other (Middle-Eastern backgrounds, primarily--8.8%), Mixed (of multi-racial background--7.8%), Japanese (3.9%), Vietnamese (2%), and Thai (1%).
Relationship between Assertiveness and Ethnic Identity

The distribution of high and low assertiveness scores by high and low ethnic identity scores is summarized in Table 1. The high and low scores of assertiveness and ethnic identity were demarcated by the mean score obtained. A chi-square contingency test was used to analyze the relationship between ethnic identity (a term to be used almost as an antonym to acculturation) and assertiveness. The results indicate that these two variables are significantly related, $X^2 (1, N = 103) = 9.356, p < .005$, consistent with predictions in Hypothesis 1 that ethnic identity and assertiveness are related in that high ethnic identity is associated with less assertiveness.

Further, a significant correlation in a negative direction was found between ethnic identity and assertiveness, $r(101) = -.397, p < .01$. In other words, lower ethnic identity scores (or higher acculturation) were associated with higher assertiveness scores. Unpaired one-tailed $t$-tests were conducted to explore this correlation further. The low and high ethnic identity groups significantly differed from each other on their scores of assertiveness, $t(101) = 3.999, p < .001$. Subjects with lower ethnic identity or higher acculturation had significantly higher assertiveness scores ($M = 140.226, SD = 22.284$) than their counterparts with higher ethnic identity or lower acculturation ($M = 122.42, SD = 22.903$). These results are consistent with the prediction in Hypothesis 1 that Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity would hold to
### Table 1

**Distribution of Assertiveness Level by Ethnic Identity Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Identity Level</th>
<th>Assertiveness Level</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: High and Low categories of assertiveness and ethnic identity were determined by mean splits on the Ethnic Identity Questionnaire and the College Self-Expression Scale.
traditional Asian values more so than dominant mainstream American values and therefore, value and practice assertiveness less.

Additionally, the more assertive subjects had significantly lower ethnic identity scores ($M = 136.078$, $SD = 13.547$) than their less assertive peers ($M = 144.885$, $SD = 16.077$), $t(101) = 3.003$, $p < .005$.

Relationship between Assertiveness with Authority Figures and Ethnic Identity

Subjects with high ethnic identity and lower acculturation reported that they assert themselves significantly less with authority figures including parents and professors ($M = 14.8$, $SD = 4.036$) than their counterparts with low ethnic identity and higher acculturation ($M = 17.189$, $SD = 4.211$), $t(101) = 2.936$, $p < .005$. This finding is consistent with the prediction in Hypothesis 2 which states that, in accord with previous research results, Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity will have more difficulty in assertiveness with authority figures of parents and professors than their peers with lower ethnic identity.

Relationship between Generational Status and Ethnic Identity

Hypothesis 3 which states that generations further removed from the point of immigration will have lower ethnic identity was partially supported by the results. First generation subjects had significantly higher ethnic identity scores ($M = 142.66$, $SD = 14.766$) than second generation
subjects \( (M = 136.571, SD = 15.852), t (93) = 1.932, p < .05 \).

First generation refers to those who have immigrated to the United States. Second generation designates those who were born in the United States to immigrants. The third generation, not included in the analyses because there was only one subject that fell in this category, are those who were born to non-naturalized Americans who themselves were children of immigrants. Those who have immigrated tended to have higher ethnic identity scores (and lower acculturation) than their peers who have been American-born. The other category of generation \( (n = 7) \), also not included in the analyses, consisted of several individuals who were born in Asia and adopted as infants or young children by American Caucasians, individuals who immigrated to the United States with their parents, and one individual who was born abroad and lived abroad as an American citizen.

**Relationship between Differential Treatment and Ethnic Identity**

Contradicting Hypothesis 4, individuals with higher ethnic identity and lower acculturation cited experiencing more differential treatment \( (M = 10.1, SD = 4.027) \) than those with lower ethnic identity and higher acculturation \( (M = 8.509, SD = 3.662), t (101) = -2.099, p < .05 \). Exploring this finding further, it was found that two out of the seven differential treatment situations were encountered more frequently by students with high ethnic identity than those
with low ethnic identity. First, high ethnic identity scorers said they were more often told by a non-minority classmate that their English-speaking ability was impressive and surpassed this classmate's usual expectations of their ethnic group, \( (M = 2.34, \text{SD} = 1.533) \) than low ethnic identity scorers \( (M = 1.755, \text{SD} = 1.299) \), \( t(101) = -2.094, p < .05 \). Second, those with higher ethnic identity cited that they were more often being looked to by professors in classes as experts, representatives and spokespersons for their entire ethnic groups, despite any classroom emphasis on not generalizing \( (M = 2.64, \text{SD} = 1.382) \) than those with lower ethnic identity \( (M = 2.057, \text{SD} = 1.2) \), \( t(101) = -2.292, p < .05 \).

**Relationship between Differential Treatment and Assertiveness**

The more assertive subjects did not report experiencing significantly more or less differential treatment situations \( (M = 9.039, \text{SD} = 3.666) \) than the less assertive subjects \( (M = 9.519, \text{SD} = 4.151) \), \( t(101) = .622, p > .10 \), thereby not supporting Hypothesis 5. However, in viewing the various differential treatment scenarios, it was found that more assertive subjects indicated that they experienced significantly less of one particular situation than less assertive subjects. More assertive subjects were less often met with hostility by other party guests at a party due to negative perceptions of their ethnic groups (such as feeling their ethnic group had taken away many jobs from friends and relatives of
the hostile party attenders) \((M = 1.098, SD = .3)\) than less assertive subjects \((M = 1.423, SD = 1.036), t (101) = 2.154, p < .05.\)

A number of interesting findings were obtained which were not directly related to the hypotheses. The background literature states that specific contextual factors, such as gender and culture, are important in assessing assertiveness. As a result, gender and ethnicity were examined in relationship to assertiveness as well as acculturation.

