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ABSTRACT

This research was done on the interrelatedness of acculturation, parental style and social skills development. It investigated how the experience of acculturation influenced the social skills development of Chinese immigrant adolescents and explored the interaction of parental styles, the degree of acculturation and social behavior of Chinese immigrant adolescents in the United States. Three measures were administrated to paired parents and their adolescents: Suinn-Lew Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA), Parent Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) and Social Skills Rating System (SSRS). After reclassifying the data of the parents, the results indicated that the parent sample belonged to More Asian/Chinese oriented and Biculturally oriented in the SL-ASIA. The majority of the parents belonged to the Authoritative parenting style. The adolescent sample showed an average level of social skills and had fewer to average levels of problem behaviors. In sum, the Chinese immigrant families kept a balance between preserving the traditional ethnic heritage and incooperating into American society.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The phenomena of immigration is universal. The current trend of immigration is that people from less developed countries, in terms of modern industrialization, gravitate toward more industrialized countries. Financial, political, educational, religious and climatic reasons are common for immigration. Whether or not immigrants enter a host country voluntarily or involuntarily, as soon as they arrive in the targeted country, a certain amount of adjustment is inevitable. The adjustment to the new cultural context is demanding.

To be integrated into the host culture is called acculturation. The process of acculturation occurs when immigrants try to re-organize their lives in the unfamiliar environment even if they are still surrounded by close relational ties. The range of acculturation can be enormous.

For example, some observable areas of adjustment are food supply, custom practices, language barrier, geographical location, and community resources. Yet acculturation goes beyond the observable to invisible areas such as shifts in self-identity, changes of interactional patterns, learning gender role expectations, modifying attitudes toward life, reformation of religious beliefs, and re-constitution of personal psychology as well as absorption of ideological outlook.

The process of acculturation is complex. The degree of successful acculturation
depends upon multiple factors, such as the age of immigrant, educational attainment, linguistic preparation and years of stay in the host country; however, accessibility to and immersion into the dominant culture is a primary condition of successful acculturation. Very often the degree and pace of acculturation vary. Because of the tremendous transition that an immigrant family has to go through, the family dynamics and parental styles may also be greatly influenced or affected, as well as the development of social skills of immigrant children. Chinese immigrants are not excluded from undergoing all this transitional adjustment.

**Purpose of Study**

In reference to these conditions, the purpose of this study is twofold: to investigate how the experience of acculturation influences the social development of Chinese immigrant children, and to explore the interaction of parental styles, the degree of acculturation and the social behavior of Chinese immigrant children in the multicultural society of the United States.

**Hypotheses**

This study attempts to examine the following statements according to the five acculturation levels of the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA).

(a) Level 1, Very traditional Asian/Chinese oriented: Parents of this type will be rated by their adolescent children as Authoritarian and their adolescent children will score low on the total score. Specifically these youth will score low on the Assertive Subscale in the Parent Form of the Social Skills Rating System. In addition, female adolescents will be rated as more cooperative than male adolescents. (b) Level 2, Asian/Chinese oriented to
approximately balanced bicultural: Parents of this type will be rated by their adolescent children as Authoritative and their children will not demonstrate problematic social skills. (c) Level 3, Slightly Anglo oriented bicultural: Parents of this type will be rated by their adolescent children as Authoritative and their adolescent children will show relatively high scores. Specifically, these youth will score high on the Assertive Subscale of the Social Skills Rating System. (d) Level 4, Strongly Anglo oriented: Parents of this type will be rated by their adolescent children as Authoritative and their adolescent children will have a high total score. In particular, in the Parent Form of the Social Skills Rating System, they will rate their adolescent children high on the Assertive Subscale and these youth will score high on the Empathy Subscale in the Student Form of the Social Skills Rating System. (e) Level 5, Very assimilated (Anglicized): Parents of this type will be rated by their adolescent children as Permissive. Their adolescent children will have low scores on Responsibility Subscale, and will be given a low rating on the Self-Control Subscale in the Parent Form of the Social Skills Rating System. These youth will also have low scores on the Empathy Subscale in the Student Form of the Social Skills Rating System.

In addition, this study will look into the possibility that the male parent sample will show a more Authoritarian style compared to the female parent sample. This study will also investigate whether the female adolescent sample will show less problematic social behavior than the male adolescent sample. This study will explore whether the scoring of the children’s social skills development will be higher than that rated by their parents.
In recent research very few studies are dedicated to the interrelatedness of multiple factors of acculturation, parental styles and the social skill development among Chinese immigrant families. However, Sung (1985) acknowledged the significance of this interrelatedness. She stressed that unsuccessful adjustment of children could result in concrete negative consequences, such as poor school performance and gang involvement. Social institutions such as the school, the community, and the family serve as strong props for the relatively healthy adjustment experiences of the children. Hsu (1994) also showed that different styles of Chinese American parental authority, as well as the family's acculturation experience strongly affect the self-esteem of the children.

**Acculturation**

Acculturation occurs when two different cultural groups come into continuous first-hand contact over an extended period of time, resulting in changes in either or both cultural group (Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). Early research used mostly anthropological and sociological approaches to study acculturation (Olmedo, 1979). In America, most research has focused on the acculturation of Native American Indians to Western culture with a focus on the process of sociocultural change under the conditions that cultures in contact (Siegel, 1955). Chance (1965) notes that anthropologists and
sociologists have generally chosen an intrapsychic or interpersonal approach which stresses acculturation as a group process in terms of its relationship to socialization, social interaction and mobility.

Most of the psychological literature on acculturation appears within the last three decades. The majority of the literature has focused on the adjustment of immigrant groups in the America setting (Berry, 1980a; Johnston, 1976; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1980), accultural stress (Berry, 1970; Padilla, 1987), diverse paces of acculturation process due to generational/individual difference of immigrants (Meredith, 1966; 1967a, 1967; Yao, 1979) and methodological issues. Furthermore, the populations under study were mostly Hispanics, Japanese, and Southeast Asians. Although other minority ethnic groups such as Chinese, Korean, and Filipino are also major ethnic minorities in America, not much attention has been given to them.

Olmedo (1979) notices that gradually the research foci are turning to the areas of acculturation within the context of ethnic identity or ethnicity. Cultural value orientations, attitudes, knowledge, and behavior are some of the psychological variables being investigated. In 1993, Ho summarized some of the commonly agreed upon characteristics of acculturation as follows: (a) individual acculturation is a multidimensional process rather than a linear process, and is a function of various factors, e.g., generation, age, language, and (b) there are different gradients of ethnocultural identification and levels of individual acculturation within a given ethnic group (Bayard, 1978; Matsumoto et al., 1970; Pierce, Clark & Kaufman, 1979; Sue & Sue, 1971; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987).
Ethnocultural identification can be defined as "the individual's values, attitudes, and preferences representative of a particular cultural group, as an integral part of the totality of identification formed by the individual" (Bayard, 1978, p.110). The ethnocultural identification is psychological in nature (Graves, 1967). Currently, the research on acculturation within the context of ethnic identity is still rare. Although several efforts have been made to generate some models in describing acculturation and ethnocultural identity (Olmedo & Padilla, 1978; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978), researchers are still looking for a precise definition and method of measurement, hoping to find a comprehensive model to investigate the phenomena of acculturation and ethnocultural identity.

**Acculturational Experience of Chinese Immigrants in the United States**

In the 1840s, the Chinese were the first immigrants from Asia to enter America. During that time, the social and economic upheaval of China as well as the overpopulation in some provinces (De Vos & Abbott, 1966) certainly encouraged large numbers of Chinese to pour into the United States and meet the high demand of cheap labor in constructing the transcontinental railroad. This first wave of Chinese immigrants mainly were uneducated, unskilled peasants who clustered around the area of the West Coast, especially in California. Because their presence in the labor force served to fill a void in the labor market, these early Chinese peasants were not particularly mistreated. In 1852, there were only seven women among 11,794 Chinese in California (Ling, 1990). This group of Chinese bachelors mainly lived in isolation from main stream Americans. Why did Chinese wives not enter the land of opportunities, America, with their husbands? The primary
reason was that the traditional Chinese considered that traveling was temporary as shown in a proverb: "People are compared to leaves which should go back to the root. Chinese women were waiting for their husbands to come home." Most of the Chinese laborers at that time intended to go back to China after making their fortunes. To be incorporated into the American society was not their main concern.

In 1869, when the Union-Central Pacific Railroad was completed, the labor market was diminished. Thus, the competition of Chinese labor with White labor became fierce. The prevailing fear of the "yellow peril" reduced the acceptance of Chinese immigrants. The remaining Chinese men were mugged, beaten, and murdered. Finally, anti-Chinese sentiment culminated in the passing of the Federal Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882, the first exclusion act against any ethnic group. Later on, the systematic harassment of the Chinese resulted in legal discrimination that denied them the right of citizenship: Chinese testimony in court was ruled inadmissible as evidence (Sue & Sue, 1990). Kagiwada and Fujimoto (1973) point out that the phrase "not a Chinaman's chance" alludes to these conditions. Large-scale massacres of the Chinese in Los Angeles in 1851, and Rock Springs, Wyoming, in 1885, are examples of such abuse (Daniels, 1971; Kitano, 1969 b).

According to Sue and Sue (1990), the treatment of the Chinese was no better than that of African slaves. Not until 1943, was this racist immigration law repealed as a gesture of friendship toward China, an ally of the United States during World War II. The Immigration Act eventually abolished the national-origin quota. Those Chinese who then entered in America were characterized as well-educated urban families (Lai, 1980).
A change toward a more positive image of Chinese and Asian immigrants in general also occurred in the mid-1960’s in the wake of the Watts riot and amid growing discontent among blacks and other minorities. For the past three decades, the popular contemporary image of Chinese/Asian Americans as the “model minority” is of recent advantage and the result of a rapid change in the American public’s mind (Sue & Sue, 1973; Suzuki, 1977a).

The Chinese immigrants today still might be the target of Anti-Asian/Chinese sentiment. In 1982, Vincent Chin, a United States citizen of Chinese ancestry was murdered in Detroit by a Caucasian auto-worker who blamed Japanese auto imports for his unemployment. In addition, Chinese immigrants have to face the acculturation stresses such as personal losses, a language barrier, emotional detachment, economic hardship in addition to the ideology of White supremacy/Oriental inferiority, discrimination and the long-term effects of cultural conflict.

**Mirror Effect of Western/American and Asian/Chinese Cultural Values**

While all human beings share common universals, each culture defines its distinctive cultural values. Interestingly, Asian-Chinese culture, the major influential force in Asia, is often in contrast to the Western/American culture.

Augsberger (1986) proposed several examples of cultural differences between the Chinese and the American will lay the foundation for further discussion on the acculturation, parental styles and social skill development of Chinese immigrant children in the United States.
1. **group-oriented vs. individual-oriented.** Western/American thought about human beings begins with "the individual". The individual is a self-contained independent unit. This stands in polar contrast to the views of collective humanity, a society in which persons are linked to one another. For instance, Eastern/Chinese thought that human beings is more likely to begin with the family.

Grounded in the individual dignity and uniqueness, Western/American thought, equality and liberty are two ideals which help satisfy an individual's needs. On the contrary, in Eastern/Chinese thought, personal needs are secondary to the group’s survival. Therefore, personal needs, wishes and dreams are normally brushed aside or suppressed. Instead, group-centric ideals such as Jen (仁), Hsiao (孝), Yi (義), Li (禮) and Cheng (成) and Harmony (和) are six classic basic communal values or ideals in Chinese culture.

Jen (仁), Benevolence, is a sympathetic heart, love of all human beings, respect for and prizing of true humanity. This love of others is rooted in love of parents and in filial piety. Hsiao (孝), Filial piety, is the foundation of all good conducts and filial obedience. The central relationships are between sovereign and subject, father and son, husband and wife, elder and younger brother, and friend and friend. "Filial piety and fraternal submission, are they not the root of all benevolent actions (Analects I.2).”

Yi (義), Righteousness, is virtuous obedience to communal values expressed in reciprocity, concern for others’ welfare, and honoring of the five relationships. Righteousness is the working out of benevolence shown in true filial piety.
Li (禮), Propriety, is attendance to ritual, ceremony, and courtesy, a sense of respect, honor, and emotional balance. Propriety is the social behavior of righteousness.

Cheng (誠), Sincerity, is the genuiness toward all things under heaven which will bring Harmony (和), that is in the balance with nature, heaven, and humanity and expresses benevolence in the five relationships through righteous action, and ritual propriety.

Filial piety and fraternal submission are seen as the central root of all five values. (Augsburger, 1986). Obedience and conformity to the hierarchical authorities are assumed as normal experiences of humanness. In short, communal identity among Chinese override the pursuit of individuality. Individual uniqueness is de-emphasized. The hierarchical structure is stressed over egalitarian mutuality.

Hz (1985) asserts that culture is a system of patterned symbolic interactions that results in values and traditions that are transmitted intergenerationally. For example, among Chinese, one’s identity is intimately linked to cultural values regarding family and relationships. The traditional Chinese search for support from family, kin and heavily depend on an extensive network of relationships.

Many Chinese proverbs reflect these millennia of group-centric values as Augusberg collected them in his book, Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures.

“The tall tree is crushed by the wind”; 
“A rock that protrudes on the riverbank will be washed away by the current.”

There is no equivalent word in Chinese for conformity, it is only doing what is expected, acting in propriety, fulfilling Li (禮), the laws of ritual and etiquette. One does not show talents, express uniqueness, take independent positions, but is
all things to all people. As the proverb puts it, "When in a herd of elephants, trumpet; when in the company of cocks, crow; when in a flock of goats, bleat"

(1986, p. 83).

Traditional Chinese develop many group harmony promoting behavioral patterns. First, an individual is expected to exemplify the following manner while interacting with others, moderation in expressing one’s emotions, personal self-discipline/control, self-cultivation (教化), modesty, cooperation and submission of personal will to group-determination. Direct ways of facing up to interpersonal issues is not welcomed or modeled. The so called “third party mediation” or “middle man” is a preferred method to settle the interpersonal conflicts. Straight-forward forms of feedback in interaction are rare. No effort is made to teach or model constructive disagreement, so as the proper assertiveness. The negative extremes of this behavioral mode can induce interpersonal dishonesty, unconscious psychological manipulation, and domineering/subservient social patterns. For the powerless, unassertiveness, emotional repression or withdrawal, and insomnia are common defensive mechanisms. These interactional patterns differ from the Western/American values of emphasizing individual autonomy, self-expression, self-fulfillment, direct interchange between people, straight feedback, and encouragement of competitiveness for personal goals.

2. patriarchal hierarchy vs egalitarian structure. The individual-oriented and the group-oriented societies also organize, and function differently in the area of the family. In traditional China, the family structure is hierarchical and patriarchal. Age and sex are two main organizing factors. The age lineage goes from the elder to the younger. Paying
respect to the elder naturally results in minimizing the generational gap. To traditional Chinese, it is normal that the individual is superseded by the family. The female is supposed to submit to the men. The male dominance designs to secure the male control and stability of gender relationships. Further, the family adheres to the Confucianistic principles, with its strong emphasis on specific roles and the proper relationships.

Shon and Ja (1982) put it well by saying:

With the traditional Eastern Asian framework the family is not time limited. The concept of the family extends both backward and forward. The individual is seen as the product of all the generations of his or her family from the beginning of time. This concept is reinforced by rituals and customs such as ancestor worship and family record books, which trace family members back over many centuries. Because of this continuity, the individual’s behavior has a different importance and consequence. Personal actions reflect not only on the individual and the nuclear and extended families, but also on all of the preceding generations of the family since the beginning of time. And individual actions will impact upon all future generations as well. Therefore, there is a burden of responsibility that transcends the individuals’ personal concerns (McGoldrick, Pearce & Giordano, 1982, p. 211).

Although after 1949, the current regime of Communist China motivated by promoting her political ideology, reorganize Chinese families into nuclear units and legalized gender equality which are similar to American family structure and
egalitarianism; the undercurrent force of the old tradition seems to still exert its influence on the modern Chinese.

3. **external control vs. internal control.** The Western/American and Asian/Chinese view the locus of control very differently. Rotter (1961) utilized the internal-external control dimension to measure a personality trait shaped by the belief that rewards are dependent on one's own actions of a person that can shape his or her own fate vis-à-vis the belief that rewards occur independently of one’s actions and the future is determined more by chance and luck. The sociocentric perspective of the Chinese culture heavily emphasizes the group, tradition, social expectations, appropriate roles and harmony with the universe. With these perspectives, Chinese score high on external-control. By the same token, this trait of high externality accounts for the phenomena that the Chinese easily explain their life events in the name of chance, luck or fate as well as cultural dictates and political totalitarianism or racism (Sue, 1981, P. 77). Again, the situation-centered Chinese culture with its high regard for group harmony is in contrast with the individual-centered American culture with its stress on independence, self-reliance, and individual effort (Hsieh, Shybut, & Lotsof, 1969, p.122).

Although every society uses an integrative system of controls to ensure socialization of the individual, different ways of control such as anxiety, guilt and shame are given disparate weight in cultures. Predominantly, a primitive society tends to use anxiety as a social control mechanism. In contrast, Western/American society mainly uses guilt and Eastern/Chinese society employs shame to ensure socialization of the individual (Piers & Singer, 1953). Social conformity achieved through guilt will be essentially one of
submission. Social conformity achieved through shame will be essentially one of identification.

Hsu (1949) suggests that the essential element is not shame and guilt but rather the uses of suppression and repression as restraints in socializing persons into cultural conformity. To him, shame is a by-product of suppression, guilt a by-product of repression. He said that in a culture which emphasizes suppression as a mechanism of socialization, external expectations/circumstances, group sanction/approval as well as significant people’s criticism/acceptance will be more important to the individual than internal controls.

Alternatively, in a culture which stresses repression as the mechanism of socialization, internal demand/ responsibility, absolute standards of morality as well as internalized conscience will be more important than external control. For instance, Eastern/Chinese people basically live the former pattern of life which tends to be situation-centered; in contrast, Western/Americans basically live in the later pattern of life which tends to be individual-centered. Historically, Chinese culture uses both social shame and familial shame effectively to control their group members to establish, maintain and restore group-harmony.

4. interpersonal obligation vs. contractual responsibility. The Chinese and Americans perceive the issue of responsibility and reciprocity differently. Historically, Chinese develop high feelings of responsibility/obligation and reciprocity towards nature and people (McGoldrick, Pearce, & Giordano, 1994). Chinese philosophies tend toward an acknowledgment that any obtained personal achievement is merited to the efforts of
many things and other people. Thus, interpersonal responsibility/obligation extend from the contractual obligations to the unspoken obligatory reciprocity that arises out of human relationships. In comparison, Western/Americans heavily emphasize contractual responsibility, based upon free agreement among individuals and groups.

Patterns of Acculturation

Confronted by various cultural contrasts, one’s attitude towards the ways in which he/she wishes to become involved with and to relate to, other people and groups he/she encounters in his/her acculturation area determines one’s level of ethnocultural identification (Berry et al., 1989). The magnitude of one’s ethnocultural identification is a complex result of the extent of the individual’s incorporation of his/her identification with one or more ethnic groups into his/her total ego identity (Matsumoto, Meredith, & Masuda, 1970). The experience of acculturation demands an individual to make all levels of adjustment.

On the behavioral level, an acculturating individual must embrace many types of behaviors, including verbal behavior or language, customs, foods, music and dance. On the affective level, an acculturating individual has to learn new cultural connections of emotions such as feelings for symbols and new meanings attached to life itself. On the cognitive level, an acculturating individual has to accommodate the beliefs about male/female roles, ideas about socialization, attitudes towards family relationships and other fundamental values.

Many researchers have attempted to understand the effects of two cultural influences on Asian Pacific Americans. In 1971, based on level of acculturation, Sue
offered a scheme to categorize three types of personality among Asian-Americans: Traditionalist, Marginal, and Asian-American. Traditionalist is viewed as less acculturated than the Asian-American with the Marginal straddling both cultures simultaneously (Lui, 1990). The middle stage of acculturation is seen as a clash between Eastern and Western values. Some other researchers such as Fong (1965, 1973), Meredith and Meredith (1966) and Yu (1984) as well as Sue hold a common assumption. That is, they apply a culture conflict model to interpret the continuum which begins with very Asian-identified and ends with very Americanized. Sue's later research brings a paradigm shift to biculturality which implies that a person can comfortably identity with aspects of both the dominant societal values and values of ethnic origins rather than being caught and thus very uncomfortably exist between the two cultural contexts. It is sound to say that these three personality types apply to the acculturating Chinese immigrants, too.