**Relationship between Gender and Assertiveness**

Analyses were conducted to explore the relationship of gender with some of the different variables. Female subjects scored significantly higher on assertiveness \((M = 134.576, SD = 25.154)\) than male subjects \((M = 126.243, SD = 21.672), t (101) = -1.693, p < .05.\) Some analysis of selected assertiveness items found that females reported more assertiveness in situations where they are teased about their ethnic background \((M = 3.234, SD = 1.035)\) than males \((M = 2.595, SD = 1.279), t (101) = -2.742, p < .01.\)

**Relationship between Gender and Ethnic Identity**

Male \((M = 143.595, SD = 15.561)\) and female respondents \((M = 138.803, SD = 15.238)\) did not significantly differ on their ethnic identity scores, \(t (101) = 1.52, p > .05.\) To explore the possibility of any interactive effects, a two-factor analysis of variance of assertiveness due to the independent variables of gender and ethnic identity was conducted.
yielding no significant interactive effect of gender and ethnic identity on assertiveness, \( F (1, 99) = .487, p > .05. \)

**Relationship between Specific Assertiveness Situations and Ethnic Identity**

In exploring the relationship of various assertiveness items in relation to ethnic identity, low ethnic identity scorers or those who are more acculturated reported greater assertiveness in situations where they are teased about their ethnic background (\( M = 3.235, SD = 1.031 \)) than high ethnic identity scorers or those who are less acculturated (\( M = 2.76, SD = 1.255 \)), \( t (101) = 2.082, p < .05. \)

**Relationship between Ethnicity and Ethnic Identity**

Given the wide number of specific ethnic Asian groups represented in this sample, ethnicity's relationship with other variables was examined. Ethnic identity was found to significantly vary due to ethnicity, \( F (4, 98) = 3.526, p < .01. \) The mean ethnic identity scores for each of the ethnic group categories are summarized in Table 2. Protected t-tests or Fisher PLSDs and in some cases, Scheffe F-tests were conducted to explore the differences between pairs of ethnic groups. Significant results are designated in Table 2 by common subscripts. Filipinos scored significantly lower on ethnic identity than the other Asian ethnic groups: Chinese, Eastern Indians, Koreans, and Asians in the Other category. The Other category was comprised of a mix of Thai,
Table 2

**Ethnic Identity as a Function of Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Ethnic Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or Taiwanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>144.077a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>131.929abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>145.952b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>141.118c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>143.458d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly at $p < .05$. 
Vietnamese, Japanese, and Middle-Eastern ethnic groups with too few subjects in each of these groups to include separately in the analysis. Thus, Filipinos had significantly higher acculturation than many of the other Asian ethnic groups.

**Relationship between Ethnicity and Assertiveness**

Assertiveness was not found to vary significantly due to ethnicity, $F (4, 98) = 1.783, p > .10$. The mean assertiveness scores by specific ethnic group is summarized in Table 3. Fisher PLSDs were conducted to compare the different ethnic groups with each other on assertiveness. Significant results are summarized in Table 3 by common subscript. The Filipinos were significantly more assertive than the Chinese, while the Filipinos were significantly less assertive than the Other category of Asian groups (Thai, Vietnamese, Japanese, and Middle-Eastern).

**Relationship between Social Group Interactions and Ethnic Identity**

Ethnic identity was found to have a significant relationship with a number of other variables. Ethnic identity was found to vary by which groups of people subjects reported they socially interacted with most, $F (2, 100) = 10.669, p < .001$. The results are summarized in Table 4. On protected $t$-tests and post-hoc comparisons conducted to compare the groups with each other on ethnic identity, the Fisher PLSD and Scheffe F-tests were found to be significant.
Table 3

Mean Scores of Assertiveness by Ethnic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Assertiveness Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or Taiwanese</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>124.462a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>140.929ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>132.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>128.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>126.167b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means sharing a common subscript differ significantly at $p < .05$. 
### Table 4

**Ethnic Identity and Social Interactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups Most Socializes With</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian groups</td>
<td>149.844ab</td>
<td>9.811</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse ethnic groups</td>
<td>137.625a</td>
<td>14.946</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian groups</td>
<td>133.609b</td>
<td>17.304</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means sharing common subscripts differ significantly at \( p < .05 \).
with two pairings. First, those who socially interacted most with Asians \((n = 32, M = 149.844, SD = 9.811)\) had higher ethnic identity than those who interacted in social contexts mostly with Caucasians \((n = 23, M = 133.609, SD = 17.304), t(53) = 7.684, p < .05, \(and F(2,100) = 8.787, p < .05\). Second, those who interacted most with Asians also had higher ethnic identity than those who interacted socially most with a diversity of ethnic groups including Caucasian, Asian, African, Hispanic, and others \((n = 48, M = 137.625, SD = 14.946), t(78) = 6.415, p < .05, \(and F(2, 100) = 7.141, p < .05\). These results are designated by subscript in Table 4.

### Relationship between Campus Group Interactions and Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity was also found to significantly vary by which ethnic groups respondents said they most interact with on their college campus, \(F(3, 99) = 7.21, p < .001\). These results are summarized in Table 5. Protected t-tests (Fisher PLSD) and post-hoc comparisons (Scheffe F-test) yielded some significant differences between groups. First, those who interacted on campus mostly with Asians \((n = 31, M = 150.097, SD = 10.675)\) had a higher ethnic identity than those who interacted on campus mostly with Caucasians \((n = 21, M = 133.381, SD = 17.738), t(50) = 7.969, p < .05, \(and F(3, 99) = 5.776, p < .05\). Second, those who interacted on campus mostly with Asians had a higher ethnic identity than those who
### Table 5

**Ethnic Identity and Campus Interactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group(s) Most Interacts With On Campus</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian groups</td>
<td>150.097ab</td>
<td>10.675</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse ethnic groups</td>
<td>137.76a</td>
<td>14.481</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian groups</td>
<td>133.381b</td>
<td>17.738</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means sharing common subscripts differ significantly at p < .05.
reported that they interacted mostly with a diversity of ethnic
groups on campus (n = 50, M = 137.76, SD = 14.481), t (79) =
6.446, p < .05, and F (3, 99) = 4.809, p < .05. These results are
designated by subscript in Table 5.

Relationship between Grade Point Average and Ethnic Identity

Ethnic identity was also correlated with grade point
average of respondents, r(102) = .291, p < .01. Higher ethnic
identity was associated with higher grade point averages.

Relationship between Mother's Education and Ethnic Identity

While ethnic identity did not vary significantly by the
educational background of subjects' mothers, the Fisher PLSD
found that subjects whose mothers completed only high school
(n = 17, M = 146.941, SD = 15.578) had significantly higher
ethnic identity scores than those subjects whose mothers had
completed a professional education (n = 16, M = 135.312, SD =
16.839), t(31) = 10.718, p < .05.