Although Asian/Chinese-American men and women might apply different ways to cope with the acculturational experiences, Ho (1993) lumps them together and categorizes their level of ethnocultural identification into another three basic types. (a) Asian-identified: a person retains identity with his/her ethnic heritage and refuses attempts to become integrated within the larger Western-American society. (b) Western-identified: a person entirely assimilates into the new culture in all aspects; e.g. the Asian becomes completely identified as a part of the dominant Western/American society. (c) Traditional: a person identifies himself/herself with more than one particular culture; i.e., the Asian/Chinese does not clearly fall into either of the above two types.
Lee and Cochran (1988) researched on migration problems of Chinese Women. They found six patterns that Chinese women adopted in order to cope with their conflictual situation.

1. rejection of Chinese identity. The first type of adjustment is to react against a Chinese identity. Similar to Ogbu's (1992) model of "emulation", a woman who adopts this type of coping rebels against Chinese constraints and behaves according to the norms of the Western/American Whites. She strives for independence, freedom from family obligations and submergence in a collective identity. This kind of adjustment may bring integration into the dominant society. At the same time, this experience may bring on feelings of guilt, confusion and uprootedness.

2. affirmation of Chinese identity. The second type of adjustment is to affirm Chinese identity. A woman who adopts this coping mechanism resists assimilation and continues to strengthen and maintain her cultural origins. This experience can make her feel secure in the ethnic milieu but invalidated and unsettled in the host country.

3. re-aligning on less central values. The third type of adjustment is by re-aligning on less central values. When faced with central conflicts between Western/American and Chinese values, this type of woman tries to develop a context that may allow her a basis for an alternative path of development. For example, she may behave as a Westerner in her career and as a traditional Chinese at home. This way of coping may reduce the alienation and increase the acceptance and flexibility needed in the mainstream society. However, her central values remain unclear, and deeper contradiction may appear in a crisis.
4. **compartmentalization.** The fourth type of adjustment is by compartmentalization. The adopter of this method rigidly acts like two separate persons in Chinese and Western contexts without true assimilation. This way of coping sounds practical at times and at other times it can cause inconsistency, hypocrisy and confusion to oneself and others.

5. **cultivating a core identity.** The fifth type of adjustment is by cultivating a core personal identity, relying on personal choice, not social norms. This type of adjustment can offer the best chance for self-development and strength to manage the stress involved in transition. The drawback of this method is a feeling of not belonging to either one's culture of origin or the culture of the new environment.

6. **expanding of personal identity.** The sixth type of adjustment is the expanding of personal identity. A woman who takes this route is anchored either in Chinese identity or American identity and is open to natural assimilation or an exclusion.

**Measurements of Acculturation**

Currently, there are not many measurements of acculturation developed. Cuellar et al. (1995) designed and revised Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA) to look into many areas of accultural adjustment such as attitudes, beliefs, custom practice, food, self-identity, language, and musical preference.

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

Another acculturation measurement is the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). At present, SL-ASIA is the only acculturation instrument available designed for Asian Americans, therefore this researcher chose it to measure the
acculturation of Chinese immigrants. Suinn & Lew (1987) developed this scale based on the ARSMA, using the Likert scale to assess several content areas of acculturation. These areas are language, identity, friendship choice, cultural behaviors, generation/geographic history and attitudes. The SL-ASIA also divides acculturation into five levels: (a) Very traditional Asian, (b) Asian/Chinese oriented to approximately balanced bicultural, (c) Slightly Anglo oriented, (d) Strongly Anglo oriented and, (e) Very anglicized.

**Parental Style and Socialization**

Throughout the history of human existence, parenting is a vital social role which ensures the survival of the species as well as the psychological fulfillment of the young and the old. Today, in studying universal parental behavior, Jordan (1980) finds that not only is the mechanistic view of the past replaced by the orgasmic view, but also the integrative model becomes the central perspective. For example, the ecological framework of Bronfenbrenner (1979) and a multiple-determinant approach to parenting by Belsky (1984) are two integrative models.

Bronfenbrenner (1979)’s ecological framework takes into account the intertwining reciprocity of multi-dimensional systems within which the parental behavior occurs. This implies that the parental behavior is constantly and continually influenced by the tangible and intangible structures, polices, values, beliefs and operations in all levels of our human existence as shown in micro-systems like families, meso-systems like schools, exo-system like work places as well as macro-systems like the cultures/sub-cultures of our entire living condition.
From another point of view, Belsky (1984) emphasizes that both parents and children are simultaneously developing and changing. Therefore, viewing the parental style from the developmental and the life-course perspectives will promote the understanding of the combined influence of multiple factors of parental behavior.

Broadly speaking, the source of parenting does not need to come from the biological parents but it takes at least a caring, significant person or a concerned community to carry out this important function. The main purpose of parenting aims to provide a conducive environment which allows the children and the young to have optimal development and fully utilize their talents.

In sum, the parental behavior basically attempts to socialize children by nurturing, bonding, providing, modeling, teaching, guiding, monitoring, controlling, demanding, disciplining, supporting and supervising them. Through these interpersonal interactions, children and the young can comprehend, absorb cultural/group values, assimilate attitudes, take in beliefs, establish self-identity, and develop technical and social skills, so to become happy, and prosocial members of human society. But the negative influences of parental deficits can damage the normal development of a growing person in all aspects most severely at the childhood. Worse yet, the harm can extend and last through the later stage of life such as adolescence and adulthood.

Darling and Steinberg (1993) distinguish three aspects of parental behavior in its broad sense: the goals or values toward which socialization is directed, the parenting specific practices used by parents to help children reach those goals, and the global parental style, or emotional climate within which socialization occurs.
They posit that parental style and practice are two parenting attributes. Parental style theoretically is independent of specific socialization content and is displayed across a range of parent-child interactions. They argue that parental style can best be thought of as a contextual variable that moderates the relationship between specific parental practice and specific development outcomes. Because it is only the parental practice which directly effect the development of the child, therefore, only parental practices have a direct effect on the developing children.

In the past, both the qualitative and quantitative efforts are made focusing on three particular components of parental style: the emotional relationship between the parent and child, the parents’ practices and behaviors, and the parents’ belief systems. The researchers also look into various dimensions of the parental style such as control (Watson, 1928) and nurturance (Freud, 1933; Roger, 1960), acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission (Symonds, 1939), emotional warmth/hostility and detachment/involvement (Baldwin, 1955), love/hostility and autonomy/control (Schaefer, 1959); warmth and permissiveness/strictness (Sears, 1957); and warmth/hostility and restrictiveness/permissiveness (Becker, 1964).

Although the parental style contains many dimensions, there is a consensus among theorists. They all agreed with Symonds (1939) who describes the “model children” as those who are “socialized, cooperative, friendly, loyal, emotionally stable, and cheerful...honest, straightforward, and dependable.. good citizens and good scholars” (p. 75).
In 1966, Baumrind proposed a theoretical model to incorporate the emotional and behavioral processes that underlay earlier models of socialization into a conceptualization of parental style that is anchored in an emphasis on parental belief systems. Baumrind’s configurational approach has profoundly altered the subsequent thinking about parental style. For Baumrind, the fundamental element of the parental role is to socialize a child to conform to the necessary demands of others while maintaining a sense of personal integrity.

Darling and Steinberg (1993) describe Baumrind’s contribution in the following way:

Baumrind’s (1967, 1971a) operationalization of parental style sets her apart from earlier researchers in several ways. First, rather than determining with great exactitude multiple dimensions of parental behavior and defining style as linear combination of these dimensions, Baumrind specified one broad parental function—control—and added articulation within that single domain. Secondly, rather than demand that parental control be organized linearly from high to low, she distinguished among three qualitatively different types of parental control: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Third, Baumrind used a configurational approach to define parental style, arguing that the influence of any one aspect of parenting (e.g., ideology, maturity demands, or the use of specific disciplinary techniques) is dependent on the configuration of all other aspects (p. 490).

According to Baumrind (1967, 1971a), the authoritarian parents try to shape, mold, and control the behavior of their children according to absolute standards of
behavior. Obedience is the most important quality the child of an authoritarian parent can display. Authoritarian parents stress respect for authority. Talking out problems is not the solution to problems between authoritarian parents and their children. Problems are solved when children obey their parents. In contrast, the authoritative parents are considered the most nurturing of all parents who apply positive reinforcement and minimal use of punishment. Authoritative parents are also quite responsive to their children’s demands for attention and have high control of their children’s behavior within the context of considering what is best for the children’s developmental needs.

On the other hand, Permissive parents deal with their children in a non-punishing, accepting, and affirming manner. Children are not told what to do by permissive parents; rather, they are consulted and made part of the family decision process. Baumrind (1967) states that permissive parents present themselves as “resources” for their growing children instead of active, demanding authority figures who try to mold their children’s behavior. Lewis (1981) enriches Baumrind’s typology by pointing out that the advantages enjoyed by authoritatively reared children are attributable to their parents’ openness to bi-directional communication.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) also try to capture parental style as a function of two dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness. They expand the permissive style of parenting to include the indulgent parents and neglecting parenting. The indulgent parents are defined as high in responsiveness but low in demandingness. Neglecting parents are defined as low in both responsiveness and demandingness. In her more recent work, Baumrind (1978, 1980, 1991a, 1991b) has applied the concepts of responsiveness and
demandingness to reflect the balance of demands between society (as represented by the parent) and the individual.

Baumrind (1989) redefines parental demandingness as the parent’s willingness to act as a socializing agent, where responsiveness refers to the parent’s recognition of the child’s individuality. Empirically, Baumrind discovers that both authoritative and authoritarian parents are high in firm control, but only authoritarian parents are highly restrictive (i.e., high in psychological control). In addition, she finds that authoritative parents instill instrumental competency by helping their children balance other-oriented, rule-following tendencies with individualistic, autonomous, active thinking through parental reciprocity of communication and use of explanations and reasoning.

**Measurement of the Parent Style: Parent Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)**

The Parent Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) was developed according to Baumrind’s (1971) parental topology, authoritarian, authoritative and permissive styles. PAQ consists of 30 items. This research will use this measurement to assess the parental styles among the Chinese immigrant parents rated by their adolescent children.

**Variance of the Parenting and Social Behaviors Between the Chinese Immigrant Families and Local Americans**

In addition to natural instincts, no doubt, cultural factors determine enormously the ways that parents think, feel, and behave. Before Communism occupied the minds of modern Chinese in this century, historically, Chinese people were influenced by three main philosophical ideologies: Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism. Since most of the yinastic rulers used Confucianism as a governing tool to domesticate Chinese people, Confucius
became the dominant influence among Chinese. Even today, Sung (1985) observed that this traditional parenting heritage among Chinese still exerts its influence on the immigrant parents and their children, although the degree of acculturation might alter its strength. For Chinese immigrant families in America, the challenges lie in how to integrate two various traditions of parenting and parent-child interaction/relating modes in facilitating the well-being of all. Some of the challenges confronted by Chinese immigrant parents and their children are as follows:

1. **education.** Traditionally, scholars are respected and looked up to in China, Confucius elevated the scholars to the highest post among other careers. With this background, immigrant Chinese parents usually will urge their children to make the most effort in order to do well in the academic setting. However, immigrant children themselves do not share the same value with their parents when they interact with their American peers or educators.

2. **respect to the elder and the authority.** The hierarchical structure of traditional China made the demands of respecting the elders and of unquestioned obedience to authority figures much easier to practice. Yet in a context in which equalitarian treatment is more prevalent, Chinese immigrant parents and children are faced with the two inconsistent social interaction norms.

3. **emotional reservation/regulation and demonstration of affection.** Self-cultivation, self-discipline, emotional control and behavioral modesty are some tenets of social rules among Chinese. With this interactional mode, even among parents and children, not only physical intimacy and love are private matters never exhibited in public,
but also what seems to be excessive emotionally, or exaggerated affectively or verbally is not encouraged. This lack of demonstrative affection is the common complaint that some immigrant Chinese children have about their parents, friends and relatives. They are not loved or appreciated because they are never prized, kissed, or hugged compared to their American peers.

4. **hero and heroine.** In China, heroes and heroines are people of high moral virtues. Chinese parents teach their children to imitate filial sons or daughters: the self-sacrificing heroes/heroines, the loyal ministers, the patriots or war heroes who save the country. Priest, monks, and female actresses occupy the lowly social ranges. However, in America, the most popular figures are movie, television, and stage star, sports figure, politicians, famous authors, inventors and scientists. In the past, religious rabbis, ministers, and priests once commanded prestige in America, too. Thus frequently, Chinese immigrant parents often find themselves bewildered in guiding their children about whom to admire and follow.

5. **aggressiveness, assertiveness and sports.** For the Chinese, sports are tools for good health and skills for self defense. The martial arts do not call for physical strength as much as concentration, skill and agility. In the traditional Chinese way of thinking the development of the mental faculties is more important than development of the physique. Accordingly, a well-rounded gentleman is expected to be able to channel his own aggression through martial arts, and encounter other people’s aggression with wits or silent endurance instead of physical violence. Traditional Chinese females were almost completely excluded from any form of sports. Any Chinese who resorts to violence is at
the bottom of the social ladder. Alternatively, American people consider sports more for building up physical power. Verbal assertion is a strong sign of self-expression. Aggression in verbal or physical forms is tolerable for meeting others' hostility. Due to these attitude differences, Chinese children are brought up to refrain from aggressive behavior, and to stay out of fights (Sollenger, 1968, p.17). On the other hand, American children are taught not to inhibit asserting their macho image through verbal assertion, and, if necessary, through physical aggression.

6. **sexuality.** Traditional Chinese downplay sexuality before marriage. Until forty years ago, pre-arranged marriages by the parents was common. Sexual awareness, attractiveness and sexual experience are always put below the pursuits of academic achievement, pre-marital chastity, and moral acceptability. With this mentality, Chinese immigrant parents mostly do not allow teenagers to date or to be sexually involved in order to safeguard the continuation of normal schooling and to avoid "improper behavior." But in America, adolescents’ sexuality is very strong and pronounced. Teenage dating is pervasive and forceful. This difference in attitudes and customs poses another dilemma for both Chinese parents and their teenagers.

7. **independence, interdependence and privacy.** Traditionally, the Chinese emphasize the vertical relationships, interpersonal obligation and responsibilities. Interpersonal interdependence is attenuated. Intergenerational status and life-long interaction with their offspring allow Chinese parents tremendous powers to exert over their children. Consequently, Chinese children do not assert their rights of personal decision making and privacy in many areas of their lives. For example, Chinese mothers do
not relinquish their caring responsibility to the baby-sitter or leave their children with any baby-sitter who is not a relative or a friend. Chinese parents approve or disapprove of whom their children associate with, what career they pursue, and what mate they marry. Because of this close contact between parents and children, the boundary of interpersonal privacy is minimal and unexpected. Chinese immigrant parents assume that their constant and strict supervision over their children is their basic task. But in the eyes of their American born children, they might be viewed as overprotective, intruding and over-controlling. Surveying the different ethnic parents about their practice of rearing children, Nancy F. Young (1982) found that the immigrant Chinese child is expected to be able to take care of himself/herself at an earlier age, but he/she is discouraged from socializing with people outside the family until a much later age. Some American-born Chinese have higher expectations of independence for their children than any of the other ethnic groups. Betty Lee Sung (1985) explains this fact as: American-born Chinese have assimilated the American values of independence at an early age and may even have gone overboard in rearing their own children toward these ends.

**Measurement of the Social Skills: Social Skills Rating System (SSRS)**

In order to assess how well the Chinese immigrant adolescents develop their social skills, this research uses the Social Skills Rating System (Gresham & Elliott, 1990) as a measurement. SSRS is a standardized norm-referenced instrument designed to screen and classify the social skills development in educational and family settings. Both the parent-form and the student-form of the secondary level of this measurement will be rated by the Chinese parents and their adolescent children.
Parallel and Reciprocal Development

In spite of the variance of parenting beliefs and practices between American and Chinese, it seems that no matter what style is applied by the parents, the parenting style has enormous impact on all children’s overall development. It is also natural as Steinberg (1994) states in his book, Crossing Paths, that parents and children reciprocally influence each other. To Chinese immigrant families, the above statements ring true. Viewed from this perspective, this research shows that there is a parallel and reciprocity between the personal developments of the Chinese immigrant parents and their children, particularly their adolescent sons and daughters.

First, they are both struggling with the issue of self-identity. Erikson (1982) in his book, The Life Cycle Completed, proposed that human development consists of a series of crises during the eight stages of life’s course. The crisis involves a marked shift in perspective for the individual. It is a time of vulnerability as well as of new strengths. This turning point must be faced with a choice between two ways of coping: the maladaptive or the adaptive way. Only as each crisis is positively resolved does the personality manifest a normal development, with the energy to confront the next critical stage.

Normatively, the stage of adolescence, prescribed as the fifth stage, is believed by Erikson to be crucial in developing one’s basic ego identity. The adolescents need to establish a self-image that is meaningful and provides both a continuity with the past and an orientation toward the future. Without exception, Chinese immigrant adolescents are confronted with this growth opportunity. In parallel, Chinese immigrant parents, although supposedly at the seventh stage of mid-life, have to establish a positive and integrated
ethnic self-identity in order to guide the next generation as their normal epigenetic instincts urge them to do.

Secondly, simultaneously Chinese immigrant parents and their children are challenged to become socially competent in the American context. All cultures use different rituals, ceremonies to initiate their adolescents into the adults’ world, for example, the Jewish Bar Mitzvah for boys and Bat Mitzvah for girls. Thus, the adolescents can seek age-appropriate autonomy, personal space, emotional detachment, financial independence and responsibilities from the family of origin to form peer affiliation and close relationships with friends of both genders in the outside world (Steinberg, 1994).

In other words, Chinese immigrant adolescents, like any other ethnic youth, must develop socially competent skills to behave age-appropriately in order to function well within their bi-cultural worlds of the Chinese environment and the American context. Likewise, Chinese immigrant parents with their unique cultural heritage must acquire social competence in order to provide a model for their children to learn how to adjust positively to the demands of the American multi-cultural living context.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Five hundred and twenty surveys were sent to the Chinese families in suburbs of Chicago, Washington D.C., Los Angeles, and Tampa. Two hundred and eight surveys were returned; this gives a response rate of 40%. Of these, only 172 pairs of parent-child surveys were useable because the rest of the surveys did not have complete data. In total, there were 344 voluntary respondents. This includes 113 mothers, 59 fathers, 88 female and 84 male children.

Statistical Demographic Characteristics

Parents’ Sample. The ages of the respondents ranged from 35 to 60 with a mean of 44.06 (SD = 3.87). The times that they had been in the United States ranged from birth to age 46 with a mean of 26.73 (SD = 6.33). The numbers of years they resided in the United States ranged from 1 to 41, with a mean of 17.32 (SD = 7.07).

The age at which parents began their school in the United States ranges from 5 to 47 with a mean of 25.46 (SD = 7.11). The years they attended school in the United States range from 1 to 23 with a mean of 3.97 (SD = 3.31, Median = 3). About 72.4% (N = 125) of them had 1 to 5 years of education in the United States. One hundred forty one (82%) of them began schooling in the United States before the age of 30. Among parents, nine
(2.9%) of them earned a high school degree, 64, (37.2%) a college degree, 83 (44.8%) masters degree and 30 (15.1%) a doctorate.

Regarding the number of children, 22 (12.7%) of the parents had only one child, about 95 (55.2%) had two, 38 (22%) had three, 14 (8.4%) had four, and 1 (.6%) had five children. Seventeen parents’ (10%) data were missing. The mean was 2.2 (SD = 0.9) children.

Regarding friends and relatives, the number of their relatives that stayed in the United States ranged from 0 to 75, with a mean of 18.1 (SD = 14.42). The number of non to Chinese friends ranged from 2 to 97, with a mean of 27.9 (SD = 29.61). The number of Chinese friends ranged from 2 to 120, with a mean of 45.2 (SD = 30.48).

The predominant ethnic group of the residential area in which they reside is as follows: 69.7% Caucasian (N = 120), 27.9% (N = 48) mixed area, 10% (N = 17) in Chinese communities and 10% (N = 17) in other non-specified areas. The primary reason mentioned for being in the United States was education (80.2%, N = 138), having been born here (16.2%, N = 28), and for the remaining 8% (N = 14) finances, politics, religion, or climate.

The primary languages spoken at home were: Mandarin (76.7%, N = 132), English (8.1%, N = 14), Cantonese (7.6%, N = 13), Taiwanese (3.4%, N = 6), Shanghai Hua (3.5%, N = 6)) and Hakka (0.6%, N = 1). The secondary languages spoken at home were: English (87.2%, N = 150), Mandarin (7.6%, N = 13), Taiwanese (4.1%, N = 7), Shanghai Hua (5.8%, N = 10), French (.06%, N = 10) and others (5.8%, N =10).
The jobs of male parents can be categorized into professional (56.4%, N = 97), white collar (38.4%, N = 66), blue collar (17%, N = 28), and non-specified (3.5%, N = 6). The jobs of female parents can be categorized into professional (37.2%, N = 64), white collar (40.1%, N = 69), blue collar (3.5%, N = 6), and homemaker (19.2%, N = 33).