Relationship between Mother's Education and Assertiveness

Assertiveness did not vary significantly by the
educational background of subjects' mothers, but subjects
whose mothers completed some college short of a Bachelor's
degree or a trade school (n = 10, M = 118.5, SD = 23.562) were
significantly less assertive than subjects whose mothers
received Bachelor's degrees but not any more advanced
degrees (n = 45, M = 136.067, SD = 22.208), t(53) = 16.9, p <
.05.
DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest that cultural values or ethnic identity influence assertive behavior in Asian-Americans. Further, this study also suggests that various contextual factors such as generational status, differential treatment experiences, gender, ethnicity, and ethnic group preferences for social interactions have a relationship with ethnic identity and/or assertiveness. Several hypotheses discussed earlier were supported.

The results indicate support for Hypothesis 1; Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity (lower acculturation) do have a lower level of assertiveness than Asian-Americans with a lower ethnic identity (higher acculturation) on the measures used in this study. This supports the underlying assumption that Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity, while ascribing to traditional Asian values more so than dominant mainstream American values, may very well value and practice assertiveness less. These results lend empirical validation to "cultural meaning" being an essential mediator of assertiveness (Comas-Diaz & Duncan, 1985). In other words, cultural values do affect and influence assertiveness in Asian-Americans. It is important to note that the high and low
categories of ethnic identity and assertiveness were determined by mean splits on these measures and not absolute scores which has been the precedent with previous research. The mean assertiveness score in this Asian-American sample were higher than mean scores received by Asian-American and Caucasian undergraduates at a large Pacific Northwest landgrant university in another study using the College Self-Expresssion Scale (Fukuyama & Greenfield, 1983).

Consistent with previous research, support for Hypothesis 2 was suggested by the results. Asian-Americans with higher ethnic identity (lower acculturation) reported they asserted themselves less with the authority figures of parents and professors. This was assumed to be due to the Asian cultural value of honor and respect toward authority figures (especially parents and teachers) as well as the value of deference and silence as gestures of respect toward these figures (Ho, 1976).

The results are supportive of the prediction in Hypothesis 3 and consistent with previous findings (Fong, 1965, 1973; Masuda et al., 1970) that ethnic identity decreases as the generation from the point of immigration increases. Thus, first generation (those who have immigrated to the United States) have the highest ethnic identity compared with the second generation (children of immigrants). There was only one third generation subject.
While this result is not widely interpretable, it is consistent with the predicted trend. Each generation further removed from the point of immigration becomes more acculturated (lower ethnic identity).

However, the relationship between generational level and ethnic identity cannot be oversimplified. Most notable is the presence of the "other" category of generation--Asians adopted at young ages by American Caucasians, individuals who immigrated at the same time as their parents (sometimes known as the '1.5 generation), and one individual who was born and lived abroad as an American citizen. While the "other" category is quite diverse, it includes individuals who were all born abroad, similar to the first generation group. The "other" group may well include individuals who have faced a greater environmental and cultural change at early age than second or first generation individuals. While the number of subjects in this group did not allow for inclusion with the analyses, the presence of this group poses a challenge to a simplistic view of generational differences.

Hypothesis 4 was contraindicated by the results. Situations of differential treatment were identified and cited more frequently by individuals with higher ethnic identity (lower acculturation) than those with lower ethnic identity. This finding was exactly opposite of what had been predicted. The original rationale was that individuals with lower ethnic identity, in ascribing to more of the mainstream Western
values of individual rights and equality, might be more inclined to readily identify experiences of differential treatment which may have violated these rights and values than their peers with high ethnic identity. This rationale was not supported by the results. While the hypothesis did not make a specific prediction of actual differential treatment experiences, the finding may be interpreted in several non-mutually exclusive ways. First, individuals with higher ethnic identity or lower acculturation may actually experience significantly more experiences of differential treatment. This may be because of their ascribing more to their traditional ethnic values and practices which may be viewed unfavorably by those who perpetrate insensitive, discriminatory behavior. This departure from mainstream American values may be threatening to or disliked by others. Individuals with higher ethnic identity may have less facility with such acculturation-relevant skills such as language and attention to social nuances which may be met with less patience, greater misunderstanding, and prejudicial behavior. Having less facility with some of these skills may mean the individual becomes more of a "target"; that is, there is less opportunity for the individual to get to know others and to be known on a deeper, more encompassing way by others across racial barriers. Second, individuals with higher ethnic identity may be more cognizant of differential treatment experiences than those with lower ethnic identity. This may be due to
increased social consciousness and pride about their ethnic background by those with high ethnic identity. A third possibility is that individuals with higher ethnic identity may perceive cultural differences as negative events, in and of themselves.

The additional finding that high ethnic identity scorers encountered two particular differential treatment experiences significantly more often than low identity scorers help to illustrate the above result. High ethnic identity scorers compared to low ethnic identity scorers were more often told by non-minority classmates that their English-speaking abilities were impressive and superior to their classmates' expectations and usual experiences with other Asian-Americans. Those with high ethnic identity compared to those with low ethnic identity also stated they were more frequently being looked to by professors in classes as experts and spokespersons for their entire ethnic groups. Perceptions of one's English language expressive skills and one's ethnic and cultural expertise and "ambassadorship", then, have been more salient and frequent an issue for those with high ethnic identity compared to those with low ethnic identity.

Hypothesis 5 was not suggested by the results which found that more assertive subjects did not report significantly more or less personal differential treatment experiences than those who were less assertive. This does not support the underlying assumption that more assertive individuals would
be more likely to self-disclose about differential treatment incidents and would be more apt to identify and respond to situations which overlook their needs and feelings. While no prediction was made regarding whether more or less discrimination would be experienced due to subjects' level of assertiveness, there was an interesting finding. The more assertive subjects experienced significantly less of one of the differential treatment situations compared with less assertive subjects; that is, high assertiveness scorers were less frequently met with hostility at a party due to negative perceptions of their ethnic group by other party guests. This scenario is the most overtly unfriendly, hostile, and closest to a hate-based situation out of the seven scenarios. The other scenarios tended to deal with being ignored and/or being misperceived in terms of competence, representation of one's ethnic group, one's "foreignness", and one being "all the same" as other Asian-Americans.

Specific contextual factors such as gender and culture, which includes ethnicity, were cited as important in assessing assertiveness (Chiauzzi et al., 1982; Comas-Diaz & Duncan, 1985; Fukuyama & Greenfield, 1982; D. Sue et al., 1983; Wood & Mallinckrodt, 1990). Female subjects scored significantly higher on assertiveness than male subjects in this study which stands contrary to the cultural assumption that females would defer more than males given their traditional role status below men in Asian culture. The finding also runs contrary to
assumptions based on mainstream American culture and socialization. However, Galassi and Galassi (1979), when they compared the factor structure of the College Self-Expression Scale across sex and population (different college environments and courses of study) found that sex differences influenced the factor structure less than population differences. This would indicate looking more closely at other demographic characteristics and effects on assertiveness to inform this gender-related significant finding. Indeed, the data analyses show a more powerful effect and relationship between ethnic identity and assertiveness where probabilities ranged from less than .01 to less than .001 than between gender and assertiveness where the probability was less than .05. So, then, it may very well be than certain demographic characteristics about the female and male population contributed to this finding above and beyond one's designation of gender. Caution must be exercised in interpreting this result given the unequal sample sizes; the female population is nearly twice that of the male population in this study. The fact that the finding does contradict cultural assumptions in American and Asian milieus is nonetheless striking. Also, females, compared to males, reported more assertiveness in situations where they are teased about their ethnic background. These findings, if viewed as looking at verbal ability and social expression skills, are consistent with the widespread finding that usually, if there is a sex
difference in verbal abilities, it is in favor of the female (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974).

When assertiveness items were looked at more closely, low ethnic identity scorers were more assertive in situations where they are teased about their ethnic background than high ethnic identity scorers or those who are less acculturated. This would be consistent with the rationale that those with low ethnic identity or higher acculturation are more aware of and possibly more practiced in defending their individual rights from violations.

Ethnic identity was found to significantly vary due to ethnicity. Generalizations cannot be made about specific Asian ethnic groups because of unequal group sizes. For example, the Filipinos who had the lowest ethnic identity of all the groups was also the largest group in this study. Also, the "other" ethnic grouping is comprised of very diverse groups including Middle-Eastern, Thai, Japanese, and Vietnamese. However, it does highlight the variability among the different Asian ethnic groups and argue against wide generalizations of Asians and Asian-Americans as a whole in terms of ethnic identity, assertiveness, and other concepts.

Ethnic identity, as a concept, was found to be strongly related to which ethnic groups subjects said they most interacted with on their college campus and in social contexts. Generally, those who interacted mostly with Asians in both these contexts had higher ethnic identities than those who
mostly interacted with Caucasians or those who mostly interacted with a diversity of ethnic groups including Caucasians, Asians, Africans, Hispanics, and others. It is of no surprise, then, that most measures of ethnic identity and acculturation include ethnicity of one's friends as one of the important items (Leong, 1986; Meredith, 1967; Olmedo, 1979; Phinney, 1992; Suinn et al., 1987). The above findings are consistent with Olmedo's research (1979) which found that a second dimension after language in the composition of ethnic identity is differential cultural knowledge and behavior including social preference.

The other findings are also somewhat consistent with Olmedo's work (1979) which found that the third dimension in ethnic identity is socioeconomic status which is related to educational level and occupational status. While mere family income in this study did not correlate with ethnic identity, higher ethnic identity did correlate with higher grade point averages. This is consistent with popular notions about the Asian study ethnic and the high cultural value placed on academic achievement. It could also indicate a self-report bias whereby more ethnically-identified individuals may report higher grades due to cultural values of achievement and not exposing potentially shaming material.

Further, not father's education, but mother's education had some possible relationship to ethnic identity. Subjects whose mothers completed only high school had higher ethnic
identification than subjects whose mothers had completed a professional education. This finding may be due to the mothers being more traditionally, in American and Asian culture, the primary caretaker, and therefore influencer, of children in the home. It may be that the more educated mothers, regardless of their ethnic identity level, may encourage more acculturation than less educated mothers. A different possibility is that more acculturated mothers tend to have higher educational attainment levels possibly than less acculturated mothers; the mothers serve as role models for their children in this regard.

Interestingly, subjects with mothers who had a trade school education or some college education without a Bachelor's degree were less assertive than subjects whose mothers did complete their Bachelor's but not any advanced degrees. This is another interesting "mother effect" which may be supportive of the speculation that there is a disproportionately high influence of mothers as primary caretakers. This finding is consistent with work suggesting that some demographic variables over others are more influential in assertiveness (Galassi & Galassi, 1980). One's background and certain demographics, including education level of one's mother, may provide more of a sense of empowerment and encouragement toward greater assertiveness. This "mother effect" needs to be interpreted with caution given the unequal group sizes and that a
significant variance was not found across all the educational levels attained by mothers of the subjects.

There was a great deal of situation-specific and qualitative data from this study that can only be summarized here, but which would be highly useful in informing and planning culturally-sensitive assertiveness training. For example, an overview of the questionnaire-specified differential treatment situations found that subjects encountered the following in descending order of frequency: (1) being viewed as "all the same" as other Asian ethnic groups, (2) being considered a race expert on one's ethnic group by a professor in class, (3) dating interracially and one's significant other cannot tell his/her parents, (4) non-minority classmate is impressed and surprised by one's English speaking ability, (5) one is mistakenly viewed as a "foreigner", (6) one is ignored and not given assistance while other individuals of non-Asian descent are served, and (7) one is met with hostility in a social setting because of misperceptions of one's ethnic group.

Subjects also rated certain of these scenarios as being more discriminatory than others with encountering hostility at a party due to misperceptions about one's ethnic group and being perceived as all the same as other Asian-Americans at the top. Being viewed as a racial expert in class was viewed as least discriminatory. Second least discriminatory was
having one's English speaking ability complimented on by an impressed non-minority classmate.

Subjects also rated the greatest personal offense at being ignored and not given assistance in a receptionist's office compared to other individuals and being viewed as being the same as all Asian-Americans. Subjects were least offended by being viewed as racial representatives of their ethnic groups in class.