**Children’s Sample.** Children’s ages ranged from 12 to 18 with a mean of 13.97 (SD = 1.67). The age children arrived in the United States ranged from birth to 16 with a mean of 1.72 (SD = 3.55). Seventy two percent of them were born in the United States. The number of years children resided in the United States ranged from 1 to 18, with a mean of 12.35 (SD = 3.73).

Nearly 103 (59.8%) of them have been in the United States for 10 to 20 years. Among the children, 133 (77.3%) live with both parents, 17 (10%) live with one parent, and 22 (12.6%) children’s data are missing. The age at which children began their school in the United States ranged from 5 to 16 with a mean of 5.64 (SD = 1.88). One hundred forty two (82.6%) of them began schooling in the United States at the age of 5. The years children attended school in the United States ranged from 1 to 13 with a mean of 8.30 (SD = 2.85). About 142 (86.6%) of them have 10 years of education in the United States.

Regarding relatives and friends, the number of their relatives who stayed in the United States ranged from 0 to 75, with a mean of 19.63 (SD = 14.59). The number of non-Chinese friends ranged from 2 to 124 with a mean of 31.50 (SD = 28.86). The number of Chinese friends ranged from 1 to 76, with a mean of 19.87 (SD = 20.86).

The primary reason mentioned for being in the United States is birth.
(64.5%, N = 111), education (30.5%, N = 52) and the remaining 5%, (N = 9) consisted of finance, politics, religion, and climate. Regarding birth order, first-borns were 64.5% (N = 110), second-borns were 30.2% (N = 52), the third-borns were 2.9% (N = 5) and 1.8% (N = 3) data are missing.
Table 1

Statistics of Demographic Characteristics of Parents & Children in America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (N = 172)</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Children</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>35-60</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age arrived in America</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0-46</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age began schooling in America</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5-47</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years attending school in America</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0-23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years resided in America</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1-41</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years family resided in America</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1-71</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of children</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Numbers of relatives in America</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0-75</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Numbers of non-Chinese friends</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>2-97</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>2-124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Numbers of Chinese friends</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>30.48</td>
<td>2-120</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>2-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers are approximate due to the elusive definitions of relatives, and friends.
Quantitative Measures

To gather data, this researcher distributed to each participant an introductory letter, a consent form and a background information sheet in addition to two quantitative measures. To each parent participant, these two quantitative measures were: SL-ASIA and the parent-form of the SSRS; to each student/adolescent participant, the PAQ and the student-form of the SSRS. Both SSRS instruments were at the secondary level.

1. **SL-ASIA.** The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) was basically modeled after the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (Cuellar, Harris & Jasso, 1980). This instrument was administered to the parent in each family pairing. In this study, 25 multiple-choice items from the SL-ASIA (Suinn, Richard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) were chosen to assess several content areas of acculturation. These areas were language, identity, friendship choice, cultural behaviors, generation/geographic history, and attitudes. Participants were asked to choose the one response that best describes them. When the scale was scored, a total value was obtained by summing the scores across answers for all items. An acculturation score was obtained by dividing the total score by the number of items on the scale. Acculturation scores could range from 1 to 5.

Suinn et al. (1987) indicated that persons with scores close to 1 were considered Asian-identified, or low in level of acculturation, persons with scores around 3 were considered bicultural; and persons with scores around 5 were considered western-identified, or high in level of acculturation. Suinn et al. (1987) reported the reliability coefficient of the scale to be .88. They also confirmed the criterion validity of the scale by
using three different approaches. They found a direct relationship between acculturation and the variables of length of stay in the United States, generation, and respondents' self-rating of cultural identity on a 5-point scale ranging from very Asian 1 to 5 very Anglicized. Item 20 represents an overall self-identity rating. Items 22 and 23 showed a participant's attitude towards either Western or Eastern value systems. Items 24 and 25 were scored for rating a participant's behavioral competence either in a Western or Eastern context.

2. **PAQ.** The second instrument was the Parent Authority Questionnaire (PAQ), designed by Buri in 1991, which was administered to the adolescent participants. This instrument rated the participants' perceptions of parenting styles according to Baumrind's (1971) parental typology: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive styles. This instrument consists of 30 items per parent and yields authoritative, authoritarian and permissive scores for both the mother and the father; each of these scores is derived from the phenomenological appraisals of the parents' authority by their son or daughter. This instrument uses a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The results of several studies have supported the PAQ as a psychometrically sound and valid measure of Baumrind's parental authority prototypes (Buri et al, 1991).

3. **Parent-Form and Student-Form of the Secondary Level of the SSRS.** Additionally, the Parent Form and the Student Form of the Secondary Level of the Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) were administered to the parents and their student/adolescent children, respectively. The SSRS was a standardized, norm-referenced instrument designed to provide professionals with a means to screen and classify the
participant’s social behavior in educational and family settings. The SSRS suggested three methods of evaluating a participant’s social behavior: Parent Form; Teacher Form; and Student Form. The SSRS Parent Form was filled out by a participant’s mother, father, or guardian. The Parent Form of the secondary level had 52 items. Parents were asked to rate the frequency of a specified behavior (e.g., “Attempts household tasks before asking for help”) on a 3-point scale, 0, Never; 1, Sometimes; 2, Very often. In addition, the parent was asked to rate the importance of the behavior, 0, Not Important; 1, Important; 2, Critical. The Parent Form yielded four Social Skills Subscale raw scores: i.e., Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, and Self-Control as well as a Social Skills Scale total raw score.

In addition, the Problem Behavior Scale was absent from the Student Form. The PBS section consisted of 12 items which included subdomains measuring Externalizing Problems, Internalizing Problems, and Hyperactivity. Problem behaviors, which might interfere with social skills performance, were rated according to their perceived frequency (0, Never; 1, Sometimes; and 2, Very Often). Only the Teacher and Parent forms included problem behavior ratings. The three problem behavior subdomains were defined as follows: Externalizing problems were inappropriate behaviors involving verbal or physical aggression toward others, poor control of temper and arguing. Internalizing problems were behaviors indicating anxiety, sadness, loneliness, and poor self-esteem. Hyperactivity behaviors were those involving excessive movement, fidgeting, and impulsive reactions. Hyperactivity was measured only at the elementary level.
The Student Form of the secondary level had 39 items. The Student Form differed from the Parent Form in that a Empathy Subscale replaced the Responsibility Subscale.

The authors of the SSRS have used a “multi-method” approach and articulated a comprehensive model of social skills assessment. The SSRS standardization sample included 41,709 self-rating of children and youth, 1,027 parents and 259 teachers. The standardization sample was drawn from 18 states in the Northeast, North Central, South, and Western regions of the United States. The SSRS was a psychometrically sound means of measuring the perceived social skills of youth. In total, four quantitative measures were used to collect data.

Procedure

A confidential pilot study examined 10 Chinese families. From each family, one parent and one child (12 to 18 years of age) participated in this study. The pilot respondents gave three suggestions for revising the pilot surveys. It was recommended that the Chinese translation of the survey should stand right next to the English version of the survey. The wording of the Chinese translation could be simplified and clearer to enhance easy understanding for the respondents. For clear definition, they suggested adding the phrase, “in America” to the question of “how many relatives do you have?” in the demographic section. Four adolescent respondents complained that some of the survey items were difficult to answer because these items were not applicable to their experience. Their parents agreed with them. These difficult items were asking them to rate “how confident are you in dating or interacting with the opposite sex”. Since these items were attached to the whole questionnaire of the SSRS and the researcher did not have
permission to change them, they remained in their original forms. Then a survey packet was prepared which included both copies of the survey for each pair of parent-child participants to fill out. An introductory letter and a consent form were also attached to the survey to inform the participants that the participation was free, anonymous and confidential and to obtain a free signature to indicate their personal consent.

Then, the principals and the teachers were approached to obtain permission to solicit volunteers in their respective schools of Chinese language in suburban Chicago. The researcher gave out the survey to the prospective adolescent participants and asked them to bring the survey packet home to invite their parents' participation. One week later, the researcher went back to the schools to collect the completed surveys. The pastor of a Chinese church also allowed the researcher to invite active church members to complete the survey. Those who completed the survey were allowed to choose one of three gifts: a flash-light, a puzzle or a keyholder. Participants from Washington D.C., Los Angeles, and Tampa were recruited by friends of the researcher to volunteer to participate.

**Qualitative Interviews**

After all data was gathered and analyzed, interviews were conducted to gather further qualitative information. The interviewees were recruited from those who volunteered by signing the consent form of the survey. Five pairs of interviewees allowed the researcher to do the interview at their home. The other five pairs of the interviewees were interviewed over the phone. These interviewees showed curiosity, generosity and cooperation during the interview sessions.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Results of the SL-ASIA

The Suinn-Lew Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SSRS) consists of 25 items. Scoring is based on a five point Likert Scale intended to measure the degree of acculturation. Level 1 of acculturation stands for very traditional Asian/Chinese oriented, Level 2, Asian/Chinese oriented to approximately balanced bicultural, Level 3, slightly Anglo oriented bicultural, Level 4, strongly Anglo oriented, and Level 5, very assimilated (Anglicized). The higher the score, the more acculturated the respondent is. There are four methods to analyze the data.

One method is to score all the 25 items of the SL-ASIA together as a unit. The respondents' total average is then used to place them into one of the five acculturation groups. Another suggested method is by looking at only their high and low scores as cutoffs to classify the respondents according to the obtained scores. This method resulted in the loss of respondents, as many in this sample used mid-range rather than extreme scores. A third method is to score Item 22 and Item 23 together to produce a values score. Lastly, Item 24 and Item 25 can be scored together to produce a behavioral competencies score.
First, this report presents the relationship between demographic characteristics and the SL-ASIA, then offers a more detailed account from different methods of analyzing and organizing data.

**Demographic Characteristics and the SL-ASIA**

Pearson product-moment correlations are used to examine the relationship between the respondents’ level of acculturation and various demographic characteristics. A positive relationship exists between the number of years the parents have lived in America and the total SL-ASIA acculturation score ($r = .33, p < .01$). The years that parents attending school in America positively correlates with SL-ASIA’s total score ($r = .35, p < .01$). A similar relationship exists between the years that a parent’s family resided in America and the SL-ASIA ($r = .34, p < .01$) and the number of relatives residing in America ($r = .30, p < .01$) (Table 2).

By contrast, the age that a parent arrived in America has an inverse relationship with the total score the SL-ASIA ($r = -.30, p < .01$). The same inverse relationship exists between the age that a parent begins schooling and the SL-ASIA ($r = -.20, p < .01$).

In sum, the results indicate that the longer a parent lives in America, receives education in America and has more relatives in America, the greater the level of acculturation on the SL-ASIA. In addition, the earlier a parent arrived and began schooling in American, the higher the parent's total SL-ASIA acculturation score.
Table 2

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Parental Demographic Characteristics and the SL-ASIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Characteristics</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age arrived in America</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age began schooling in America</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years lived in America</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years attending school in America</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years family resided in America</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of relatives in America</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01.

Different Results From Various Methods of Scoring the SSRS

This section of the report would demonstrate the results of the SL-ASIA from four methods of scoring such as the general SL-ASIA score, the re-categorizing, the values score and the behavioral competencies score.

1. the results from the SL-ASIA score. Scoring all 25 items together to create an overall acculturation score, this group of parent respondents have a mean score of 2.16 (SD = .46). Thus, the degree of acculturation of this group falls at Level 2. This means that these Chinese immigrant respondents mainly fall at the level of being Asian/Chinese oriented to approximately balanced bicultural. Additionally, this group of Chinese immigrants distributes their scores in the following way: only 1 respondent (0.06 %) is identified as Level 1, Very traditional Asian/Chinese oriented, 146 (84.8 %) as Level 2,
Asian/Chinese oriented to approximately balanced bicultural, 20 (11.6%) as Level 3, Slightly Anglo oriented bicultural, 5 (3.2%), as Level 4, Strongly Anglo oriented, and no respondent as Level 5, Very assimilated, Anglicized (Table 3).

Table 3

Results of Five Levels of SL-ASIA Acculturation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>SL-ASIA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very traditional Chinese/Asian oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asian/Chinese oriented to approximately balanced bicultural</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slightly Anglo oriented</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Anglo oriented</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Very assimilated/Anglicized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. the SL-ASIA values score. Scoring Item 22 and 23 together results in a SL-ASIA values score that categorizes the respondents into different identification groups. Item 22 is: Rate yourself on how much you believe in Asian values (e.g., about marriage, families, education, and work...). Item 23 is: Rate yourself on how much you believe in American (Western) values. Based on a 5-point Likert Scale, Suinn and Lew (1994) set up four identification based on respondent extreme scores. For instance, (a) if Item 22 had 4 or 5 (high Asian values) and Item 23 had either, 1, 2, or 3 (low Western values), then this respondent was classified as Asian-identified; (b) if Item 23 had 4 or 5 (high Western) and Item 22 had either 1, 2 or 3 (low Asian), this respondent was classified as Western-identified; (c) if Item 22 had 4 or 5 (high Asian) and Item 23 had 4, or 5 (high Western), then this respondent was classified as bicultural; (d) if the respondent had
checked 1 or 2 for both Items 22 and 23 (low Asian and low Western values), the respondent was classified as alienated.

Following the above standard, the results show that 45 (26.2 %) of the respondents were Asian-identified; 45 (26.2 %), Western-identified; 2 (1.2 %) Bicultural; 3 (1.7 %), Alienated. The remaining 77 (44.86 %) respondents provided mid-range scores of 3 and are lost as a result of the Suinn-Lew’s scoring protocol.

3. behavioral competencies score. Item 24 and 25 are scored together to categorize the respondents on behavioral competencies. Item 24 is: Rate yourself on how well you fit in with other Asians of the same ethnicity. Item 25 is: Rate yourself on how well you fit in with other Americans who are non-Asian (Westerners). Suinn and Lew (1994) also establish four categories using extreme scores for categorizing the respondents.

For instance, if Item 24 had 4 or 5 (high Asian fit) and Item 25 had either 1, 2, or 3 (low Western fit), then this respondent belonged to Asian-identified; if Item 25 had 4 or 5 (high Western fit) and Item 24 had either 1, 2, or 3 (low Asian fit), this respondent belonged to Western-identified; if Item 24 has 4 or 5 (high Asian fit) and Item 25 had 4, or 5 (high Western fit), then this respondent belonged to bicultural; if the respondent had checked 1 or 2 for both Items 24 and 25 (low Asian and low Western fit), the respondent might be denying any identification and might be alienated from both cultures which labeled as alienated.

Following the above standard, the results showed that 47 (27.3 %) of the respondents belonged to Asian-identified; 43 (25 %) Western-identified; 1 (0.6%)
Bicultural, 9 (5.2%) Alienated. As with the values score due to mid-range answers on these few questions, 72 (42 %) of the respondents are left uncategorized due to the scoring protocol.

4. **adjusted Type 1 and Type 2 of acculturation**. Suinn and Lew present three scoring protocols on the SL-ASIA which they state are equally useful in categorizing respondents level of acculturation. However, each of these scoring systems has a problem with actually capturing a clear picture of these respondents. Under the coding scheme presented in sections 2 and 3 above, over 40% (N = 172) of the sample is lost because the respondents rated themselves with mid-range scores. These mid-range scores indicate a more Anglo orientation and are thus important to capture. In the coding scheme presented in section A there are too few cases in several of the categories to allow for statistical manipulation. It is necessary to find a means of collapsing categories for statistical purposes that do not violate the true nature of this data. Because Suinn and Lew state that each of the three scoring systems should give a similar acculturation score across the three, this researcher, develops a composite score based on the three individual scores. By doing this, it is believed, that a more accurate score would result, and the original three codes are not as clear cut as Suinn and Lew indicate. For example, a person rated as Level 2 on all three scores was coded as Level 2. In situations where a respondent’s scores are, for instance, Level 2 on score 1, Level 1 on score 2 and Level 2 on score 3, he/she is labeled as level 2, the most frequently occurring Level. Those cases with mid-range scores on scoring protocol 2 and 3 are logically considered to be Anglo-oriented, thus allowing the researcher to capture even those cases that fall out due to the incomplete
standard in the coding protocol presented by the original authors. This coding scheme results in the slight shifting of cases across the categories presented in Table 3, resulting in the following categories: Type 1, More Asian/Chinese oriented and Type 2, Biculturally oriented. There are 144 (83.7%), Type 1 respondents, 28 (16.3%), Type 2 respondents. The summary of this coding scheme is given in Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Asian/Chinese oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biculturally oriented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sue (1971) proposed three types of personality: Traditionalist, Marginal, and Asian-American. Under the coding scheme just outlined above, the Type 1, More Asian/Chinese oriented respondents fit to the Traditionalist type and the Type 2, Biculturally oriented, fit to the Marginal type, defined as straddling both cultures simultaneously (Lui, 1990).
These two groupings (More Asian/Chinese oriented and Biculturally oriented) are also supported by SL-ASIA’s six key items including 19, 20, 22, 23, 24 and 25. Appendix O presents further data about these six items which appear in special scoring patterns that substantiate the results of the SL-ASIA.

Statistically, there are 71% (N = 122) of the respondents who take pride in Asian group membership as shown in Item 19. There are 19.2% (N = 33) of respondents rating themselves very Asian, 40.1% (N = 69), mostly Asian and 35.5% (N = 61), and bicultural in Item 20. Indicated by the various statistics, all respondents are going through different degrees of acculturation, however, they could not be adequately interpreted only by the cultural conflict model advocated by Fong (1975), Meredith and Meredith (1966) and Yu (1984) in the continuum of acculturation.

In addition to the cultural conflict model presented above, Sue’s “biculturality” model applies to this study’s particular group of respondents. Sue’s biculturality implies that a person can comfortably identity with aspects of both the dominant societal values and ethnic origins rather than being caught and thus very uncomfortably exist between the two cultural contexts. This biculturality among respondents is both shown in Item 24 and Item 25. In Item 24, 92.4% (N = 159) of the respondents rate themselves fitting in with Asians of the same ethnicity. In Item 25, 62.8% (N = 44) of the respondents rate themselves as fitting in with non-Asian/Americans.

No doubt, there are various degrees of believing in Asian and American beliefs, and the rating of fit in within Asian or American contexts. For Ho (1993), there are three ethno-cultural identification types. Viewed from his perspective, the respondents as a
group do not fit into the Ho's (1993) first type, Asian identified, who mainly identified with his/her ethnic heritage and refuses attempts to become integrated within the larger American society nor fits the second type, Western-identified, a group entirely assimilated into the new culture in all aspects. Rather, these respondents fit into the third type, identifying with more than one particular culture.

As implied by the rating pattern, it is understood that respondents are facing some cultural adaptive issues in adjustment in the American context. Theses adaptive issues are seen by Items 22, 23, 24, and 25. For example, in value questions, Item 22, there are 37.8% (N = 65) of respondents who rate themselves as strongly believing in Asian values in contrast to Item 23, only 7% (N = 12) rate themselves as strongly believing in American values. Similarly, in behavioral competencies questions, there are 45.9% (N = 79) of respondents who rate themselves as moderately believing in Asian values versus 21.5% (N = 37) who rate themselves as moderately believing in American values. In addition, there are 12.8% (N = 22) who rate themselves believing in Asian value versus 42.4% (N = 73) who believe in American value. None of the respondents rate themselves disbelieving in Asian value. Only one respondent (0.6%) rates himself/herself as disbelieving in American value. The overall trend of this research seems lending toward believing in more Asian values than in American values.

Although the data clearly shows that there are different degrees of adaptive patterns, the actual content of data does not aim to tap into the coping mechanisms in conflictual situations in the process of acculturation. Thus, strictly speaking, this research
cannot be analyzed from the six adjustment patterns designed by Lee (1985) and Cochran (1986). However, some tentative arguments can be organized as follows.

First, no respondent fits into the first type of conflictual adjustment which is to react against the original (Chinese) identity. Secondly, the respondents also do not completely fit the second type of adjustment pattern which affirms Chinese identity, resisting assimilation, and continuing to strengthen and maintains only the Chinese cultural origins. Thirdly, these respondents might fit into the third type of adjustment on one side that realigns on less central values such as American values but do not fit on other side, because most of the respondents relate strongly to the Chinese identity, without compromising their own clear central/traditional values. Fourthly, these respondents do not fit to the fourth type of adjustment pattern which is compartmentalization without assimilation. But the entire group of respondents seem to lean towards the combination of fifth and sixth types. These respondents cultivate a core ethnic Chinese identity by choice not by social norms. At the same time these respondents are expanding this identity and are open to either a natural assimilation or an exclusion.