Of the 50 respondents to the second mailing which included qualitative questions about discrimination experiences, seventeen cited situations of being called racial or religious slurs (often mistakenly identified as another Asian ethnic group) including being accused of "taking over the world", being told to "go back to Vietnam", or having people "imitate" one's supposed ethnic language. Twelve individuals stated they had never experienced any discrimination experiences in their lifetime. Eight cited situations where it was assumed that their English language abilities were poor and they were talked to very slowly. Five individuals discussed being stereotyped as such as being assumed to be a genius or knowing karate. Four people discussed not being helped in retail stores or being scrutinized in stores. Two discussed some retail fraud being attempted including being charged a significant amount more than a non-minority friend for a health club membership. Two said they were discriminated against by other Asians for dating Caucasians.
Two discussed cultural conflicts and discrimination while living in college residence halls. Two could only recall some incidents of discrimination in young childhood, but not beyond that time. There was only one person who discussed vandalism to the house and family car (eggs being thrown or rotten food in mailbox).

Further, most of them said they did not tell their parent about these incidents of racism (n = 31) compared to the nine individuals who did. The most popular response of parents to reports of racism was to advise their children to ignore the offenders. Two subjects who were adopted and whose parents were white said their parents could not understand or relate to the racial incident. Two subjects were met with emotional support via shared anger or sympathy and a parent talking about his or her own experiences. Two subjects had parents respond with action such as calling the police about the eggs being thrown at the house or filing an official complaint with the attempt at business fraud. One subject was told to joke with the perpetrator or to ignore the perpetrator.

Most of the parents did not share experiences of discrimination with their children (n = 35) while 12 of these parents did. Subjects' parents most frequently dealt with their own experiences of discrimination by ignoring it and not "rocking the boat" (n = 7) and getting angry and frustrated (n = 5). Two of the parents would only interact with their own ethnic groups as a result. Two parents would continue
striving toward their personal and professional goals. One parent got angry with job discrimination, quit his job, and started his own professional practice. One parent was reported to have gotten physically violent about racial discrimination incidents. One parent was cited as blaming other ethnic groups and "perpetuating the racism cycle."

In addition, several subjects discussed the positive advantages to interracial marriages from personal and family experiences. Several subjects also stated they avoided socialization with their own Asian ethnic group because of pressures to conform. Several said that it was realistic to expect to personally encounter discrimination and racism at some point. However, some individuals cautioned against looking for racism and possibly misperceiving situations at times.

This study has certainly achieved its goal of studying a diverse Asian-American Midwestern sample that has not been exclusively confined to Chinese- and Japanese-Americans. Empirical support was found for cultural values as influencing assertiveness in Asian-Americans. There were also initial empirical indications that there may be a relationship between ethnic identity and differential treatment experiences. This study has also lent empirical support to the utility of situation specificity in assessing assertiveness, acculturation, and differential treatment experiences of Asian-Americans.
This study also lends strong support to recommendations for culturally-sensitive assertiveness training which focuses on context and specific situations (Comas-Diaz & Duncan, 1985; Wood & Mallinckrodt, 1990). This type of training would ideally include lecture and discussion around cultural values and conflicts for Asian-Americans and experiences of racism. This would clarify values implicit in the assertiveness construct and in Asian interpersonal communication values. Assertiveness would not be presented as the unilateral best or most appropriate way to express oneself. Rather, the goal would be to understand and value mainstream American and Asian orientations and to learn bicultural skills. The training would attempt to promote an awareness of different cultural values, an ability to assess situations, anticipate and evaluate consequences, and to choose appropriate behaviors and responses that "fit" with an individual. Such training would also use certain strategies and skills that will promote assertiveness within, rather than in spite of, cultural norms. The technique of reading contextual cues or discriminative cue learning, for example, was used by Comas-Diaz and Duncan (1985) to train Latina women. In reading contextual cues, individuals can assess the costs and benefits of assertiveness in different situations and with different individuals. Those who are sensitized to culture, gender, and role status aspects of communication in addition to message content can be taught to assess these cues and to
select from a group of responses most appropriate to the ethnic identity, gender, and authority status of the recipients of their assertive communication (Wood & Mallinckrodt, 1990). This promotes the view that there is no single best way, but that behaviors are more or less effective in different situations.

Further and extended use of the Ethnic and Cultural Diversity among College Students Survey, which has been so helpful in focusing and identifying specific situations of differential treatment in this study, could be very valuable in assessing discrimination-related assertiveness situations most salient and relevant for assertiveness training. It could be used as a pre-assessment measure to help plan culturally-sensitive assertiveness training.

This study is a beginning step in developing parallel-type research studying the constructs of assertiveness, acculturation, and discrimination. Certainly, more research is needed to further explore these constructs from an Asian-American cultural viewpoint. As such, greater numbers of subjects and greater representations of various Asian ethnic groups, particularly of different ages and different socioeconomic backgrounds, is needed.

The biggest limitation to this study and other acculturation studies is that ethnic identity and acculturation can only be measured on a bipolar continuum with most current measures, while acculturation theory suggests it is
actually a four-cell model; acculturation and identity are separate, but related constructs and not necessarily opposite.

Additionally, replication of this study and use of other modes of measurement including behavioral measures, role-playing measures, and observer assessment would be useful in establishing a solid base of emic (culturally-specific) assessments of assertiveness, acculturation and discrimination. For example, the College Self-Expression Scale (CSES) was developed and normed with a college-aged Caucasian population, but has been widely used with Asian-American and other ethnic minority college students. Thus, the CSES would be an example of a measure that is being used cross-culturally even though it was developed and normed with a Caucasian population. Much of previous cross-cultural research was conducted in this fashion, but cross-cultural research is entering an era of developing within-culture measures. Future research, then, might proceed to develop, from within an Asian-American context, a measure of assertiveness. Research can then proceed on to doing cross-cultural comparisons around these constructs of assertiveness, ethnic identity, and differential treatment experiences in a vastly different way. The power of context and environment cannot be underestimated in cross-cultural research. Although future research can address these other questions, it is clear that this study has provided a better understanding of
the interaction among assertiveness, ethnic identity, and differential treatment experiences.
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE:

"PART 1: INFORMATION ABOUT YOU"
Part 1: Information About You

What is your ethnic identity? (How do you see yourself?) 

1. Age: _____
2. Birthdate: _____ _____ _____
   (month) (day) (year)
3. Sex (M or F): _____
4. Marital Status: [ ] single [ ] married [ ] other, please specify:

5. Your birthplace: [ ] U.S.A. [ ] other, please specify city & country:

6. Father's birthplace: [ ] U.S.A. [ ] other, please specify:

7. Mother's birthplace: [ ] U.S.A. [ ] other, please specify:

8. If you have lived abroad or immigrated, how long have you lived in the U.S.A.?
   (years) (months)

9. Are you:
   [ ] a. first generation (you immigrated to the United States)
   [ ] b. second generation (your parents immigrated and you were born in
       the U.S.)
   [ ] c. third generation (your grandparents immigrated and your parents
       and yourself were born in the U.S.)
   [ ] d. other, please specify which generation or any special circumstances:

10. Why did you, your parents, and/or your ancestors come to the U.S.? (check all that apply)
    [ ] a. economic reasons
    [ ] b. educational reasons
    [ ] c. relatives already living in U.S.A.
    [ ] d. political refuge, please specify: __________________________
    [ ] e. other, please specify: __________________________

11. Where do you live for most of the academic year?
    [ ] a. on-campus housing
    [ ] b. family home off-campus, please specify who else lives at home:
    [ ] c. alone in off-campus housing
    [ ] d. with roommate(s) in off-campus housing, please specify their
        relationship to you (friend, acquaintance, relative):

12. What language is it that you speak the most? [ ] English [ ] other, please specify:

13. What is your primary written language? [ ] English [ ] other, please specify:

14. What is the language(s) spoken most in your family's home? [ ] English
    [ ] other, please specify:

15. If your immediate family does not live in the U.S.A., please specify where they are (city
    and country):


16. Number of sisters: 
17. Number of brothers: 
18. Estimated family household annual income: 
   [ ] a. $5,000 or less 
   [ ] b. 5,001 - 10,000 
   [ ] c. 10,001 - 20,000 
   [ ] d. 20,001 - 35,000 
   [ ] e. 35,001 - 50,000 
   [ ] f. 50,001 or more 
19. Are you employed during most of the academic year? 
   [ ] a. part-time 
   [ ] b. full-time 
   [ ] c. no 
20. Your major: 
21. Your cumulative GPA: 
22. Year in school: 
   [ ] a. freshman 
   [ ] b. sophomore 
   [ ] c. junior 
   [ ] d. senior 
   [ ] e. graduate/professional 
23. Your father's highest level of education, please specify years in school and/or degrees held: 
24. Father's occupation: 
25. Your mother's highest level of education, please specify years in school and/or degrees held: 
26. Mother's occupation: 
27. Your ethnicity: 
   [ ] a. Cambodian 
   [ ] b. Chinese 
   [ ] c. Filipino 
   [ ] d. Indian 
   [ ] e. Japanese 
   [ ] f. Korean 
   [ ] g. Laotian 
   [ ] h. Thai 
   [ ] i. Vietnamese 
   [ ] j. other, please specify 
   [ ] k. Mixed, please specify: 
28. Your father's ethnicity: 
29. Your mother's ethnicity: 
30. Who do you mostly interact with while on-campus at school? 
   [ ] a. Asians, please specify ethnic group(s): 
   [ ] b. other minority ethnic groups, please specify: 
   [ ] c. Caucasians 
   [ ] d. a mix, please specify: 
31. Who do you mostly interact with while socializing? 
   [ ] a. Asians, please specify ethnic group(s): 
   [ ] b. other minority ethnic groups, please specify: 
   [ ] c. Caucasians 
   [ ] d. a mix, please specify: 
32. Who do your parents mostly interact with while socializing? 
   [ ] a. Asians, please specify ethnic group(s): 
   [ ] b. other minority ethnic groups, please specify: 
   [ ] c. Caucasians 
   [ ] d. a mix, please specify: 
33. Do your relatives or extended family: 
   [ ] a. live near you 
   [ ] b. live near your parents 
   [ ] c. both a & b 
   [ ] d. neither a nor b
APPENDIX B
ADAPTED COLLEGE SELF-EXPRESSION SCALE:
"PART 2: SELF-EXPRESSION SURVEY"
Part 2: Self-Expression Survey

The following questionnaire is designed to provide information about the way in which you express yourself. Please answer the following questions by circling the appropriate number from 0 - 4 and filling in the blanks. Your answer should reflect how you generally express yourself in the situation or how you would express yourself if in such a situation.

0 = Almost Always or Always  1 = Usually  2 = Sometimes  3 = Seldom  4 = Rare or Never

1a. Would you ignore it when someone of your same ethnic group pushes in front of you in line? 0 1 2 3 4

1b. Would you ignore it when someone of a different ethnic group pushes in front of you in line? Does it matter which ethnic group it is? If so, please specify which ethnic group(s) and whether you would ignore them or not if they pushed in front of you: ____________

2. When you decide you no longer wish to date someone, do you have great difficulty telling the person of your decision? 0 1 2 3 4

3. Would you exchange a purchase you discover to be faulty in some way? 0 1 2 3 4

4. If you decided to change your major to a field which your parents will not approve, would you have difficulty telling them? 0 1 2 3 4

5. Are you inclined to be over-apologetic? 0 1 2 3 4

6. If you were studying and if your roommate were making too much noise, would you ask him to stop? 0 1 2 3 4

7. Is it difficult for you to compliment and praise others? 0 1 2 3 4

8. If you are angry at your parents, can you tell them? 0 1 2 3 4

9. Would you insist that your roommate do her fair share of the cleaning? 0 1 2 3 4

10. If you find yourself really liking and valuing someone you are dating, would you have trouble expressing these feelings to that person? 0 1 2 3 4

11. If a friend who has borrowed $10.00 from you seems to have forgotten about it, would you remind this person? 0 1 2 3 4

12. Are you overly careful to avoid hurting other people's feelings? 0 1 2 3 4

13. If you have a close friend whom your parents dislike and constantly criticize, would you inform your parents that you disagree with them and tell them about your friend's positive qualities? 0 1 2 3 4

14. Do you find it difficult to ask a friend to do a favor for you? 0 1 2 3 4
0 = Almost Always or Always  
1 = Usually  
2 = Sometimes  
3 = Seldom  
4 = Rarely or Never  

15. If you are served food in a restaurant that is not entirely to your satisfaction (too cold, half-cooked, etc.), would you tell the waiter about it?  
0 1 2 3 4

16. If your roommate, without your permission, eats food that he knows you have been saving, would you bring this up to him?  
0 1 2 3 4