Cuellar et al., (1995) propose five acculturation patterns. The first pattern, assimilation, labeled as cultural shift by Mendoza and Martinez (1981), does not fit these respondents because the research results do not indicate that the respondents are losing their original cultural identity as they acquire a new identity in America. The second pattern, integration, labeled as cultural incorporation, seems more suitable to the respondents since 70.9% (N = 112) of the respondents believe in American values and still anchor themselves in the traditional Chinese cultural values. Statistically shown in
Item 22 and Item 23, there is only one (.6 %) respondent who rates himself as not disbelieving in American values and forty nine respondents (28.5 %) rate themselves as moderately disbelieving of American values. By the same token, only five respondents (2.9 %) rate themselves as not fitting in at all with Asians while fifty nine respondents (34.3 %) rate themselves as moderately not fitting into non-Asians/Americans.

Based on this evidence, it will not be fair to state that the respondents apply the third pattern of adjustment, separation. That is that the respondents resist acculturation and choose not to identify with another cultural group and attempt to retain separate ethnic identification, behaviors, beliefs, practices and values. It is sensible to state that an extreme degree of separation, cultural resistance is not applicable to these respondents. In the same vein, neither do the results place these respondents in the fourth pattern of adjustment, marginalization. That is that acculturating individuals give up their original ethnic/cultural identification for identification with Americans only to experience rejection by the group that they are joining. Nor can these respondents be categorized into the fifth pattern, cultural transmutation, that refers to new cultural group emerging from the clash of two cultures in conflict resulting from the relationship between parents and their offspring.
Result of PAQ

The Parent Authority Questions (PAQ) consists of 30 items, scoring on a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The sample children rate their parents on each of the 30 items. The results are then used to categorize parental styles into three types: Authoritative, Permissive and Authoritarian. First, this research describes the correlation between parental demographic characteristics and parental style. Then a report on three parental styles follows.

Demographic Characteristics and Parental Style

According to the Pearson product-moment correlation between parental demographic data and styles, the Authoritative style is the only style that correlates with any of the demographics. The Authoritative style is inversely related to parents' age \((r = -.21, p < .01)\), arrival \((r = .20, p < .01)\) in America, and the age began schooling in America \((r = -.23, p < .01)\). In other words, the younger the parents, the earlier they arrive in America, the earlier they are exposed to American values, the greater the propensity that they would use an Authoritative style with their children.

In contrast, there is a positive relationship between the number of Chinese friends and Authoritative style \((r = .17, p < .05)\). In other words, the more Chinese friends, the stronger their Authoritative parenting style.
Table 5

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Parental Demographic Characteristics and the Authoritative Style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Characteristics</th>
<th>Authoritative Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age arrived in America</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age began schooling in America</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of Chinese friends</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01; * p < .05.

These results confirm much of the past research. In general, Chinese parents compared to Western/American parents, are highly involved in their children’s lives, exercise high control and give close supervision to their children. This strong interaction between the parents and the children is one of the characteristics of the Authoritative style. This strong involvement from the part of the sample parents might explain many of the SSRS findings such as low problematic behaviors in the adolescent sample and their mutual agreement in emphasizing following rules, and prizing academic excellence.

Adjusted Four Styles of PAQ

Based on student/child ratings, 114 parents (66.3%) are classed as Authoritative, 4 (2.3%), Permissive, 50 (29.1%) Authoritarian and 4 (2.3%) a Mixed style. Mixed parental style resulted from the results that 4 children rate their parents with a tie score on two of the three parental styles. The original PAQ did not provide a means for dealing
with tie scores, these four parents are placed into a mixed style category, due to the inability to place them in one category.

Table 6

**Adjusted Four Parental Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Styles</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Authoritative</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Permissive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Authoritarian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One noteworthy result of the PAQ is the prevalence of the Authoritative style over the other styles. From the entire sample, 66.3 % (N = 114) of the Chinese immigrant parents are perceived by their children as Authoritative over and above both Authoritarian and Permissive. This result seems to contradict the old perception that states that Chinese parents are basically Authoritarian. This finding reveals a new trend among the modern Chinese immigrant parents.
The results of t-tests reveal that rating the Authoritarian style, the difference between male adolescents \((M = 3.07, SD = .80)\) and female adolescents \((M = 2.80, SD = .70)\) is statistically significant (Table 7). That means the parents of male adolescents are perceived as more Authoritarian than the parents of the female adolescents are perceived.

Table 7

**Female and Male Adolescents and Authoritarian Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = 2.50 \quad P < .014. \]

T-tests also reveals that in the Permissive style, the score of Type 1 acculturation respondents (More Asian/Chinese oriented) is lower than the score of Type 2 acculturation respondents (Biculturally oriented). The difference between them \((Type 1, M = 2.20, SD = .50; \text{ vs. } Type 2, M = 2.43, SD = .50; \ t = -2.66, P < .009)\) is statistically significant (Table 8). That is the parents of Type 2 of acculturation (Biculturally oriented) respondents are perceived as more Permissive than the respondents of Type 1 acculturation.
Table 8

Two Types of Acculturation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of acculturation</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 More Asian/Chinese oriented</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 Biculturally oriented</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t = -2.66; \ p < .009. \]

Grounded in the traditional, patriarchal structure between the Chinese men and women, this research expected that the male parent sample would show a more Authoritarian style in comparison to the female parents, the results do not support this hypothesis. The difference between the male parents \( (N = 59, M = 2.88, SD = 0.72) \) and female parents \( (N = 113, M = 2.96, SD = 0.74) \) is not statistically significant. No assertion can be made that male parents are more Authoritarian than female parents.

The results also do not support another statement that predicts the scoring of the children's overall social skills development score \( (M = 54.51, SD = 8.21) \) would be higher than their parents' score \( (M = 55.15, SD = 9.14) \). The prediction originated from the assumption that Chinese parents with their traditional inclination to be Authoritarian would underrate their children's social skills development compared with the children's own rating.

Another statement expected that the male parents would show a more Authoritarian style in comparison to the female parents is not supported. The difference between the two sets of parents is not statistically significant (female parents, \( M = 3.00, SD = .80 \); male parent, \( M = 2.90, SD = .80 \)). To predict that male parents would be more
Authoritarian than female parents is influenced by the traditional, distinctive gender role expectation found in Chinese society. In other words, this traditional gender role expectation is not applicable to both genders in this research sample. While female parent respondents do obtain a slightly higher mean scores in the Authoritative (female: $M = 3.44$, SD = .80; male: $M = 3.27$, SD = .70) and lower in the Permissive styles (female: $M = 2.17$, SD = .46; male: $M = 2.32$, SD = .50), the differences are still not statistically significant.

**Explanation of Parental Styles**

One of the explanations for these results could be viewed from the framework of Bronfenbrenner's (1979) theory of ecological interconnectedness. Viewed from this perspective, it can be assumed that Chinese immigrant parent respondents have been exposed to the democratic values of America that result in them applying a more democratic approach to parenting their children. Furthermore, these results are in accord with Belsky’s (1984) model asserting that parental behavior is influenced by the context in which the parent-child relationship is evolving.

However, 50 (29.1%) of the parent respondent still lean strongly toward the Authoritarian style, that means these parents still hold on to a traditional parenting style in spite of their exposure to a democratic environment. One of the explanations for this result can be looked at according to the Baumrind’s (1961b) theoretical model which emphasizes parents’ belief systems. These Authoritarian parents might still prefer to hold on to the traditional parenting belief system that operates on a hierarchical, authoritarian interactional style with their offsprings. Thus, they are rated by their children as applying
this Authoritarian style. These Authoritarian parents most probably believe that their children would be best socialized by an Authoritarian parental style in order to face the multiple-faceted world of America. Furthermore, the results indicate that only 4 (2.3%) children rate their parents’ style as Permissive. This result calls for further investigation in to see what makes Chinese parents not permissive.

**Results of the Secondary SSRS**

The secondary level of Social Skills Rating System contains parent and student/child forms. The parent form of the SSRS (52 items) consists of two parts: Social Skills Scale (40 items) and Problem Behaviors Scale (12 items). The Social Skills Scale divides into four subscales: Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility, and Self-Control. The Problem Behavior Scale is designed to measure the three problematic behaviors that might interfere with social skill performance: externalization, internalization, and hyperactivity. Each problem is rated according to its perceived frequency. This research used the secondary level of the SSRS that has only externalization and internalization subdomains of the Problem Behavior Scale. Normed by the reference-sample, the manual provides a chart that has three levels of problem behaviors (Fewer, Average and More). The fewer the problem behaviors, the better is a respondent’s social skills development.

The student/child form of the SSRS (39 items) has only the Social Skill Scale with its four subscales: Cooperation, Assertion, Empathy and Self-Control. All returned surveys from both forms were scored and interpreted according to the manual published by the American Guidance Service (Gresham & Elliott, 1990), and also were compared to
the behavior levels normed by the standardized reference-sample. The results of the SSRS are as follows:

**Demographic Characteristics and the SSRS**

*Parent-form.* Based on Pearson product-moment correlation method, the years that parents lived in America is significantly and positively correlated to the subscales of Assertion (r = .18, p < .05), Responsibility (r = .16, p < .05), Self-Control r = .17, p < .05) and the total score of the SSRS (r = .19, p < .05) in parent form. The number of non-Chinese friends also is positively correlated with the subscales of Cooperation (r = .16, p < .05), Assertion (r = .36, p < .01), Self-Control (r = .27, p < .01) and total SSRS (r = .31, p < .01). The same positive relationship existed between the number of Chinese friends to the subscales of Assertion (r = .28, p < .01), and total SSRS (r = .18, p < .05).

Over all, the more years that parents live in America and the greater number of Chinese friends and non-Chinese friends, the higher the parents rated their children on the SSRS.
Table 9

**Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Parental Demographic Characteristics and the SSRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Variable</th>
<th>SSRS Variable</th>
<th>Coop</th>
<th>Asrt</th>
<th>Resp</th>
<th>Selfc</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years lived in America</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Chinese friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coop = Cooperation; Asrt = Assertion; Resp = Responsibility; Selfc = Self-Control.

**p < .01; * p < .05.

**Student/child form.** Like their parents, the student/child respondents have a positive, significant relationships between the number of non-Chinese friends and the subscale of Assertion (r = .24, p < .01) and the total score of the SSRS (r = .18, p < .050). The same positive relationship also existed between the number of Chinese friends and the subscales of Assertion (r = .20, p < .05), Empathy (r = .22, p < .01) and total SSRS (r = .20, p < .01). Once again the greater the number of Chinese and non-Chinese friends the higher the student/child’s score on the SSRS scales mentioned.
Table 10

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between the Student/Child’s Demographic Characteristics and the SSRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>student/Child Variable</th>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Chinese friends</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese friends</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01; * p < .05.

All data is examined by using t-tests. The differences among various groups are presented as follows. First, t-tests were run to look for differences between parent and student/child scores on the overall social skills scale and the related subscales. On the overall scores, there are no statistical differences between the parent (M = 55.16, SD = 9.15) and child (M = 54.51, SD = 8.22); however, there are statistical differences between parent and child on each of the related subscales. Parents (M = 12.40, SD = 3.07) rated their children lower on Cooperation than the children rated themselves (M = 15.91, SD = 2.50 t = -13.23, p < .0001). With respect to assertion parents rated their children higher (M = 13.60, SD = 3.05 and M = 11.35, SD = 2.95, respectively; t = 8.64, p < .0001). While the scores are very similar with regards to Responsibility/Empathy ratings between parent and child, parents (Responsibility, M = 15.97, SD = 2.80) rated their children slightly higher (Empathy, M = 15.33, SD = 3.20, t = 2.12, p < .036) than the children did themselves. Lastly, parents (M = 13.19, SD = 3.16) rated their children higher on Self-Control (M = 11.91, SD = 2.34, t = 4.82, p < .0001). With the
exception of Cooperation, parents tended to see their children in a more positive light than did the children themselves as revealed in their higher rating scores. The lower Cooperation score on the part of parents may come from different definitions of cooperation between the parents and their adolescent children. Suppose, parents wanted their children to be more cooperative. Yet in the eyes of their adolescents, they considered themselves very cooperative, therefore, they wanted to have more personal autonomy (Table 11).

Table 11

| Differences Between Parents and Adolescents on Overall Scales of the SSRS (N = 172) |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|----------|
|                                | Parents      | Child       |              |           |          |
|                                | M            | SD          | M            | SD        | t         | p         |
| Overall score                  | 55.16        | 9.15        | 54.51        | 8.22      | -13.23    | <0.0001   |
| Cooperation                    | 12.40        | 3.07        | 15.91        | 2.50      | -13.23    | <0.0001   |
| Assertion                      | 13.60        | 3.05        | 11.35        | 2.95      | 8.64      | <0.0001   |
| Responsibility/Empathy         | 15.97        | 2.80        | 15.33        | 3.20      | 2.12      | 0.036     |
| Self-Control                   | 13.19        | 3.16        | 11.91        | 2.43      | 4.82      | <0.0001   |

T-tests also indicate that Type 1 (More Asian/Chinese oriented) and Type 2 (Biculturally oriented) levels of acculturation of parents have a very close total scores for their separated groups of children (Table 12). It implies that no matter how acculturated the parents are, they kept a certain kind of objectivity in judging their children's social behavior. It also suggests that the degree of acculturation of immigrant parents does not change the universal challenges that different types of parents have to face when dealing with their adolescent offspring. Additionally, it denotes that the Chinese immigrant parents still keep a more traditional, moderate and modest way of viewing/expressing issues and
avoid taking up the extremes even when they are measuring, judging and rating their own
children's social behavior.

Table 12

**Acculturational Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 144</td>
<td>N = 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>55.02</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>54.46</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: no significant differences.

Table 13 presents the differences between two genders in the total scores of the
SSRS. The difference between female and male parents is not statistically significant. The
same result exists between female and male adolescents, too.

Table 13

**Gender and the SSRS (N = 172)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>M 54.95</td>
<td>SD 8.90</td>
<td>M 55.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents</td>
<td>56.04</td>
<td>N = 88 7.80</td>
<td>52.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: no significant differences

In addition to t-tests, one-way analysis-of-variance was run to look for differences
based on acculturation, parenting style, and parental gender. Table 14 shows that there is a
statistically significant difference in the total SSRS score between Authoritative and
Authoritarian parents in the child-form. Authoritative parents have a higher SSRS score than Authoritarian parents (F = 4.78, p < .003).

Table 14

**Parental Styles (N = 172)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AV (N = 114)</th>
<th>PV (N = 4)</th>
<th>AN (N = 50)</th>
<th>Mixed (N = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>56.36</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child *</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AV = Authoritative; PV = Permissive; AN = Authoritarian.

* F = 4.78, p < .003.

In sum, of the areas of interest in this research, acculturation, parental style, and gender, only parental style revealed statistically significant group differences. Of the four parenting styles statistical differences exist between only two of the four groups and are specific to the overall SSRS child scores. These differences are between the Authoritative (M = 55.95, SD = 7.35) and Authoritarian (M = 52.30, SD = 9.01; F = 4.78, p < .003) parents. Children with Authoritative parents have a higher total SSRS score than children with Authoritarian parents. This finding will be discussed further in the section related to parental styles.

In order to differentiate the total scores of the SSRS from various groups of respondents, the manual of the SL-ASIA provided several charts with standardized scores from the norm-referenced samples, including teachers, parents and the students/children in both the Social Skills Scale and the Problem Behavior Scale. Corresponding to the
different total scores of the respondents, three behavior levels including Fewer, Average, and More, are set to allow further distinction. In the secondary level of parent form, the total scores for the Fewer level fall between 0 to 47, the Average level, 48 to 66, and the More level, 67 to 80. In the student-child form, the total scores for the Fewer level fall between 0 to 46, the Average level, 46 to 61, and the More level, 62 to 80. Against these standardized information, the lowest (45) to the highest (56.75) total scores from both parent and the student/child respondents fall at the higher end of the Fewer to the middle point of the Average behavior level (Appendix O).

**Frequency and Importance Rating of the SSRS**

In both forms of the Social Skills Scale, there are two ways of scoring the main section of the subscales of the SSRS. One way is to rate “how frequent” a behavior occurs, and another way is to rate “how important/critical” a particular behavior is perceived by both parent and child.

**Parent form.** Of the 52 items, three stand out as most frequently occurring behaviors selected by parents: informing the parent before going out with friends (Item 32, N = 172, 100%), following rules when playing games with others (Item 24, N = 170, 98.9%), and waiting turn in games or other activities (Item 29, N = 169, 98.2%).

There are three least frequently presented behaviors: introducing oneself to new people without being told (Item 6, N = 136, 80.8%), keeping room clean and neat without being reminded (Item 15, N = 142, 76.7%) and attempting household tasks before asking for help (Item 3, N = 147, 81.4%) (Table 15).
The three behaviors are marked as important/critical: following rules when playing games with others (Item 24, N = 170, 98.9 %), informing the parent before going out with friends (Item 32, N = 169, 98.2 %), and following household rules (Item 33, N = 169, 98.2 %).

The three least important/critical behaviors are: attempting household tasks before asking for help (Item 3, N = 147, 85.5 %), inviting others to home (Item 12, N = 139, 80.8 %) and (Item 1, N = 136, 79.1 %), starting conversations rather than waiting for others to talk first (Table 16).

Student/child form. In the Student/Child Form of the SSRS, the results indicated that among 39 items, the three most frequently presented behaviors are: doing homework on time (Item 13, N = 172, 100 %), finishing classroom work on time (Item 17, N = 171, 98.4 %), and following the teacher’s directions (Item 35, N = 170, 94.4 %).

The three least frequently presented behaviors are: asking someone for a date, (Item 20, N = 168, 97.7 %), asking adults’ for help when other children are trying to hit me or push me around (Item 3, N = 145, 84.3 %), and being confident on dates (Item 4, N = 135, 78.5 %) (Appendix O).

The three most important/critical behaviors are: doing homework on time (Item 13, N = 168, 97.7 68 %), following the teachers’ directions (Item 35, N = 166, 96.5 %), and finishing classroom work on time (Item 17, N = 166, 96.5 %).

The three least important/critical behaviors are: asking someone I like for a date (Item 20, N = 168, 97.7 %), ignoring classmates who are clowning around in class
(Item 19, N = 152, 88.4 %), and asking adults for help when other children are trying to hit me or push me around (Item 3, N = 146, 84.9 %) (Appendix O).

Behavior Clusters of the Secondary SSRS

Alternatively, SSRS can be analyzed according to the combination of frequency, and the how important/critical rating among all 40 items. The results can be organized into four categories of strength, performance deficit, acquisition deficit, and not important in identifying various manifestation of social behaviors. This research finds that there are four clusters of social behaviors as rated by the parents with higher means than others. The notion is that the higher the means, the less the strength indicated in behaviors. Since all the means of these four areas did not reach a score of 3, the rated behaviors are not considered as acquisition deficit or unimportant. Rather they are in a status of either less strength or performance deficit. These four areas are described as follows:

The highest means are clustered in the behaviors of “household tasks”, such as keeping one’s room clean, attempting and helping with household tasks without being told or asked, completing household tasks within a reasonable time as included in the items of 2, 3, 11, 15, 16 and 28. The means ranged from 1.88 to 2.20. Evidently, parents did not rate their children as performing strongly in the behaviors of doing household tasks.

The second highest means are clustered in the behaviors of participating in organized activities such as joining groups, sports, or clubs, starting conversations rather than waiting for others to talk first, making friends and inviting friends home. These behaviors are appeared in the items of 4, 12, 26. The means ranged from 1.82 to 1.93. This might indicate that the Chinese immigrant teenage respondents are less inclined to
either join group activities or take initiative to socialize with others as rated by their parents.

The third highest means are clustered in the behaviors of self-appreciation and interactional behaviors. The first dimension, self-appreciation (Item 8), saying nice things about oneself when appropriate. The interactional behaviors included: being able to ask sale clerks for information or assistance, responding appropriately when hit or pushed by other children, accepting criticism well, controlling one’s temper in conflict situations, ending disagreement calmly, compromising in conflict situations by changing one’s own ideas to reach agreement, expressing appropriate feelings and confidence in interacting with opposite sex friends. These behaviors are rated by items 3, 9, 10, 18, 19, 27, 39 and 40. The means ranged from 1.70 to 1.80. This might indicate that parents wished that their children would perform better in the self-appreciation and performed more adequately in interactional dimensions.

The fourth highest means are clustered in the behaviors of using time. These behaviors are rated by items of 7, 23, 27, and 40. The means ranged from 1.70 to 1.74. Parents expect their children to use time more productively while waiting for help with homework or some other task and using free time at home in an acceptable way.

The three with the lowest means rated by parents are: informing parents before their children going out, following rules when playing games with others and waiting one’s turn in games or other activities as shown in items 24 and 29, and 32. The means ranged from 1.32 to 1.22. This might indicate that parents perceived their children as performing
well at informing them of whereabouts, and being able to follow rules when playing games with others.

**Coherence Between the Parents and Their Adolescent Children in the SSRS**

By viewing the frequency and the important/critical rating together, the results find a consistent pattern. That is the more or the less frequent the behaviors, the more or less important/critical is attached to them. For example, in the parent form, the more frequent and important/critical behaviors are informing the parent of whereabouts and following rules.

At same time, the less frequent and less important/critical behaviors are initiating interaction and keeping household tasks. Similarly, in the student/child form, the more frequent and important behaviors all related to proper classroom performance. The same pattern is found in the less frequent and less important/critical behaviors such as dating and asking for adult’s help in time of need.

Since consistence between the frequency and the importance/critical rating appeared in both parent and child set of results, this research only focuses on the importance/critical rating as an example to cross examine the results of the parents versus the results of the student/child’s. Here, too in this research a coherence emerged. The parent respondents emphasized following the rules either at home or in games (Items: 32, 24 & 29). The student/child respondents focused on following the rules of school in terms of finishing homework, following directions given by teachers (Items: 13, 35, & 17) as well as behaving well in the classroom. In sum, no matter what rules, the results indicate that following rules is important/critical for both sets of respondents.
Explanation of Coherence

In order to comprehend this coherence between these two sets of respondents, this research proposes two theories to interpret this emphasis of following rules. One theory is that although unavoidably influenced by the more individualized American value, out of a true caring spirit, the parent respondents still want their children to learn the traditional values of respecting the authority and obeying the social rules both at home and in activity. This emphasis on respect and obedience is a special training which is similar to Chao’s (1994) concept that the Chinese parents’ control (and Authoritarian parenting style) is a form of training. Although this kind of control and parental style are exercised in more Chinese hierarchical family context; it is unlike the merely harsh, tough and absolute control of irrational Authoritarian style of parenting. (As evidence shown in this research, 66 % (N = 113) of parents were rated as Authoritative.)

On the contrary, it is more like Baumrind’s (1991) concept of disciplinary technique which demands the growing maturity to obey the necessary social norms and interactional rules for children to become considerate and law abiding persons in order to function well in this democratic America.

The second theory can be put in this way. The parent respondents are afraid that if their children did not learn to follow rules, the parents might not be able to keep proper control and supervision over their adolescent children; in return, this might hamper their children’s further adjustment in America. As stated well by Sung (1987), the Chinese value of respect for one’s elders and for authority is common knowledge and needs no further elaboration. Respecting the elders and the authority entails obeying the rules set by
them. Following this train of thought, it would make sense to state that most probably, the student/child respondents are extending their training of respecting the elders and the authority at home to the school setting as reflected in the results. It seemed that the research respondents still are carrying the value of respecting the elders and the authority in their belief system and behavioral performance.

Alternatively, by comparing the less important behaviors between the parent and student/child results, a discrepancy is found. The parent respondents did not emphasize household cleaning, inviting friends to home and starting conversation presented by their children. Their children considered another set of behaviors unimportant such as asking someone for a date, being confident on dates and asking adult’s help.

One way to explain this discrepancy is that traditionally Chinese valued the educational achievement and scholarly labor of an individual highly and minimized the manual work such as house chores; therefore, even the modern parent respondents are not weighting household tasks nor taking initiative as important in socialization.

This strong emphasis on academic achievement might overshadow the importance of taking initiative in socializing, especially socializing with the opposite sex. This concern might be transmitted to their children and thereby, reflected by their children’s putting interacting with the opposite sex aside and rate these skills as unimportant/uncritical.

On the other hand, the parent respondents might simply consider that taking or not taking initiative in socializing is only a matter of transitional, adolescent behaviors which will be cured as their children mature more; thus, they de-emphasize these sets of socializing skills.
Additionally, another way of looking at the discussed discrepancy is that this might be a true reflection that these adolescent respondents are undergoing the natural process of so called "individuation"; therefore, they put less weight on asking for an adult's help, as well as interacting with the opposite sex. This de-emphasis of interacting with the opposite sex affirmed a report given by Sung (1985). Sung observed that the difference in attitudes and customs of dating and sexual attractiveness between the American and the Chinese posed a dilemma for both immigrant parents and their children.

Therefore while on the surface, the student/child respondents probably displayed their different judgments from their parents, in reality it might have been a manifestation of individuation phenomen. Very possible, under a greater inspection, these Chinese immigrant adolescents might merely be showing that they are still under the strong influence of traditional Chinese beliefs toward sexuality and, therefore, trying to ignore, deny or delay their sexual interests. If so, it is sound to say that parental influence is immeasurably important.

Another result worth noticing is that despite the parents' rating reporting accidents to appropriate persons is very important, their children do not. This discrepancy entailed two kinds of situations. One is reporting accidents of either an unintentional or intentional nature caused by other misbehaving peers. Another situation concerned about how to handle conflictual peer relationships when being wronged. This researcher assumed that this discrepancy mainly came from the great disparity of maturity levels between the parent and the student/child respondents, other than the gap among various ways of handling conflicts perceived by the parent and the student/child respondents.
Results of the Problem Behavior Scale of the SSRS

The Problem Behavior Scale of the SSRS attempts to ascertain the externalizing problems and the internalizing problems of the respondents. For example, the form states that the externalizing problems are inappropriate behaviors involving verbal or physical aggression toward others, poor control of one's temper, and arguing. It also defines internalizing problem behaviors as identifying anxiety, sadness, loneliness, and poor self-esteem. In the results of the overall Problem Behavior Scale, mothers have a score of \( M = 3.45 \) (SD = 2.45) and fathers have a score of \( M = 3.08 \) (SD = 2.09). Both scores fall between the Fewer (0 to 3) to Average levels (4 to 12) of behavior set by the normed sample. Therefore, the respondent students/children of this research are in the lower end of the Average level in the problem behavior subscale.
Table 15

Problem Behavior Levels Corresponding to Subscales and Total Scale Raw Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Normed Sample</th>
<th>Parent Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer Average More M SD M SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externalization</td>
<td>0 1-6 7-12</td>
<td>3.07 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>0-2 3-7 8-12</td>
<td>3.45 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0-3 4-11 12-24</td>
<td>3.45 2.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items 41 to 52 of the parent’s form were used to identify problem behaviors, with 0 on the rating scale indicating never; 1, sometimes; and 2, very often. In all instances the problem scale remains in the range of sometimes with the overall mean scores ranging from 1 to 1.10. Item 51 (acts sad or depressed) has a score of 1.00. Only one (0.6 %) out of 172 parents rated his/her child having this problem of being sad and depressed. Item 50 (shows anxiety about being with a group of children) is the only behavior rated as “never” occurred (Appendix 0).

Explanation of Adolescent Problem Behavior

This range of behaviors are among the 27 conflicts listed by Smilansky (1991) in his book, Between Adolescents & Parents. It is normal to find the struggles between the parents and their adolescent children. This research utilizes the “individuation theory” to understand this natural human process. The term “individuation” was coined by Mahler (1977) to describe a stage in the human development of a child from birth to the end of his third year. Later, Blos (1962, 1979) used this term to describe the psychodynamic process at the beginning of adolescence, defining this period as “a second individuation stage”. In
all, there are 11 stages of individuation in the full life cycle. According to Blos’s categorization, most of the parent respondents in this study fall at stage 9, middle aged, and their children all fall between stage 3 to 5, from early adolescence to advanced adolescence (12 to 18 years-old). In each stage, each person is faced with a set of tasks to manage in order to achieve personal psychological differentiation and autonomy and formulate ones’ own identity and fulfill life’s responsibility. According to the individuation theory, the parent respondents are in an evaluative stage which makes them re-examine their early decisions and youthful dreams. On the other hand, the student/child respondents are pursuing privacy, autonomy and new identity. In Crossing Paths, Steinberg (1994) best described how an adolescent child can trigger a parent’s own "middle age crisis". Steinberg’s basic assumption is that the degree to which a parent can deal with the crisis of his/her own, including those crises provoked by his/her child will determine how well that a parent and a child can grow in parallel.

This research supports both individuation theory and Steinberg’s positions and can be applied together to explain data results. In this light, it is explainable that it might be due to the physical as well as psychological rapid changes occurring for the adolescent respondents that they become easily embarrassed. It is also understandable that due to the search for autonomy and privacy, the adolescent might be perceived by their parents to want to be alone; yet most probably they want to be with the peers all the time.

In the process of forming a new identity, it is understandable that the adolescent respondents might stand up for themselves and if necessary talk back to their parents when corrected. If misunderstood by others, it might be viewed as acceptable for the adolescent
respondents to get angry, argue, lose their temper occasionally, feel lonesome or feel low about himself/herself.

But it is unproductive to deal with conflicts by fighting, threatening, bullying and acting sad or depressed. Fortunately, from the results, the adolescent respondents are basically a group of prosocial teenagers, their problematic behaviors only fall at the level of very few.

Statistically, only 1.7% (N = 3) student/child respondents manifested fighting, threatening, and bullying behaviors. Besides, only one child (0.6%, N = 172) behaved in a sad and depressed manner to a problematic degree. This research proposes that this prosocial development, to a certain degree, or be a direct reflection of how well the parent respondents are managing their own middle age crises and the crises caused by their children. Very possibly, that the parent respondents are re-evaluating their earlier decision of immigrating into America and re-examining how they can better raise their children in a challenging context of America with their bi-cultural experiences to deal with future. The argument can be that on the flip side, it is possible that the respondents are presenting themselves in a positive light in the survey research. But this researcher considers that it is more reasonable to see that there are several factors that can have contributed to this good outcome. For example, the parent respondents are middle aged, equipped with bi-cultural experience, well educated and have good contact with the mainstream of America by varied occupational experiences and many non-Chinese friends.

In addition, 72% (N = 124) of the student/child respondents were born in America, speaking English as their primary language and most have more non-Chinese
friends than their parents. All of them are currently involved with the American education system; and 98.9% (N = 170) of them are living with one or both parents in mostly Caucasian residential areas. The strong evidence from the results depict that this group of middle-aged Chinese parents and adolescent respondents are well integrated into the American fabric. Therefore, the student/child respondents' social skills are developing in a normal fashion as measured by the American instrument of the SSRS.

**Correlations Between the Secondary SSRS and PAQ.**

The data from these two measures are analyzed using the Pearson product-moment correlational method and the results are as follows:

**Parent-form.** In the parent form, among three parenting styles, the Authoritarian style has significant and inverse relationships with the three subscales and the total score of the SSRS (Cooperation: r = -17, p < .05; Responsibility: r = -21, p < .01; Self-Control = -16, p < .01 and total: r = -23, p < .01). Authoritarian parenting style has significant and positive relationships with Externalization (r = .16, p < .05) and Internalization (r = 16, p < .05) of problem behavior subscale. These results indicate that parents with higher Authoritarian scores rated their children’s total score of the SSRS lower than parents of the other two styles. By the same token, parents with Authoritarian style rated their children with higher Externalization and Internalization in problem behaviors.

**Student-form.** In the student/children form, Authoritative style has significant and positive relationships with two subscales and the total score of the SSRS Cooperation: r = .16, p < .05; Self-Control: r = .28, p < .01 and the total score of the SSRS: r = .2,
p < .01). On the contrary, Authoritarian style has significant and inverse relationships with two subscales and the total score of the SSRS (Cooperation: r = -.20, p < .01; Self-Control: r = -.34, p < .01; and the total score of the SSRS: r = -23, p < .01). In addition, the Permissive parenting style was the only one having significant, inverse correlation with Empathy (r = -0.19, p < .05). In short, the results indicate that children of Authoritative style have higher scores than children of other styles do.

Table 16

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between the SSRS and PAQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAQ</th>
<th>Cooperation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Self-Control</th>
<th>Total (Parent)</th>
<th>Total (Child)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent-Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child-Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice: AN = Authoritarian; PV = Permissive; AV = Authoritative.

** p < .01; * p < .05.

The above results can be understood in the following ways. First, the Authoritative style of parenting is related positively to the total social skills development of the youth. Secondly, the Authoritarian style of parenting is related negatively to the total social skills development. Although the absolute connection between Authoritative style and the better
social skills development cannot be established merely by this study, at least this result is consistent with the assertions made by Baumrind (1967). According to Baumrind, Authoritative parenting is more likely to result in self-reliant, independent, achievement oriented, self-controlled children than are either Authoritarian or Permissive parenting. To Baumrind (1982), Authoritarian parenting is especially deleterious in the development of these personality and behavioral correlates of self-esteem.

In parallel, the research done by Lewis (1981) also finds that children high in dominance and control (Authoritarian parenting) have poor social development and adjustment. In contrast, it is found that parents who are less dominating and more willing to share control (Authoritative parenting) with their children have children who achieve more positive outcomes.

The aforementioned assertions are confirmed by the results of this study. For example, in the parent-form, the Authoritarian style correlates inversely and significantly with subscales of Cooperation, Responsibility, and Self-Control. Besides, in the student/child form, the Authoritative style correlates positively and significantly to the subscales of Cooperation and Self-Control. Conversely, the Authoritarian style correlates inversely and significantly to the subscales of Cooperation, Self-Control. The Permissive style also correlates negatively and is statistically significant to Empathy subscale. The inverse and significant correlations between the Authoritarian style and several subscales confirm the research of Youniss (1978) who finds that when parents behave in an Authoritarian manner, a morality of constraint and lower self-esteem resulted, consequently, the social skills development was negatively influenced.
Empathy, Self-Control Subscales and Parental Styles

Analysis of variance was conducted to examine the differences between parental styles and the subscales of the SL-ASIA. Authoritative parents reported a statistically higher Empathy score ($M = 15.72$, $SD = 2.80$) than parents falling into the Mixed parental style category ($M = 11.50$, $SD = 1.29$) (Table 17). On the Self-Control subscale, parents classified as Authoritative ($M = 12.57$, $SD = 2.07$) were statistically higher than parents classified as Authoritarian ($M = 10.48$, $SD = 2.54$). These results imply that the Authoritative parenting has more positive relationships than the Mixed style of parenting does to the development of empathy in youth. Similarly, the Authoritative style is also related more positively to the development of Self-Control (Table 18).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Permissive</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Form *</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.72</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $F = 4.37$, $p < .0005$. 
Table 18

Analysis of Variance Between the Parental Styles & Self-Control Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authoritative (N = 114)</th>
<th>Permissive (N = 4)</th>
<th>Authoritarian (N = 50)</th>
<th>Mixed (N = 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Form</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Form*</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F = 11.36, p < .005.

In *Empathy and Its Development* (Eisenberg, 1987), Feshback asserted that a parental attribute, such as the degree of involvement or noninvolvement, might relate to the development of empathy children. Thus, it can be assumed that some dimensions of the Permissive style, such as no boundary setting, noninvolvement, and non-controlling aspects, possibly are contributing factors to the inverse yet significant correlation between the Permissive style and Empathy subscale. This result also confirms the research done by Baumrind and some other researchers (Always, 1980; Baumrind, 1971; Patterson, 1982); they find negative consequences of Permissive parenting.

Based on the results, the hypothesis says that the female adolescent participants (N = 88, M = 87.52 SD = 4.18) will show less problematic social behavior than the male adolescent participants (N = 84, M = 87.22, SD = 3.58) is not supported. The general low problematic social behavior in the entire respondent group resulted in this non-difference on this particular hypothesis. The lack of extreme ratings between female and male student/child respondents goes against the stereotype regarding gender differences in adolescent’s antisocial behavior.
**Pearson Correlation Coefficients Among Problem Behavior Subscales (PBS)**

In Table 19, the overall picture is that the scores of the SSRS correlate negatively to the Problem Behavior Subscale. In the parent form, the total score correlates negatively and significantly with the Problem Behavior Subscale and its two subdomains of Externalization and Internalization ($r = -.23, p < .05$). In the student/child form, the overall score ($r = -.16, p < .05$), Cooperation ($r = -.16, p < .01$) and Self-Control ($r = .21, p < .01$) correlate negatively and significantly with the Externalization. The same inverse and statistically significant relationship exists between Assertion, Internalization ($r = -.16, p < .05$) and Problem Behavior Subscale ($r = -.16, p < .05$). In contrast, Authoritarian style correlates positively and significantly with Internalization ($r = .16, p < .05$) and Problem Behavior Subscale ($r = .16, p < .05$). These results illustrate that problem behaviors and Authoritarian parenting are detrimental to the social skills development.
Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Externalization</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
<th>EX/ IN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Total Score</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/EX</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/IN</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/EX/IN</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Total Score</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Cooperation</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Assertion</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-Self-Control</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian style</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: EX = Externalization; IN = Internalization.

** p < .01; * p < .05.

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Within Subscales of the Parent-Form

Table 20 presents a matrix of the internal relationships among subscales of the parent form. Four subscales correlate positively and significantly with each other and with the total Social Skills Scale. But all four subscales as well as the total scale correlate negatively with Externalization, Internalization and the overall Problem Behavior Subscale. These results signify an interrelatedness among the various social skills. The pro-social behaviors such as Cooperation, Assertion, Responsibility and Self-Control support each other facilitating the overall social skills. But the problem behaviors like Externalization and Internalization undermine social skills development. Compared to the other three skills (r = 0.08, p < .01), Responsibility (r = 0.09, p < .01) correlates most highly to the overall score of the Social Skills Scale. Thus, it can be said that in the eyes of
the parent sample, a sense of responsibility occupies a critical position to the overall social skills. This researcher assumes that the root of emphasizing responsibility among Chinese immigrant parents arises from the pursuit of social harmony.

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent-Form</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Coop.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asrt</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resp.</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.6**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selfc.</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>.9**</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EX.</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. INTL</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. E/I</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** p < .01; * p < .05.

Correlation Coefficients Within Subscales of Student/Child Form

Table 21 lists the internal relationships among subscales of the student/child form. Four subscales correlate positively and significantly with each other and to the total Social Skills Scale. Yet all four subscales as well as the total scale correlate negatively with Externalization, Internalization and the overall Problem Behavior Subscale. These results are similar to Table 21, displaying an interconnectedness among various social skills. The pro-social behaviors such as cooperation, assertion, empathy and self-control reinforce each other in promoting the overall social skills. But the problem behaviors hinder the
development of social skills. Empathy ($r = .9$, $p < 0.01$) correlates most highly to the overall social skills compared to the other three social skills ($r = .8$, $p < 0.01$). The adolescent sample weighs Empathy as a leading element to the overall social skills. Empathy entails being able to understand others cognitively, identify with others emotionally and take action to assist others. This researcher asserts that the heavy weight given to Empathy by the adolescent sample is a manifestation of seeking peer support.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child-Form</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coop.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asrt</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Emp.</td>
<td>.6**</td>
<td>.6**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selfc</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>.9**</td>
<td>.8**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EX.</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. IN.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. E/I</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coop. = Cooperation; Asrt. = Assertion; Emp. = Empathy; Selfc = Self-Control.
EX = Externalization; IN = Internalization; E/I = Total Problem Behavior Subscale;
CAES = Total Score of the Student/Child Form of the SSRS.

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$.

 Interview

The interviews were conducted with ten pairs of parent-child respondents. For confidentiality, the names of the interviewees have been changed. A summary of their interviews can be put as follows:
Feedback on demographic information. Regarding the entire survey, eight parents preferred using the Mandarin translation version of the survey. These parents said that the Mandarin version was easier for them to understand and read. Their children showed either indifference or a preference for the English version of the survey. Two parents expressed a concern about the confidentiality and the intrusiveness of the surveys into their private lives. After being given an assurance of confidentiality and an explanation of their contribution for this investigation as well as the benefit to the Chinese community, these parents felt relieved. Four parents and three children commented that in the demographic section, those questions regarding the number of relatives, aunts, uncle...etc., were difficult to answer because they were not in close contact with their relatives due to the geographical distance. They also stated that even if they could put down the exact numbers of their relatives, verification of this information was impossible. In addition, five parents said that it was difficult to say how many Chinese or non-Chinese friends they had because the Chinese definition of a friend had multiple-meanings.

Feedback on parent-adolescent interaction. Regarding the parenting questionnaire the survey, all parents agreed that it is a great challenge to handle their adolescent children. Hong recalled vividly that the age of ten seemed like a magic number for her daughter, Ahwa. When Ahwa reached ten years old, she started refusing to join family gatherings and forbade anyone to read her diary or letters. Shong and Yu said that their sons told them straight out that "a father cannot be a friend". All parents reported that their adolescent children talked back to them when corrected much more than when they themselves were small. They realized that, due to the American environment, the
traditional Authoritarian style often does not produce the desired results. Therefore, they tried to allow more freedom, independence, and privacy to their children.