17. If a salesperson has gone through considerable trouble to show you some merchandise which is not quite suitable, do you have difficulty saying no?  
0 1 2 3 4

18. Do you keep your opinions to yourself?  
0 1 2 3 4

19. If friends visit when you need to study, would you ask them to return at a more convenient time?  
0 1 2 3 4

20. Are you able to express your love and affection to people you care about?  
0 1 2 3 4

21a. If you were in a small seminar and the professor, who is of the same ethnic background as you, made a statement that you considered untrue, would you question it?  
0 1 2 3 4

21b. If you were in a small seminar and the professor, who is of a different ethnic background than you, made a statement that you considered untrue, would you question it?  
Does it matter which ethnic background?  
If so, please specify which ethnic background(s), and whether you would question it or not:  

22. If a person whom you are attracted to smiles or pays attention to you at a party, would you take the initiative in beginning a conversation?  
0 1 2 3 4

23. If some one you respect expresses opinions with which you strongly disagree, would you venture to state your own point of view?  
0 1 2 3 4

24. Do you go out of your way to avoid trouble with other people?  
0 1 2 3 4

25. If a friend is wearing a new outfit which you like, do you tell that person?  
0 1 2 3 4

26. If after leaving a store you realize that you have been given the wrong change ("short-changed"), would you go back and request the correct amount?  
0 1 2 3 4

27. If a friend makes what you consider to be an unreasonable request, are you able to refuse?  
0 1 2 3 4
0 = Always or Almost Always 1 = Usually 2 = Sometimes 3 = Seldom 4 = Never or Rarely

28. If a close and respected relative were annoying you, would you hide your feelings rather than express your annoyance? 0 1 2 3 4

29. If your parents want you to come home for the weekend or to be at home for some event but you have made some important plans of your own, would you tell them what you prefer to do? 0 1 2 3 4

30. Do you express anger and annoyance toward the opposite sex when it is justified? 0 1 2 3 4

31. If a friend does an errand for you, do you tell him or her how much you appreciate it? 0 1 2 3 4

32. When a person is obviously unfair, do you not say something to him? 0 1 2 3 4

33. Do you avoid social situations because you are nervous about doing or saying the wrong thing? Do you avoid social situations with any particular ethnic group(s) more than others? If yes, please specify which ethnic group(s): 0 1 2 3 4

34. If a friend betrays your confidence, would you hesitate to tell him that it bothered you? 0 1 2 3 4

35. When a clerk in a store waits on someone who has come in after you, do you call his attention to the matter? 0 1 2 3 4

36. If you are especially happy about someone's good fortune, can you express this to that person? 0 1 2 3 4

37. Would you be hesitant about asking a good friend to lend you a few dollars? 0 1 2 3 4

38a. If a person teases you about your ethnic background to the point where it is no longer fun, do you have trouble expressing your displeasure? 0 1 2 3 4

38b. If a person teases you about something else to the point where it is no longer fun, do you have trouble expressing your displeasure? 0 1 2 3 4

39. If you arrive late for a meeting, would you rather stand than go to a front seat which you could only get to by being well noticed by many others in the meeting? 0 1 2 3 4

40. If your date calls on Saturday night 15 minutes before you are supposed to meet and says that she (he) has to study for an important exam and cannot make it, would you express your annoyance? 0 1 2 3 4

41. If someone keeps kicking the back of your chair in a movie, would you ask her to stop? 0 1 2 3 4
0 = Always or Almost Always  1 = Usually  2 = Sometimes  3 = Seldom  4 = Never or Rarely

42. If someone interrupts you in the middle of an important conversation, do you request that the person wait until you have finished? 0 1 2 3 4
43. Do you freely volunteer information or opinions in class discussions? 0 1 2 3 4
44. Are you reluctant to speak to an acquaintance you are sexually attracted to? 0 1 2 3 4
45. If you lived in an apartment and the landlord failed to make certain necessary repairs after promising to do so, would you insist on it? 0 1 2 3 4
46. If your parents want you home by a certain time that you feel is much too early and unreasonable, do you try to discuss or negotiate this with them? 0 1 2 3 4
47. Do you find it difficult to stand up for your rights? 0 1 2 3 4
48. If a friend unfairly criticizes you, do you express your resentment there and then? 0 1 2 3 4
49. Do you express your feelings to others? 0 1 2 3 4
50. Do you avoid asking questions in class because of feeling self-conscious? 0 1 2 3 4
APPENDIX C

ETHNIC IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE:

"PART 3: OPINION SURVEY"
Part 3: Opinion Survey

**Instructions.** Listed below are a number of statements about which people often have different opinions. You will discover that you agree with some, that you disagree with others. Please read each statement carefully, then circle the letter that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. **Answer every statement.** Even if you have to guess at some. There is no right or wrong answer. This information will be treated as confidential. You may wish to clarify and explain some of your answers. Please do this by circling the numbers of these items as you go along and then using the comments section at the end to comment on the items. Please specify which number item(s) your comments refer to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A good child is an obedient child.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is all right for personal desires to come before duty to one's family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Asian Americans should not disagree among themselves if there are Caucasians around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I especially like Asian foods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A good Asian background helps prevent youth from getting into all kinds of trouble that other American youth have today.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It's unlucky to be born Asian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It would be more comfortable to live in a neighborhood which has at least a few Asian Americans than in one which has none.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I feel affectionate I show it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is a duty of the eldest son to take care of his parents in their old age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Asian Americans who enter into new places without any expectation of discrimination from Caucasians are naive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I think it is all right for Asian Americans to become Americanized, but they should retain part of their own culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A wife's career is just as important as the husband's career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In regard to opportunities that other Americans enjoy, Asian Americans are deprived of many of them because of their ancestry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. It is all right for children to question the decisions of their parents once in awhile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In the Asian community, human relationships are generally more warm and comfortable than outside in American society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. The best thing for the Asian Americans to do is to associate more with Caucasians and identify themselves completely as Americans.

17. I am apt to hide my feelings in some things, to the point that people may hurt me without their knowing it.

SA = Strongly Agree,  A = Agree,  N = Neutral,  D = disagree,  SD = Strongly Disagree

18. It is a shame for an Asian American not to be able to understand the language of his or her ancestors.

19. Asians have an unusual refinement and depth of feeling for nature.

20. I would be disturbed if Caucasians did not accept me as an equal.

21. It is unrealistic for an Asian American to hope that he can become a leader of an organization composed mainly of Caucasians because they will not let him.