Hoo, Huang and Wang said that, occasionally, they still had to apply a more Authoritarian approach; e.g., if their children tried to experiment on drugs for fun. Ahfu, Bin and Shing communicated that in terms of dealing with the issue of drug use, their parents became extremely vigilant and strict. Their parents would monitor them very closely whenever there was any indication of drug use.

Regarding the differences of opinions, Ling, Mei and Ning laughingly told me that their children even forbade them to look into what they had written in their surveys and requested that their parents respect their privacy. Wen was shocked to realize how diverse the perceptions were between herself, her son and her daughter when they had an open discussion about parental styles. Ahwa and Shufeing stated that frequently their parents were “old-fashioned”. For example, their parents did not allow them to stay at their friends’ house for a pajama party or to go camping without a chaperone.

Mi-Mi became irritated when her mother told her that “good girls do not wear low-cut blouses”. Ahwa, Fei-Fei and Mi-Mi told me that they could not understand why their mothers made a great fuss when they tried to wear cosmetics, as many of the American girls did. Don was upset that his allowance had been reduced after he joined a roller blading club outside his school. Hong complained that her daughter wanted extra money to buy what she thought were unnecessary things such as fashionable clothing and perfume.
In the area of dating, all parents expressed that their children should be allowed to date only after entering into college. Ling remembered that her husband refused to talk to their daughter, Fei-Fei, for more than a week when he observed, in a slow dancing party that Fei-Fei was dancing closely with a non-Chinese male friend.

Seven adolescents expressed that they wanted to get into good colleges and they did not want "a boyfriend or girlfriend" hindering them. Don and Quin (both were 17 years old) expressed that they were too young to date anyway. Wang said that he did not want his children to be involved with that "monkey business" too early and that, in his opinion, many other activities were more fun than dates.

On the other hand, all girls who were interviewed expressed that they did not fully agree with their parents' beliefs regarding dating. Yuing said because her former friends went to different schools, she felt lonely in her new school setting; as a result the first one and half years of high school were especially hard. Worse yet, all of her new girl-friends were enjoying boyfriends except her.

Other girls stated that they were often worried about whether they were as beautiful and attractive as other non-Chinese girls, because their parents did not allow them to have a boyfriend. Yet they were also not sure whether it was a good thing to have a boy friend because their parents had warned them that if they had boy friends now, they would pay a big price in the future.

All of the adolescents interviewed wanted to excel academically. Except three, the other seven adolescent respondents did not object to mastering Mandarin as their second language and they expressed a desire to go back to the Orient, at least for a short visit.
Ahfu said, “after all, my parents came from another part of the world, I want to know about that part of the world.” Mi-Mi said, “I am an American, not Chinese. I don’t see why my parents emphasize going to the Chinese school on the weekend so much.” Shufeng said, “I felt embarrassed when my relatives told me that I spoke Chinese like the way they spoke English. I disliked their comment!” Ahwa and her younger brother, Ping, said, “We are lucky that our parents send us back to Taiwan every summer. We make a lot of friends there and they are nice to us. We are not afraid of talking to them in Mandarin.”

Feedback on SL-ASIA. Regarding the SL-ASIA section of the survey, six parents said that they had moments of hesitation and ambivalence when survey items asked them to categorize themselves from several categories: (a) Oriental, (b) Asian, (c) Asian-American and (d) Chinese-American, and (e) American. For them, these categories were not definitive enough. For instance, they argued that a Chinese immigrant can belong to two or more of the above categories but the survey items only required one choice. Four parents suggested that “Chinese” identity should be offered as a category. They also commented that items 24 and 25 were too vague to answer (Item 24--Rate yourself on how well you fit in with other Asians of the same ethnicity; Item 25--Rate yourself on how well you fit in with other American who are non-Asian, Westerns). In addition, two parents suggested adding two other questions to the SL-ASIA section: (a) “how well do you know the American customs” and, (b) “how comfortable do you feel in practicing American customs.
No children interviewed gave much thought to the SL-ASIA section. The general impression was that the parent respondents struggled more in acculturation than their children did. Seven child-respondents expressed that they felt comfortable with other Asians of the same ethnicity as well as with other non-Chinese, particularly, in the areas of language, and making non-Chinese friends. Two child-respondents reported that they could not express a preference for Chinese or non-Chinese identity. One male child-respondent, working part-time in an American supermarket, said that he preferred to be associated with the non-Chinese friends more because his non-Chinese friends preferred sports over getting better grades.

**Summary of interview.** In short, from the qualitative interviews with the Chinese immigrant respondents, three conclusions can be made in accordance with Baptist’s (1993) observation on immigrant families, adolescent and acculturation.

First, immigrants including Chinese families experience a certain degree of disconnection from the extended family network. The shared connection with their relatives were greatly reduced and, at the same time, to make friends with non-Chinese friends took an extra amount of effort for many immigrants. Most of the immigrants have to make a tremendous efforts to establish contact with either with the Chinese or non-Chinese communities. This research also indicates that the child-respondents made more non-Chinese friends than their parents did.

Secondly, because they had better grasp of English and they were more impressionable, the younger generation seemed to feel less stress adjusting to American values, customs and practices. It is obvious that the Chinese immigrant parents are trying
hard to preserve some of the traditional Chinese traditions in their children for fear of losing their children to the American culture. At the same time, the immigrant parents are fully aware that they must adopt some American values and practices to effectively cope with their children’s development. After all, their number one goal in life is to assist their children to be well integrated into American society and thus, live a better life in the future. Willingly or unwillingly, these Chinese immigrant parents are experiencing a lessening of parental authority, but they continue to advocate that their children need a good education. Their children have absorbed this attitude as their primary concern by their rating good behavior in the school setting in this research. With modern practicality and functionality, both parents and children of Chinese immigrants successfully keep the traditional Confucius attitude honoring scholarly achievement alive.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This study sought to examine the impact of acculturation and parental style on the social skills development among Chinese immigrant families. The participants are from a more educated, suburban segment of the population and are more representative of that population than a less schooled, or urban based sample. The hypotheses are made according to the five acculturation levels of the Suinn-lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale.

One hundred and seventy two pairs of parent/child surveys are analyzed. The results indicate an uneven distribution among the five levels of acculturation. The majority of the respondents cluster around Type 1, \( (N = 144, 83.70\%) \), More Asian/Chinese oriented and Type 2, \( (N = 28, 16.30\%) \), Biculturally oriented acculturation. Due to the lack of differentiation, it is impossible to test the first five original expectations.

However, this study also sought to test another three statements.

The sixth hypothesis is that the fathers will be more Authoritarian than mothers. T-tests reveal that the difference between the female and male parents is not statistically significant; therefore, the sixth statement is not supported (female: \( N = 113, M = 2.96, SD = .73 \); vs. male: \( N = 59, M = 2.87, SD = .72 \)).

The seventh hypothesis is that the female adolescent sample will show less
problematic social behavior than the male adolescent sample. T-tests reveal that the difference between the female and male adolescent respondents in the Problem Behavior Scale is not statistically significant. Therefore, the seventh statement is not supported (female: $N = 88, M = 87.52, SD = 4.18$; vs. Male: $N = 84, M = 87.22, SD = 3.58$). This outcome is consistent with the fact that both sets of adolescents only fall into the range of Fewer and Average levels of problem behaviors measured against the standardized charts of the manual. In this light, it is unlikely that the female and male adolescents will have significant differences in problem behaviors.

The eighth hypothesis is that the scoring of the children's social skills development will be higher than that rated by their parents. T-tests reveal the following results. On the overall scores there are no statistical differences between the parent $(M = 55.16, SD = 9.15)$ and child $(M = 54.51, SD = 8.22)$ scores; however, there are statistical differences between parent and child on each of the related subscales. Parents $(M = 12.40, SD = 3.07)$ rated their children lower on Cooperation than the children rated themselves $(t = -13.23, p < .001)$. With respect to Assertion, parents rated their children higher (parents: $M = 13.60, SD = 3.05$; vs. children: $M = 11.35, SD = 2.95$, respectively, $t = 8.54, p < .001$). While the scores are very similar with regards to Responsibility/Empathy ratings between parent and child, parents $(M = 15.80, SD = 2.80)$ rated their children $(M = 15.33, SD = 3.20)$ slightly higher $(t = 2.12, p < .036)$. Lastly, parents $(M = 13.19, SD = 3.16)$ rated their children $(M = 11.91, SD = 2.34)$ higher on Self-Control $(t = 4.82, p < .0001)$. With the exception of Cooperation, parents tended to see their children more positively than children themselves, as revealed in their higher rating scores.
In addition to t-tests, analysis of variance was also run to look for differences based on acculturation, parental style, and parental gender. No significant differences are shown between the parents and their children on the acculturational types. There is a statistically significant difference in the total Social Skills System scores between Authoritative and Authoritarian parents. Authoritative parents have a higher Social Skills Rating System score than Authoritarian parents.

Of the areas of interest in this study, (acculturation, parental style, and gender) only parental style revealed statistically significant group differences. Of the four parental styles, statistical differences exist between only two of the four groups and are specific to the overall Social Skills Rating System child scores. These differences are between the Authoritative (M = 55.92, SD = 7.35) and Authoritarian (M = 52.30, SD = 9.01) parents. Children with Authoritative parents have a higher total Social Skills Rating System score than children with Authoritarian parents.

In order to penetrate the depth of these results, the following section will re-examine them in the light of the mirror effect of Western/American and Asian/Chinese cultural values proposed by Augsburger (1986) mentioned in the section of literature review.

**Group-Oriented vs. Individual-Oriented**

Clearly, the parent sample strongly attaches itself to the Asian/Chinese culture. This result evidences that the group-oriented cultural value from the Asian/Chinese background still has its hold on identity among the sample parents. This group-oriented inclination seems to be transmitted well to their adolescent children. For example: the
parent and adolescent respondents both put emphasis on following rules at home and in school. In other words, conformity and obedience to the social and group expectations and hierarchical authorities are perceived as very important by the entire sample. On the other hand, taking personal initiative and meeting personal needs are secondary or brushed aside to an individuated identity.

**Patriarchal vs. Egalitarian Structure**

There were 113 (65.7%) mothers and 59 (34.3%) fathers in this study. This fact is congruous with the common phenomenon that mothers are interacting more than fathers in their children’s daily activities. What seems significant is that the majority of the parents were rated by their children as Authoritative (N = 114, 66%). This strong maternal presence might be explained as the cause for the result mentioned above, because mothers usually tend to be more tender, benevolent and flexible to their children than fathers do as traditional role expectations prescribed. However, this researcher considers it as a sign of a paradigm shift regarding the Chinese immigrant family structure. This implies that a new trend of egalitarian relationship has/is replacing the traditional hierarchical men’s dominance, and it is reflected on the shift in the parental style from a more Authoritarian to a more Authoritative style. Actually, it mirrors a repercussion of acculturation that the exposure to the Western/American egalitarian way of relating is exerting its power on Chinese immigrant families’ structure and parenting style. Bronfenbrenner (1979)’s concept of ecological interrelatedness works best to support this paradigm shift in Chinese immigrant families.

**External Control vs. Internal Control**
Traditional Chinese heavily accentuate the external control as observed by Rotter (1961). Hsu (1949) suggests that instead of shame, suppression and repression are usually employed as restraints in socializing persons into cultural and social conformity in a culture that values external control. From this researcher's personal experience, a conventional Chinese chastising household phrase "recognizing the shame" is more prevalently stressed and effectively employed than unconscious suppression or repression as a psychological mechanism to ensure socialization with the individual in Chinese society. Influenced by the Confucian tradition, to excel in scholarship is historically a highly prized tool for an individual to get rid of personal and/or familiar shame and a gateway to honor one's own linkage of all levels, including, parents, relatives, friends and ancestors. Therefore, external control of group sanction/approval, as well as significant people's criticism/acceptance, are far more important to the individual than internal control of taking personal responsibility in action. In this sample, the adolescent respondent prioritizes the academic excellence and fulfillment of being a student. From this researcher's point of view, this result manifests an occurrence of intergenerational transmission in the area of external control among Chinese families in the modern American environment. Through academic excellence, the Chinese immigrant youth can be better integrated into the American society that would eventually honor the family linkage. In other words, the Chinese immigrant youth unconsciously accept their parents' value transmission on scholarly excellence and are socialized well not to shame their Asian/Chinese tradition by failing to do so. Furthermore, the sample youth, by setting priority on school work, channel their energy positively. Consequentially, they score at the
level of Fewer to and Average in the Problem Behavior Scale. Thus, simultaneously, both the Chinese immigrant parents and their children of this study sample are finding positive ways to be integrated into American society.

Interpersonal Obligation vs. Contractual Responsibility

In the area of responsibility, traditional Chinese tend to hold an attitude of acknowledging any personal achievement as an achievement merited by the efforts of many people. Thus, interpersonal responsibility/obligation extend from the contractual obligations to the unspoken obligatory reciprocity that arises out of human relationships. Our results indicate that the score of the responsibility subscale is the highest among other subscales in parent form. Similarly, in the student/child form, the Empathy subscale, an equivalent scale of Responsibility scale, also has the highest score above other subscales. This researcher perceives that this high score coherence can be attributed to the common cultural value that both parents and their adolescent children are holding. That means that the Chinese immigrant families are still leaning toward meriting interpersonal obligation more than Western/American contractual responsibility. In the same vein, the adolescent sample consider that the fraternal empathy is more important than contractual, negotiable reciprocity.

Strengths

Based on the results, this study is able to serve the following functions. This study attempts to integrate the correlational variables among the parental acculturation, parental styles and the social development of the children of Chinese immigrant families in America. This study helps to describe a common experience among many Chinese
immigrant families in the United States. While in the process of acculturation into the American society, the Chinese immigrants still hold pride in their ethnic heritage and strongly hold to the traditional, cultural values.

It is reasonable to say that the Chinese immigrants are successful at preserving a strong presence with a distinct cultural identity in the multi-cultural context of America. The results of this study also challenge the former stereotyping about the Chinese parental style as dominantly Authoritarian. The results indicate that the majority of (N =114, 66%) the parent respondents was rated as the Authoritative rather than the Authoritarian (N =50, 29%). Also as expected that only few (N = 4, 2.3%) parents were rated as Permissive because Chinese parents are traditionally more strict.

Despite the acculturational stress experienced by the Chinese immigrant families, their adolescents are not only developing the average/ regular social skills, but also their problematic behaviors fall at the fewer to the average range. The Authoritative style seems to affect children’s social skills development most positively regardless of the ethnic and immigrant background of the Chinese immigrant parents and their adolescent children. These results confirm former research which showed that the practice of the Authoritative style would enhance the pro-social behaviors in children such as cooperation, empathy, self-control, and social skills development in general.

This study also indicates that the Authoritarian parental style has a negative influence on the development of cooperation, responsibility, and self-control as well as on general social skills development. The Authoritarian style also negatively impacts on the children’s externalization and internalization in problematic behaviors.
Standing out clearly and repeatedly is the fact that three demographic variables (the years that a parent lived in America, the number of Chinese friends, and the number of non-Chinese friends) have positive and significant relationship with the total scores of Social Skills Rating System, particularly in the area of Cooperation, Assertion, Self-Control, and Empathy but not Responsibility.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are as follows: The limited respondents circumscribed the further using of the statistical methods which rendered the testing of hypotheses impossible. The second limitation is that because of the homogeneity among the respondents (only Chinese immigrant families), the results could not be generalized to describe other groups of immigrants in the U.S.. The third limitation is that since the parent-respondents as a group are generally well educated and mostly live in the mixed residential areas, their degree of acculturation might not be representative of the population who are less educated and live inside the ethnic enclaves. The fourth limitation is that there is a difficulty of working in two languages and finding a Chinese translation that is absolutely compatible to the English version.

Recommendations for Future Research

The interrelatedness among the variables of acculturation, parental style and the social development among the immigrant families is an under-investigated territory. Its rich domain opens a fertile soil for further exploration. The comparisons between intra-ethnic versus inter-ethnic groups of immigrants continue to provide great potential for understanding the ever changing dynamics of immigrant families across life stages.
Further investigation not only can expand the number of research samples; but can also increase the heterogeneous nature among the participants. The population inside the ethnic enclaves needs much more attention from the researchers in order to help them cope with many burning issues that they are experiencing, for example, coping with acculturational stress, developing and utilizing a growth-producing style of parenting, applying constructive strategies to handle conflicts between parents and adolescents, and developing some concrete assistance for enhancing the pro-social behaviors among immigrant adolescents.

Many surveys can be developed tailored to the uniqueness of a particular ethnic culture in concern. For example, a Chinese acculturation survey (in Mandarin and in English) can be developed by collecting more ethnically specific information to form a more ethnically-specific kind of survey instead of using a pan-Asia survey with any distinctive group from Asia.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study is twofold: to investigate how the experience of acculturation influences the social development of Chinese immigrant children and to explore the interaction of the degree of acculturation, parental styles and social behavior of Chinese adolescents in the multicultural society of the United States.

Data presented above shows that, overall, the acculturation experience of Chinese immigrant parents has no negative influence of the social skills development of their adolescent children. This means that the sample Chinese immigrant adolescents grow as American youth do, without bearing the negative impact from the degree of their parents's
acculturation. In general, the parent sample perceives and rates their children's social behaviors more positive than their adolescent children do themselves.

The complex interaction of parental acculturation, parental styles and the social behavior of Chinese adolescents do exhibit some findings. First, the parent sample is more Authoritative than Authoritarian and Permissive. The overall social skills development of the adolescents from Authoritative parents is higher than either Authoritarian parents or Permissive parents. Lastly, the gender of parents does not show any impact on the overall social skills development of their adolescents. In sum, to investigate the interconnectedness of acculturation, parental styles and social skills development is a fertile field for further research.
APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTION LETTER TO THE PARENT/GUARDIAN

Yue-Ching Chen
1040 W. Granville Apt# 717
Chicago IL 60660-2123
Telephone: 773-262-1107
02.18.1997

Dear Parent/Guardian: (敬愛的家長／監護人)

I would really appreciate it if you would help me by filling out this survey for my dissertation. You and I are both experiencing many bicultural differences in America. Through my research, I hope to understand how our Chinese friends are adapting to their family roles (e.g., parents and children) in the American context, and how well they are doing socially. I also hope that when the chance comes, I will be skillful enough to help our Chinese friends adjust successfully to the host culture of the United States where we are living. So, friends, when you fill out this survey, you are actually contributing something very important to our Chinese community. Also, I hope you will enjoy this meaningful task. Please return the survey to me as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

我們都親身經歷到生活在美國環境中，雙重文化的差異。我寫博士論文的目的，正是為深入了解僑友們如何在現況中，扮演家庭及社會的多重角色。當良機來臨，我希望能學以致用地輔助僑友們成功地適應美國的本土文化。為此，我敬邀您填寫這份問卷，協助我收集資料。朋友請記住，當您執筆時，你正給予僑友團體莫大的貢獻。請儘速回卷。如有問題，歡迎以電話聯絡。

Thank you and have a bright future! 敬祝 鵠程萬里 謹至謝忱

Sincerely yours,

Yue-Ching Chen 陳月卿 敬上
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APPENDIX B
CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT 同意書
(PARENT/GUARDIAN FORM) (家長/監護人)

A. PURPOSE 目標
The purpose of this research is to learn how the experience of acculturation influences
the social development of Chinese immigrant teenagers. This research is also to explore
the interaction of parenting styles, the degree of acculturation, and the social behavior of
Chinese immigrant teenagers in the multicultural society of the United States. The
information gathered from this research will be used for my dissertation research which is
to fulfill partially the requirements of attaining the Ph.D. degree at Loyola University of
Chicago, the Department of Education Psychology.

B. PROCEDURES 程序
1. The parent/guardian respondent will be asked to fill out two surveys.
請家長／監護人填寫兩份問卷。
2. The parent/guardian respondent may also participate in an optional interview after the
researcher has received his/her surveys. The parent/guardian respondent can voluntarily
choose to be interviewed either by phone or face-to-face. If the parent/guardian
respondent chooses to be interviewed, the parent/guardian respondent will leave his/her
telephone number for the researcher to contact him/her by his/her survey code number, or
the parent/guardian respondent can voluntarily leave his/her name and telephone number
for the researcher to contact him/her for an interview with the understanding that all
information will be kept confidential.
當研究員收到家長／監護人的回卷後，家長／監護人可以自由參加會談。
C. RISK AND BENEFIT 收穫與損失

1. There is no physical risk associated with participating in this research.
参加研究的人，不會遭受任何損失。

2. The parent/guardian respondent understands that all the information gathered from him/her will be kept confidential. So the risk of this study is minimal.
所收集到的資料，將全納為機密資料。

3. There are possible benefits. One is that the respondents will possibly increase their own awareness of the dynamic accompanying acculturation, parental styles, and social skill development among Chinese immigrant children. Another benefit relates to the contribution of the respondents to the now scanty research information on Chinese immigrant families in the United States.
參加的人可預見兩種收穫：1.能更加了解本地文化、教養方式及華裔子女社會行爲的發展。2.在尚呈稀少的美國資訊中，貢獻您寶貴的意見。

D. STATEMENT OF ANONYMOUS PARTICIPATION AND CONFIDENTIALITY
匿名參加及機密的聲明

The parent/guardian respondent understands that anonymous participation and strict confidentiality will be maintained throughout this research. The parent/guardian respondent also understands that the two surveys and other interview contents will be coded with numbers, and personal and identifying characteristics will be removed. As per American Psychological Association standards, lists of names, codes, survey materials and other interview contents that the parent/guardian provides will be kept in a locked cabinet for three years, then shredded. Only the dissertation committee members and the principal researcher, Yue-Ching Chen, are allowed to access to the data.
E. STATEMENT OF VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION 自願參與的聲明

The parent/guardian respondent understands the above statements. If the parent/guardian respondent wished further clarification, Dr. Edward Quinnan will answer any further questions the parent/guardian respondent may have concerning the research or the procedures. The parent/guardian respondent can reach him at Loyola University of Chicago (Telephone: 847-853-3337).

The parent/guardian respondent voluntarily consents to participate in this research, and the parent/guardian respondent has signed this consent form.

If parent/guardian respondent voluntarily includes his/her address below. The parent/guardian respondent is interested in receiving a written summary of the results of this research. 如有意接受本研究的結果書寫摘要，請留下住址：

Voluntary participation in being interviewed 同意參加會談：Yes 是的

1. To be interviewed by telephone 電話會談

2. To be interviewed face to face 面談
APPENDIX C
BACKGROUND INFORMATION 資歷表
(Parent/Guardian Form)(家長/監護人組)

Please fill out the following background information about yourself.
請填寫下列您自己的背景資料。

Gender: Female____ Male____ Years lived in the U. S.____
性別：女男在美國幾年了？

Age:____ Years attending school in the U. S.____
年紀在美國上學幾年了？

Age arriving in the U. S.____ Years family has resided in the
到達美國時的年紀？全家在美國幾年了？

Age upon beginning school in the U. S.____ Last level of schooling attended
在美國開始上學的年紀？受教育的最高程度？

How many relatives do you have in the U. S.? Total number____
多少親戚居留在美國？總數是____

Please indicate the number of each of the following in the U. S.:
請回答下列問題各有多大

Grandparent(s)祖父父母____ Parent(s)父母____

Children子女____ Siblings兄弟姐妹____

Aunt(s)/Uncle(s)姑/姨/伯、舅、叔____ Cousin(s)表兄弟姐妹____

Other relatives其它親友____

Mark the predominate ethnic group in your residential area: 您住的主要社區是：

Years/Months in this area居住在此區幾年幾個月？____

Chinese (e.g., Chinatown)中國(如唐人)區____

White白人區____ Black黑人區____

Mixed混合區____ Other其它____
Reasons for immigration: Please specify by marking the proper answer(s).

Educational 教育的 ________  Financial 經濟的 ________
Political 政治的 ________  Religious 宗教的 ________
Climatic 氣候的 ________  Other reason(s) 其它的 ________
U.S.  Asia  Other  Don't Know 美國 亞洲 其它 不知道

I was born in 我出生在 ________ ________ ________ ________
My father was born in 我父親出生在 ________ ________ ________ ________
My mother was born in 我母親出生在 ________ ________ ________ ________
My father's father was born in 我爺爺出生在 ________ ________ ________ ________
My father's mother was born in 我奶奶出生在 ________ ________ ________ ________
My mother's father was born in 我外公出生在 ________ ________ ________ ________
My mother's mother was born in 我外婆出生 ________ ________ ________ ________

Primary language spoken at home 家中的主要語言是 __________
(e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese, Taiwanese, Hakka, Vietnemese, Shanghai Hua., English. etc).
(例如：中文，廣東話，台語，客家話，越南話，上海話，英文・・・)

Secondary language spoken at home 家中的次要語言是 __________
(e.g., English, French, Germany, Japanese, Spanish, Italian, Chinese...etc.)
(例如：英文，法文，德文，日文，西班牙文，義大利，中文・・・)

My job 我的工作 ________  My spouse's job 我配偶的工作 ________

Please indicate what your relationship with the child who participates in this research is:
請指明你和填卷學生的關係 Father 父親 ________  Mother 母親 ________

Other type of relationship (specify) 其他（請指明） __________

Approximate number of non-Chinese origin friends 非中國籍朋友的大約人數 ________
Approximate number of Chinese origin friends 中國籍朋友的大約人數 ________
APPENDIX D
SUINN-LEW ASIAN SELF-IDENTITY ACCULTURATION SCALE
(SL-ASIA) 本地化問卷

INSTRUCTIONS: The questions which follow are for the purpose of collecting
information about your historical background as well as more recent behaviors which
may be related to your cultural identity. Circle the one answer which best describes you.

(1.) What language can you speak? 您講那種語言？

1. Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese etc.)
只講亞洲語言(如中文，日語，韓語，越南話，客家話・・・)

2. Mostly Asian, some English 大部份亞洲語，一些英文

3. Asian and English about equally well (bilingual) 英文和中文都會講(即雙語)

4. Mostly English, some Asian 大部份英文，一些亞洲語言

5. Only English 只講英文

(2.) What language do you prefer? 您比較喜歡講那種語言？

1. Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese etc.)
只喜歡講亞洲語言(如中文，日語，韓語，越南話，客家話・・・)

2. Mostly Asian, some English 大部份喜歡講亞洲語，一些英文

3. Asian and English about equally well (bilingual) 英文和中文都喜歡講(即雙語)

4. Mostly English, some Asian 大部份英文，一些亞洲語言

5. Only English 只講英文

(3.) How do you identify yourself? 您如何識別您自己？

1. Oriental 東方人

2. Asian 亞洲人

3. Asian-American 亞裔的美國人

華裔的美國人，日裔美國人，韓裔美國人，越裔美國人

5. American 美國人

(4.) Which identification does(did) your mother use? 您母親如何識別她自己？

1. Oriental 東方人
2. Asian 亞洲人
3. Asian-American 亞裔的美國人

華裔的美國人，日裔美國人，韓裔美國人，越裔美國人
5. American 美國人

(5.) Which identification does(did) your father use? 您父親如何識別他自己？

1. Oriental 東方人
2. Asian 亞洲人
3. Asian-American 亞裔的美國人

華裔的美國人，日裔美國人，韓裔美國人，越裔美國人
5. American 美國人

(6.) What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child up to age 6?

六歲以前，您同輩朋友的種族原籍是：

1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans Orientals

幾乎全部是亞洲人，東方來的亞裔美國人

2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals

大部份是亞洲人，亞裔美國人，及東方人

3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups 亞洲人和白種人各半

4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

大部份是白種人，黑人，西班牙語或其它亞洲種族
5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanic or other non-Asian ethnic groups
幾乎只是白種人，黑人，西班牙語人，或其它非亞洲種族

(7.) What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child from 6 to 18?
由六歲到十八歲之間，您同輩朋友的種族原籍是：
1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans Orientals
幾乎全部是亞洲人，東方來的亞裔美國人
2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
大部份是亞洲人，亞裔美國人，及東方人
3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups 亞洲人和白種人各半
4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
大部份是白種人，黑人，西班牙語或其它亞洲種族
5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanic or other non-Asian ethnic groups
幾乎只是白種人，黑人，西班牙語人，或其它非亞洲種族

(8.) Whom do you now associate with in the community?
現在在團體中，您和誰來往？
1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans Orientals
幾乎全部是亞洲人，東方來的亞裔美國人
2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
大部份是亞洲人，亞裔美國人，及東方人
3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups 亞洲人和白種人各半
4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
大部份是白種人，黑人，西班牙語或其它亞洲種族
5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanic or other non-Asian ethnic groups
幾乎只是白種人，黑人，西班牙語人，或其它非亞洲種族

(9). If you could pick, whom would you prefer to associate with in the community?
如果您能選擇，在團體中，您比較喜歡與誰來往？
1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans Orientals
　幾乎全部是亞洲人，東方來的亞裔美國人

2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
　大部份是亞洲人，亞裔美國人，及東方人

3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups 亞洲人和白種人各半

4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
　大部份是白種人，黑人，西班牙語或其它亞洲種族

5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanic or other non-Asian ethnic groups
　幾乎是白種人，黑人，西班牙語人，或其它非亞洲種族

(10). What is your music preference? 您比較喜歡那一種音樂？

1. Only Asian music (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
　只有亞洲音樂(例如：中國音樂，日本音樂，韓國音樂，越南音樂・・・)

2. Mostly Asian  大部份亞洲音樂

3. Equally Asian and English 亞洲及西洋音樂都喜歡

4. Mostly English 大部份西洋樂

5. English only 只有西洋樂

(11). What is your movie preference? 您比較喜歡那一種電影？

1. Asian-language movies only 只有亞洲語言的電影

2. Asian-language movies mostly 大部份是亞洲語言的電影

3. Equally Asian/English 亞洲語言或英語的都可以

4. English-language movies mostly 大部份是英語的電影

5. English-language movies only 只有英語的電影

(12). Circle the generation that best applies to you: 請在最合適的答案上打圈作記號：

1. 1st Generation = I was born in Asia or not in U.S.
　第一代 = 我出生在亞洲，不出生在美國
2. 2nd Generation = I was born in U. S., either parent was born in Asia or not in U. S.
第二代 = 我出生在美國，父母之一出生在亞洲，不是在美國

3. 3rd Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U. S., and all
grandparents born in Asia or not in U.S.
第三代 = 我出生在美國，父母也出生在美國，祖父母們出生在亞洲，不出生在
美國

4. 4th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents born were in U.S., and at least
one grandparent born in Asia or other and one grandparent born in U.S.
第四代 = 我和我父母都出生在美國，祖父母之一出生在亞洲之外，另有祖父母
之一，出生在美國

5. 5th Generation = I was born in U. S., both parents and all grandparents also born in
U.S.
第五代 = 我，我父母及祖父母們都生於美國

6. Don't know what generation best fits since I lack some information.
我資訊不夠，所以不知道我屬於第幾代的亞裔美國人

7. No description fits me. 沒有答案適合我的情況。

(13.) Where were you raised? 只您在那裏長大？

1. In Asia only 只在亞洲

2. Mostly in Asia, some in U.S. 大部份成長於亞洲，一部份在美國長大

3. Equally in Asia and U.S. 在亞洲及美國長大的時間相等

4. Mostly in U.S.; some in Asia 大部份成長於美國，一部份在亞洲長大

5. In U.S. only 只在美國長大

(14). What contact have you had with Asia? 您和亞洲有何聯繫？

1. Raised one year or more in Asia 在亞洲長大的時間約有一年或更多

2. Lived for less than one year in Asia 居在於亞洲少於一年

3. Occasional visits to Asia 偶而訪遊亞洲
4. Occasional communications (letters, phone calls, etc.) with people in Asia
4. 偶而以信件、電話等方式和亞洲的親友聯繫
5. No exposure or communications with people in Asia 和亞洲沒有聯繫

(15). What is your food preference at home? 在家裏，你比較喜歡享用何種食物？

1. Exclusively Asian food 只喜歡亞洲食物
2. Mostly Asian food, some American 大部份喜歡亞洲食物，一些美國食物
3. About equally Asian and American 亞洲及美國食物並食同用
4. Mostly American food 大部份喜歡美國食物
5. Exclusively American food 只美國食物

(16.) What is your food preference in restaurants? 到餐廳去，你比較喜歡享用何種食物？

1. Exclusively Asian food 只喜歡亞洲食物
2. Mostly Asian food, some American 大部份喜歡亞洲食物，一些美國食物
3. About equally Asian and American 亞洲及美國食物並食同用
4. Mostly American food 大部份喜歡美國食物
5. Exclusively American food 只喜歡美國食物

(17.) Do you 當您閱讀時，

1. read only an Asian language 只閱讀亞洲語言的刊物書籍
2. read an Asian language better than English 閱讀亞洲刊物多於英文刊物書籍
3. read both Asian and English equally well 中文、英文刊物書籍都閱讀
4. read English better than an Asian language 閱讀英文刊物多於中文刊物
5. read only English 只閱讀英文刊物書籍

(18.) Do you 當您書寫時，

1. write only an Asian language 只書寫亞洲文字（例如：中文）
2. write an Asian language better than English 能書亞洲文字勝於英文
3. write both Asian and English equally well 既能書寫亞洲文字，也能書寫英文
4. write English better than an Asian language
能書寫英文勝於亞洲文字

5. write only English
只書寫英文

(19.) If you consider yourself a member of the Asian group (Oriental, Asian, American-American, Chinese-American, etc., whatever term you prefer), how much pride do you have in this group?
您以自己是亞洲團體的一員為傲時，其程度如何？(包括東方人、亞洲人、亞裔美國人、華僑...等)

1. Extremely proud 極其引以為傲
2. Moderately proud 相當引以為傲
3. Little pride 很少引以為傲
4. No pride but do not feel negative toward group
不引以為傲，但面對亞洲的成員，也沒有消極的感受
5. No pride but do feel negative toward group.
不引以爲傲，面對亞洲的成員，且有消極的感受

(20.) How would you rate yourself? 您如何評量您自己？

1. Very Asian 非常亞洲化
2. Mostly Asian 大體上是亞洲化的
3. Bicultural 雙重(東、西)化的
4. Mostly Westernized 大體上是西洋化的
5. Very Westernized 非常西洋化

(21.) Do you participate in Asian occasions, holidays, traditions, etc.?
您參加亞洲的聚會、節慶和傳統典節慶祝嗎？

1. Nearly all 幾乎全都去參加
2. Most of them 大部份去參加
3. Some of them 有時候去參加
4. A few of them 偶而去參加
5. None at all 從來不參加

(22.) Rate yourself on how much you believe in Asian values (e.g., about marriage, families, education, and work...)

請評量您自己相信亞洲價值觀的程度(例如：婚姻、家庭、教育和工作…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(do not believe)</td>
<td>(strongly believe in Asian values)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

不相信 強烈地相信亞洲的價值觀

(23.) Rate yourself on how much you believe in American (Western values):

請評量您自己美國(西洋文化)價值觀的程度

(24.) Rate yourself on how well you fit in with other Asians of the same ethnicity:

請評量您自己和其它亞洲同種族的人認同的程度

(25.) Rate yourself on how well you fit in with other Americans who are non-Asians:

請評量您自己和其它非亞洲人認同的程度
APPENDIX E

SOCIAL SKILLS RATING SYSTEM (SSRS)
(PARENT/GUARDIAN FORM, SECONDARY LEVEL)

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to measure how often your child exhibits certain social skills and how important those skills are to your child’s development. Rating of problem behaviors are also requested. First, complete the information about your child and yourself. Next, read item and think about your child’s present behavior. Decide how often your child does the behavior described.

If your child never does this behavior, circle the 0. If your child sometimes does this behavior, circle the 1. If your child very often does this behavior, circle the 2. For items 1-40, you should also rate how important each of these behaviors is for your child’s development. If it is not important for your child’s development, circle the 0. If it is important for your child’s development, circle the 1. If it is critical for your child’s development, circle the 2. Here are two examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shows a sense of humor</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This parent thought that the child very often showed a sense of humor and that showing a sense of humor was important to the child’s development. This parent also thought that
the child never answered the phone appropriately and that answering the phone appropriately was critical to the child's development. There are no right or wrong answers. You may take as much time as you like. Please do not skip any items.

1. Starts conversations rather than waiting for others to talk first.
2. Helps you with household tasks without being told.
3. Attempts household tasks before asking for your help.
4. Participates in organized activities such as sports or clubs.
5. Politely refused unreasonable requests from others.
6. Introduces himself or herself to new people without being told.
7. Uses free time at home in an acceptable way.
8. Says nice things about himself or herself when appropriate.
9. Responds appropriately to teasing from friends or relatives of his or her own age.
10. Responds appropriately when hit or pushed by other children.
11. Volunteers to help family members with tasks.
12. Invites others to your home.
13. Avoids situations that are likely to result in trouble.
15. Keeps room clean and neat without being reminded.
16. Completes household tasks within a reasonable time.
17. Shows concern for friends and relatives of his or her own age.
18. Controls temper in conflict situations with you.
19. Ends disagreements with you calmly.
20. Speaks in an appropriate tone of voice at home.

21. Acknowledges compliments or praise from friends.

22. Controls temper when arguing with other children.

23. Appropriately expresses feelings when wronged.

24. Follows rules when playing games with others.

25. Attends to your instructions. 26. Joins group activities without being told to.

27. Compromises in conflict situation by changing own ideas to reach agreement.

28. Puts away belongings or other household property.

29. Waits turn in games or other activities.

30. Uses time appropriately while waiting for help with homework or some other tasks.

31. Receives criticism well. 32. Informs you before going out with friends.

33. Follows household rules. 34. Is self-confident in social situations such as parties or group outings.

35. Shows interest in a variety of things.

36. Reports accidents to appropriate persons. 37. Is liked by others.

38. Answers the phone appropriately. 39. Asks sales clerks for information or assistance.

40. Appears self-confident in social interactions with opposite-sex friends.

41. Like to be alone. 42. Fights with others. 43. Is easily embarrassed.

44. Argues with others. 45. Talks back to adults when corrected.

46. Talks back to adults when corrected. 47. Has temper tantrums.


50. Shows anxiety about being with a group of children.

51. Acts sad or depressed. 52. Has low self-esteem.
APPENDIX F
SOCIAL SKILLS RATING SYSTEM (CHINESE VERSION)
(PARENT/GUARDIAN FORM, SECONDARY LEVEL)

社會行爲問卷(家長／監護人組)

說明：本問卷列出貴子弟所表現的許多行爲。請細讀每一列題，並仔細思考，
然後決定貴子弟多常表現題內所列的行爲。

如果他 從未有如此的行爲，請在0號上打圈。
如果他 有時有如此的行爲，請在1號上打圈。
如果他 經常有如此的行爲，請在2號上打圈。

同時，請決定這些行爲對貴子弟發展的重要性。

如果是 不重要，請在0號上打圈。
如果是 重要的，請在1號上打圈。
如果是 很重要，請在2號上打圈。

例子

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>多常？</th>
<th>多重要？</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>從未  有時  經常</td>
<td>不重要  重要  很重要</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.大中：主動與同學交談</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.大華：保持書桌整齊清潔</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
<td>0  1  2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

說明：
1. 大中經常主動與同學交談。這行爲對大中來說是很重要。
2. 大華有時保持書桌整齊清潔。這行爲對大華來說是不重要。

※請回答所有的列題，如果您改變答案，請明示並擦清非答案。

Social Skills 社會行爲

1. 能積極主動地和人交談，而不消極等候別人先開口。
2. 能積極主動地協助做家事，而不必被人催促。
3. 不用等人要求，便努力試著處理家務。
4. 參加學校的社團組織或運動活動。
5. 客氣地拒絕別人不合情理的要求。
6. 不用別人催促，便會向新朋友自我介紹。
7. 善用自己休閒的時間。
8. 恰當地欣賞自己。
9. 對朋友或同輩親友的嘲弄，反應得體恰當。
10. 被其他同伴毆打或推弄時，反應得體恰當。
11. 自動自發地協助做家事。
12. 邀請朋友到家中做客。
13. 避免介入麻煩。
14. 容易與人交友。
15. 不必別人提醒，即能保持屋室整潔。
16. 在合理的時間內，完成家務工作。
17. 對同輩親戚及朋友，表示關懷。
18. 與您衝突時，能控制情緒。
19. 能冷靜地結束與您的歧見。
20. 在家中，以合適的腔調講話。
21. 答謝朋友的讚賞與恭維。
22. 和其他孩童爭執時，能控制情緒。
23. 被欺侮時，能得體恰當地表達情緒反應。
24. 和別人遊玩時，能守規則。
25. 會專神注意您的吩咐。
26. 不必被人催促，便主動參加社團活動。
27. 遇到衝突時，能改變自己和別人取得協調。
28. 能收拾家檔或私務。
29. 玩遊戲或活動時，能按規輪班。
30. 當等候您協助他做功課或其它事時，能善用時間。
31. 善於接受批評。
32. 先向您告明，後與朋友出遊。
33. 遵守家規。
34. 在社交聚會及其它活動中，有信心。
35. 對許多事情，表示興趣。
36. 遇到意外，會向合適的人報告。
37. 廣受他人所喜愛。
38. 禮貌地接收電話。
39. 會請問店員，以獲取諮詢或協助。
40. 和異性來往時，有信心。
41. 喜歡一個人獨處。
42. 與他人打架。
43. 容易害羞。
44. 與他人爭執。
45. 威脅或恐嚇他人。
46. 大人糾正時頂嘴。
47. 好耍脾氣。
48. 看起來孤獨。
49. 容易生氣。
50. 與其他朋友相處時，表現焦慮。
51. 感到憂愁、頹喪。
52. 對自己信心不夠。
Dear Friend: 親愛的朋友：

I would really appreciate it if you would help me by filling out this survey for my dissertation. You and I are both experiencing many bicultural differences in America. Through my research, I hope to understand how our Chinese friends are adapting to their family roles (e.g., parents and children) in the American context, and how well they are doing socially. I also hope that when the chance comes, I will be skillful enough to help our Chinese friends adjust successfully to the host culture of the United States where we are living. So, friends, when you fill out this survey, you are actually contributing something very important to our Chinese community. Also, I hope you will enjoy this meaningful task. Please return the survey to me as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

我們都親身經歷到生活在美國環境中，雙重文化的差異。我寫博士論文的目的，正是為深入瞭解僑友們如何在現況中，扮演家庭及社會的多重角色。當良機來臨，我希望能學以致用地輔助僑友們成功地適應美國的本土文化。為此我敬邀您填寫這份問卷，協助我收集資料。朋友請記住，當您執筆時，你正給予僑友團體莫大的貢獻。請儘速回卷。如有問題，歡迎以電話聯絡。

Thank you and have a bright future! 敬祝 鵬程萬里 謹至謝忱

Sincerely yours,

Yue-Ching Chen 陳月卿 敬上
APPENDIX H
CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT 同意書
(STUDENT/CHILD FORM) (學生組)

A. PURPOSE 目標

The purpose of this research is to learn how the experience of acculturation influences the social development of Chinese immigrant teenagers. This research is also to explore the interaction of parenting styles, the degree of acculturation, and the social behavior of Chinese immigrant teenagers in the multicultural society of the United States. The information gathered from this research will be used for my dissertation research which is to fulfill partially the requirements of attaining the Ph.D. degree at Loyola University of Chicago, the Department of Education Psychology.