22. I don't have a strong feeling of attachment to the homeland of my ancestors.

23. I am not too spontaneous and casual with people.

24. It is not necessary for Asian American parents to make it a duty to promote the preservation of Asian cultural heritage in their children.

25. An older brother's decision is to be respected more than that of a younger one.

26. Socially, I feel less at ease with Caucasians than with Asian Americans.

27. Asians are no better or no worse than any other ethnic group.

28. I always think of myself as an American first and as a Asian second.

29. Life in the United States is quite ideal for Asian Americans.

30. When in need of aid, it is best to rely mainly on relatives.

31. It is better that Asian Americans date only other Asians or Asian Americans.

32. Parents who are very companionable with their children can still maintain respect and obedience.

33. Once a Asian always an Asian.

34. Good relations between Asian and Caucasians can be maintained without the aid of traditional Asian organizations.

35. It is nice if a Asian American learns more about Asian culture, but it is really not necessary.
36. It would be better if there were no all-Asian communities in the United States.  

37. Asia has great art heritage and has made contributions important to world civilization.  

38. Those Asian Americans who are unfavorable toward Asian culture have the wrong attitude.  

39. I believe that, "He who does not repay a debt of gratitude cannot claim to be noble."  

40. To avoid being embarrassed by discrimination, the best procedure is to avoid places where a person is not totally welcomed.  

41. I usually participate in mixed group discussions.  

42. Many of the Asian customs, traditions, and attitudes are no longer adequate for the problems of the modern world.  

43. I enjoy Asian movies.  

44. It is a natural part of growing up to occasionally "wise-off" at teachers, policemen, and other grownups in authority.  

45. A person who raises too many questions interferes with the progress of a group.  

46. I prefer attending an all-Asian church.  

47. One can never let himself down without letting the family down at the same time.  

48. Interracial marriages between Asian Americans and Caucasians should be discouraged.  

Please comment and clarify any answers if you wish in this section below:
APPENDIX D

ADAPTED ETHNIC AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY

AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS SURVEY:

"PART 4: COLLEGE SITUATION SURVEY"
Part 4: College Situation Survey

In this questionnaire, three questions are included after each situation. We are interested in determining the frequency of occurrence of these situations in the student population. The first question asks how often have you experienced directly, during the last year, a situation similar to the one described. Use the following scale:

Never = 1
Once = 2
Twice = 3
Three times = 4
More than three times = 5

The second question asks to what extent you find this situation personally offensive. Put yourself in the situation of the student. If it happened to you, would you feel this is personally offensive? Use the following scale:

Not at all offensive = 1
Not offensive = 2
Neither offensive/nor not offensive = 3
Offensive = 4
Very much offensive = 5

The final question asks to what extent do you think discrimination is being manifested by each situation. Regardless of how offensive it may be, do you think this is ethnic discrimination? Please use the following scale for this question:

Not at all discriminatory = 1
Not discriminatory = 2
Neither discriminatory/nor not discriminatory = 3
Discriminatory = 4
Very much discriminatory = 5

1. A college student approaches a receptionist at an office and says "I am here for my appointment." The receptionist, who is from a different ethnic background than the student, first attends the person behind him, secondly, answers a telephone call, and finally says: "What do you want?"

   a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?

      Never         More than 3 times
      1            2            3            4            5

   b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?

      Not at all     Very much
      1                  2            3            4            5

   c. To what extent do you think ethnic discrimination is being manifested by this situation?

      Never         More than 3 times
      1            2            3            4            5

2. An ethnic minority student was approached after class by a non-minority student. The non-minority student commented that she was impressed with the minority student's answers in class. She also mentioned that he is the only person of that ethnic group she knows who speaks English as well as he does.

   a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?

      Never         More than 3 times
      1            2            3            4            5

   b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?

      Not at all     Very much
      1                  2            3            4            5
3. A professor constantly points out that any generalizations about society must be qualified according to cultures and ethnic backgrounds. However, a minority student in this class is often asked to give his opinions about his ethnic group as if he was an official representative of the whole race. The professor in the class calls on the minority student as an expert.

   a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?  
      Never 1 2 3 4 5
   b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?  
      Not at all 1 2 3 4 5
   c. To what extent do you think discrimination is being manifested by this situation?  
      1 2 3 4 5

4. At a social function a minority student who was invited by a friend was treated with hostility by the other guests. The guest refused to shake hands or talk to the student during the event. Later, the student found out that many of the guests had friends and relatives recently laid off from their jobs and they thought that people from his ethnic background were taking jobs away from them.

   a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?  
      Never 1 2 3 4 5
   b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?  
      Not at all 1 2 3 4 5
   c. To what extent do you think discrimination is being manifested by this situation?  
      1 2 3 4 5

5. A male student has been dating a female student from a different ethnic group for three years. Because of her parents' views toward people of that ethnic group the woman has not been able to tell her parents about their relationship.

   a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?  
      Never 1 2 3 4 5
   b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?  
      Not at all 1 2 3 4 5
   c. To what extent do you think discrimination is being manifested by this situation?  
      1 2 3 4 5
6. While seeking services in a university office, an Asian-American student is mistakenly assumed to be an international student by a staff person. The staff person insists that the student show her visa in order to receive services. The student feels that she is immediately assumed to be a "foreigner" and not a legitimate American.

a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. To what extent do you think discrimination is being manifested by this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Some non-Asian students and an Asian student in a conversation get onto the topic of stereotyping of another Asian group. The Asian student is asked, "So, what do you think of all this?" The Asian student's first response is: "I don't think my opinion would matter so much because I'm not a member of that group—we have different cultures, languages, and histories." A non-Asian student replies, "Oh, come on. You're all pretty similar. What's the difference?"

a. How often have you experienced a situation similar to this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>More than 3 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. To what extent would you find this situation personally offensive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. To what extent do you think discrimination is being manifested by this situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next few questions, please tell us in your own words what your and your family's experiences have been around ethnic discrimination.

8. What specific experiences of ethnic discrimination and racism have you encountered in the last 5 years?

9. Have you told your parents about any of these experiences?

10. How have your parents responded and reacted (by what they said or did) to your experiences of ethnic discrimination?

11a. Have your parents ever discussed their experiences of racism?

11b. What has been their response and reaction (by what they said or did) to these experiences?
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