為探討本地化的經驗如何影響華裔子女的社會行為發展。並為探討在多元化的美國環境中，華裔父母教養兒女的方式。本研究員在攻讀羅耀拉大學教育心理博士，為此所收集的全部資料，經分析整理後，將納入博士論文的內容。

B. PROCEDURES 程序

1. The student/child respondent will be asked to fill out two surveys.

請填寫兩份問卷。

2. The student/child respondent may also participate in an optional interview after the researcher has received his/her surveys. The student respondent can voluntarily choose to be interviewed either by phone or face-to-face. If the student respondent chooses to be interviewed, the student respondent will leave his/her telephone number for the researcher to contact him/her by his/her survey code number, or the student respondent can voluntarily leave his/her name and telephone number for the researcher to contact him/her for an interview with the understanding that all information will be kept confidential.

當研究員收到回卷後，學生可以自由參加會談。

會談方式可以是電話溝通或面對面交談，如果願接受會談，
C. RISK AND BENEFIT 收獲與損失

1. There is no physical risk associated with participating in this research.

參加研究的人，不會遭受任何損失。

2. The student respondent understands that all the information gathered from him/her will be kept confidential. So the risk of this study is minimal.

所收集到的資料，將全納為機密秘密資訊。

3. There are possible benefits. One is that the respondents will possibly increase their own awareness of the dynamic accompanying acculturation, parental styles, and social skill development among Chinese immigrant children. Another benefit relates to the contribution of the respondents to the now scanty research information on Chinese immigrant families in the United States.

參加的人可預見兩種收穫：1.能更加了解本地文化、教養方式及華裔子女社會行爲的發展。2.在尚呈稀少的美國資訊中，貢獻您寶貴的意見。

D. STATEMENT OF ANONYMOUS PARTICIPATION AND CONFIDENTIALITY
匿名參加及機密的聲明

The student respondent understands that anonymous participation and strict confidentiality will be maintained throughout this research. The student respondent also understands that the two surveys and other interview contents will be coded with numbers, and personal and identifying characteristics will be removed. As per American Psychological Association standards, lists of names, codes, survey materials and other interview contents that the student provides will be kept in a locked cabinet for three years, then shredded. Only the dissertation committee members and the principal researcher, Yue-Ching Chen, are allowed to access to the data.
E. STATEMENT OF VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION 自願參與的聲明

The student respondent understands the above statements. If the student respondent wished further clarification, Dr. Edward Quinnan will answer any further questions the student respondent may have concerning the research or the procedures. The student respondent can reach him at Loyola University of Chicago (Telephone: 847-853-3337).

The student respondent voluntarily consents to participate in this research, and the student respondent has signed this consent form.

Subject’s Signature 簽名_______ Datt 日期 _______ Telephone 電話_______

If student respondent voluntarily includes his/her address below. The student respondent is interested in receiving a written summary of the results of this research. 如有意接受本研究的結果書寫摘要，請留下住址：__________

Voluntary participation in being interviewed 同意參加會談：Yes 是的 ________

1. To be interviewed by telephone 電話會談 ______

2. To be interviewed face to face 面談_______
APPENDIX I

BACKGROUND INFORMATION 資歷表
(STUDENT/CHILD FORM)(學生組)

Please fill out the following background information about yourself.
請儘可能地填寫有關您背景的資料。

Gender: Female ____ Male ____
性別： 女  男

Age: ____
年紀

Age arriving in the U. S. ____
到達美國時的年紀？

Years lived in the U. S. ____
在美國幾年了？

Years attending school in the U. S. ____
在美國上學幾年了？

Age upon beginning school in the U. S. ____
在美國開始上學的年紀？

Last level of schooling attended
受教育的最高程度？

How many relatives do you have in the U. S.? Total number ____
多少親戚居留在美國？    總數是 ____

Please indicate the number of each of the following in the U.S.:
請回答下列問題各有多少人

Grandparent(s) 祖父母 ____
Parent(s) 父母 ____

Siblings 兄弟姐妹 ________
Aunt(s)姑、姨/Uncle(s)伯、舅、叔____

Cousin(s) 表兄弟姐妹 ____
Other relatives 其它親友 ____

Mark the predominate ethnic group in your residential area: 您住的主要社區是：

Years/Months in this area 居住在此區幾年幾個月？ ____

Chinese (e.g., Chinatown) 中國(如唐人)區 ______

White 白人區 ____
Black 黑人區 ____

Mixed 混合區____
Other 其它 ____
Reasons for immigration: Please specify by marking the proper answer(s).

Educational 教育的 _____  Financial 經濟的 _____
Political 政治的 _____  Religious 宗教的 _____
Climatic 氣候的 _____  Other reason(s) 其它的 _____

U.S.  Asia  Other  Don't Know

I was born in 我出生在

My father was born in 我父親出生在

My mother was born in 我母親出生在

My father's father was born in 我爺爺出生在

My father's mother was born in 我奶奶出生在

Primary language spoken at home 家中的主要語言是

(e.g., Mandarin, Cantonese, Taiwanese, Hakka, Vietnamese, Shanghai Hua, English etc.)

Secondary language spoken at home 家中的次要語言是

(e.g., English, French, Germany, Japanese, Spanish, Italian, Chinese etc.)

My father's job 我父親的工作 _____  My mother's job 我母親的工作 _____

Please indicate what your relationship with the child who participates in this research is:

請指明你和家長的關係：Father 父親 ____  Mother 母親 ____

Other type of relationship (specify) 其它(請指明) ________

Approximate number of non-Chinese origin friends 非中國籍朋友的大約人數 ______

Approximate number of Chinese origin friends 中國籍朋友的大約人數 ______
APPENDIX J

Parent Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) 管教問卷

INSTRUCTION: For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your parent. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your parent during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so do not spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

請在每一問題中，按照不同的程度（1 ～ 5），選出最符合你個人經驗數字。

Strongly disagree Moderately disagree Agree Moderately agree Strongly agree

最不同意 不太同意 同意 很同意 最同意

1 2 3 4 5

(1.) While I was growing up my parent felt that in a well run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.

在我成長過程中，我的家長認爲在健康的家庭中，家長及兒女該有同等機會實現他們的願望。

(2.) Even if his/her children did not agree with him/her, my parent felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he/she thought was right.

我家長認為即使兒女不同意，但為了兒女的好處，兒女也該順應家長認為是正的意見。

(3.) Whenever my parent told me to do something as I was growing up, he/she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

在我成長過程中，家長希望我立刻實現他的吩咐，而不提出任何問題。

(4.) As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my parent discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.

在我成長過程中，一旦家規訂立，家長會向我們兒女解釋清楚訂立家規的理由
(5.) My parent has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

當我認為家規約束不合理時，家長總是鼓勵，我們互相商量討論。

(6.) My parent has always felt that children need to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

我家長總是認爲兒女們需要自由決定去做他們要做的事，即使家長並不同意。

(7.) As I was growing up my parent did not allow me to question any decision he / she made.

當我成長過程中，家長不准我對其他任何的決定，提出詢問。

(8.) As I was growing up my parent directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.

當我成長過程中，我的家長以理性和規則來督導兒女的活動和決定。

(9.) My parent has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

我家長總是認為，該多用強制的手段，以迫兒女就範。

(10.) As I was growing up my parent did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.

當我成長過程中，家長不希望兒女們之所以服從行爲準則，是因為這一準則是某一權威人士制定。

(11.) As I was growing up I knew what my parent expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my parent when I felt that they were not reasonable.

當我成長過程中，我明白家長對我的期望，但當我認為這些期望不合理時，我亦擁有自由和他商討。

(12.) My parent felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.
(13.) As I was growing up, my parent seldom expressed his / her expectations and gave me guidelines for my behavior.

(14.) Most of the time as I was growing up my parent did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.

(15.) As the children in my family were growing up, my parent consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.

(16.) As I was growing up my parent would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him/her.

(17.) My parent feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

(18.) As I was growing up my parent let me know what behavior he / she expected of me, and if I did not meet those expectations, he / she punished me.

(19.) As I was growing up my parent allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him / her.

(20.) As I was growing up my parent took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he / she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted.
(21). My parent did not view himself / herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up. 我成長過程中，家長不認為他有責任輔導我的行爲。

(22.) My parent had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he/she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

(23.) My parent gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he/she expected me to follow his/her direction, but he/she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

(24.) As I was growing up my parents allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he/she generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.在我成長過程中，家長准許我對家務擁有自己的觀點，並且讓我自行決定行爲方向。

(25.) My parent has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parent to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they do not do what they are suppose to as they are growing up.

(26.) I was growing up my parent often told me exactly what he/she wanted me to do and how he/she expected me to do it.

在我成長過程中，家長經常告訴我：他/她的期望，並指明他/她要求我如何去完的期望。
(27.) As I was growing up my parent gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he/she was also understanding when I disagreed with him/her.

在我成長過程中，家長對於我的行爲和活動，給予清楚的方向，但我不同意時他/她也可以了解。

(28.) As I was growing up my parent did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires for the children in the family.

在我成長過程中，家長對於家中兒女的行爲、活動及期望，不加以指導。

(29.) As I was growing up I knew what my parent expected of me in the family and he/she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his/her authority.

在我成長過程中，我明白家長對我的期望，並且堅持我必須因著純粹權威的緣故，順從這些期望。

(30.) As I was growing up, if my parent made a decision in the family that hurt me, he/she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he/she had made a mistake.

在我長過程中，如果家長的某個決定傷害了我，家長願意開放地和我討論決定，並承認他的錯誤。
APPENDIX K

SOCIAL SKILLS RATING SYSTEM (SSRS)

(STUDENT/CHILD FORM, SECONDARY LEVEL)

This paper lists a lot of things that students your age may do. Please read each sentence and think about yourself. Decide how often you do the behavior described. If you never do this behavior, circle the 0. If you sometimes do this behavior, circle the 1. If you very often do this behavior, circle the 2. Then, decide how important the behavior is to your relationships with other. If it not important to your relationships, circle the 0. If it is important to your relationships, circle the 1. If it is critical to your relationships, circle the 2. Here are two examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I start conversations with classmates.</th>
<th>How Often</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>How Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I start conversations with classmates.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my desk clean and neat.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This student very often starts conversations with classmates, and starting conversations with classmates is important to this student. This student sometimes keeps his or her desk clean and neat but a clean and neat desk is not important to this student.

If you change an answer, be sure to erase completely. Please answer all questions. There are no right or wrong answers, just your feelings of how often you do these things and how important they are to you.
1. I make friends easily.

2. I say nice things to others when they have done something well.

3. I ask adults for help when other children try to hit me or push me around.

4. I am confident on dates.

5. I try to understand how my friends feel when they are angry, upset, or sad.

6. I listen to adults when they are talking with me.

7. I ignore other children when they tease me or call me names.

8. I ask friends for help with problems.

9. I ask before using other people’s things.

10. I disagree with adults without fighting or arguing.

11. I avoid doing things with others that may get me in trouble with adults.

12. I feel sorry for others when bad things happen to them.

13. I do my homework on time.


15. I do nice things for my parents like helping with household chores without being asked.

16. I am active in school activities such as sports or clubs.

17. I finish classroom work on time.

18. I compromise with parents or teachers when we have disagreements.

19. I ignore classmates who are clowning around in class.

20. I ask someone I like for a date.

21. I listen to my friends when they talk about problems they are having.
22. I end fights with my parents calmly.

23. I give compliments to members of the opposite sex.

24. I tell other people when they have done something well.

25. I smile, wave, or nod at others.

26. I start conversations with opposite-sex friends without feeling uneasy or nervous.

27. I accept punishment from adults without getting mad.

28. I let friends know I like them by telling or showing them.

29. I stand up for my friends when they have been unfairly criticized.

30. I invite others to join in social activities.

31. I use my free time in a good way.

32. I control my temper when people are angry with me.

33. I get the attention of members of the opposite sex without feeling embarrassed.

34. I take criticism from my parents without getting angry.

35. I follow the teacher's directions.

36. I use a nice tone of voice in classroom discussions.

37. I ask friends to do favors for me.

38. I start talks with classroom members.

39. I talk things over with classmates when there is a problem or an argument.
5. 當我的朋友生氣、不舒服或悲傷時，我會試著去理解他們。
6. 當大人和我談話時，我專心聆聽。
7. 當其它朋友嘲弄我或亂叫我綽號時，我不理他。
8. 我拜託朋友協助我解難。
9. 用他人物件前，我先請求許可。
10. 當我不同意大人意見時，我不動武打架或開口爭執。
11. 我避免介入是非的行爲，以免與大人發生衝突。
12. 別人遭遇不幸時，我也覺得遺憾。
13. 我按時做功課。
14. 我保持書桌整潔。
15. 我主動協助父母做家事。
16. 我積極參加學校的活動，例如運動或社團。
17. 我按時完成課堂的作業。
18. 當我和家長或師長意見不同時，我會妥協。
19. 我不理那些在班上耍小丑的人。
20. 我邀我喜歡的人約會。
21. 當朋友訴說他們所遭遇的困難時，我專心聆聽。
22. 我和平地結束與父母的爭執。
23. 我對異表示讚賞。
24. 當別人做了好事，我讚美他們。
25. 我以微笑、招手、點頭等方式向別人打招呼。
26. 我主動與異性交談，不感到不舒服或緊張。
27. 我接受大人們的處罰而不生氣動怒。
28. 我以語言或行爲來表示我喜歡他們。
29. 當我的朋友受到不公平的批評時，我會為他們挺身而出。
30. 我邀請別人參加社交活動。
31. 我善用自由休閒的時間。
32. 當別人對我生氣動怒時，我能控制我自己的脾氣。
33. 當異性朋友對我感興趣時，我不覺得難爲情。
34. 我接受父母的批評而不動怒生氣。
35. 我遵守師長的指令。
36. 我用和平良好的口氣參與教室內的討論。
37. 我請求朋友給我協助。
38. 我主動開口與班上同學交談。
39. 當我與班上同學有歧見或爭執時，我和他們商量講和。
APPENDIX M

Interview Questions

The following questions were used to interview the interviewees.

-- How clear was the explanation of this survey to you before you participated?

-- Do you find it hard to understand the wording of surveys?

-- How does the Mandarin translation of surveys help you to answer these survey questions?

-- Do these surveys make sense to you?

-- What items do you suggest to be added or subtracted from the background information sheet? Why?

-- Are these survey questions relevant to your real experiences in acculturation, parental styles and social skills development in general?

-- What items do you suggest to be added or subtracted from the Shuinn-Lew Asian Self-identity Acculturation Scale? Why?

-- Is there any content area that you think should be included in a scale of acculturation but does not exist in the scale that you just took?

-- What areas are there that a Chinese is supposed to cover for a successful acculturation experience besides speaking English, eating American food, watching Western movies, and singing/listening to Western songs?

-- Have you had the experience of your child displaying his/her faster acculturation than you have attained? How does this different pace influence your parenting styles? What impact has the acculturation differences on the child's social skills?

-- Does the Parental Authority Questionnaire impress you in any way?

-- Do you recommend changes to survey of Parental Authority Questionnaire?
-- What can be improved regarding the survey of Social Skills Rating System Scale?
-- Do you think that the social behavioral criteria listed in the Social Skills Rating System is equivalent to Chinese criteria regarding a teenager’s social skills development? What differences do you experience in the two cultures regarding the social skills development in teenagers? How does this different criteria influence parenting styles to teenagers?
-- Do you think that the experience of living in the U.S. influences a Chinese parent to become more authoritative or less authoritative than those parents who stay in the oriental society?
-- Do you observe that Chinese parents socialize their male children differently from female children in the United States? Describe your observations.
-- Do you think that Chinese female immigrant children can develop better social skills than male children?
-- If a parent is very traditionally Chinese oriented, such as requesting great respect and obedience from his/her child, what strengths and weaknesses will this orientation impact on a child’s social skills development living in the United States?
-- If a parent is approximately bicultural, how will you expect this orientation to impact on his/her child’s social skills?
-- If a parent is very strongly Anglo oriented, will you expect that his/her child would be more or less assertive, uninhibited in self-expression and well-adjusted in the U.S. or opposite?
-- Is there any other important questions that I should ask about these surveys?
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Table 22

Values Score and Behavioral Competencies Score of the SL-ASIA (N = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL-ASIA</th>
<th>Values Score</th>
<th>Behavioral Competencies Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 22 &amp; 23</td>
<td>Item 24 &amp; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Identified</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Identified</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorized</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

Pride in Asian Group Membership (Item-19) N = 172

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extremely proud</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately proud</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Little pride</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No pride but do not feel negative toward group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No pride/ feel negative toward group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

Ethnic Rating of Self (Item- 20) N = 172

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Very Asian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mostly Asian</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bicultural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mostly Western</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Very Western</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25

**Rating of Asian Value (Item-22) N = 172**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do not believe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately disbelieve</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Believe</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Moderately believe</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly believe</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

**Rating of American Value (Item-23) N = 172**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Disbelieve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Moderately disbelieve</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Believe</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Moderately believe</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strongly believe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Rating of Fit In With Asian of the Same Ethnicity (Item-24) N = 172

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do not fit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately not fit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moderately fit</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fit very well</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

Rating of Fit In With Non-Asians (Item-25) N = 172

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do not fit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately not fit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fit</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moderately fit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fit very well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

Ranking of the Problematic Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43--is easily embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41--liked to be alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46--talks back when corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49--gets angry easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>44--argues with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47--has temper tantrums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48--appears lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52--has low self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42--fights with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45--threatens or bullies others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>51--acts sad and depressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

**Behavior Frequency Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three most frequent behaviors</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students/children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>informing the parent before going out with friends</td>
<td>doing homework on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following rules when playing games with others</td>
<td>finishing classroom work on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waiting turn in games or activities</td>
<td>following the teacher's directions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three least frequent behaviors</th>
<th>introducing oneself to new people without being told</th>
<th>asking someone for a date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keeping room clean and neat without being reminded</td>
<td>asking adults for help when other children are trying to hit me or push me around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attempting household tasks before asking for help</td>
<td>being confident on dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31

**Important/Critical Behavior Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three most important/critical behaviors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Students/children</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 following rules when playing games</td>
<td>1 doing homework on time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with others</td>
<td>with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 informing the parent before going</td>
<td>2 following the teacher’s directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out with friends</td>
<td>out with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 following household rules</td>
<td>3 finishing classroom work on time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three least important/critical behaviors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 attempting household tasks before</td>
<td>1 asking someone I like for a date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asking for help</td>
<td>asking for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 inviting others to home</td>
<td>2 ignoring classmates who are clowning around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 starting conversations rather than</td>
<td>3 asking adults for help when other children are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting for others to talk first</td>
<td>trying to hit me or push me around</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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