

- i -

WHEATON COLLEGE

Norton, Massachusetts

This is to certify that Jennifer Young Mi Park has fulfilled the requirements for graduation with Departmental Honors in Psychology.

The degree of Bachelor of Arts was awarded on

May 11, 2011

Registrar

Credit: 2

Director: Peony Fhagen-Smith

Adherence to Asian Values and the Use of English Names and Self-Ethnic Labels
among Asian/Asian-American College Students

BY

Jennifer Young Mi Park

A Study

Presented to the Faculty

of

Wheaton College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for

Graduation with Departmental Honors

in Psychology

Norton, Massachusetts

May 16, 2011

Acknowledgements

On the first day of my freshman year seminar at Wheaton College, my professor began the class with the question, “What is in a name?” Who would have thought that I would be ending my senior year trying to answer the exact same question I started with? **Professor Fhagen-Smith**, you have been an inspiration to me from the first day of my college experience and will continue to be as I pursue Graduate School. I do not even know where to begin to thank you for all of your support, encouragement, and guidance for my four years at Wheaton. You have brought me into the world of Multicultural Psychology and have helped me discover my passion. I could not have gotten this far in my academic career without you! Thank you so much for everything!

Professor Berg, I would also like to thank you for all of your encouragement and support throughout the past year. I am pretty sure that I would still be stuck trying to figure out my t-tables and statistics if you had not been around to help! Thank you for always having an open office door and helping me believe that I would complete my thesis on time!

Professor Kim, I still remember walking into *Asians and America* my sophomore year thinking “what have I gotten myself into?” As much as I feared going to class because I knew that I would be called on to participate, I am so grateful that I stayed in the class. Thank you for always pushing me out of my comfort zone with your impossible questions and helping me grow out of being a “quiet” Asian student. Thank you!

I would also like to thank **Margaret Gardiner** for helping me find the existing literature on my research topic, my **participants** for providing me with meaningful data, and my **friends** who have supported me from the beginning to the end.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my **family** for always believing in me. Thank you for teaching me the values of education and providing me with these wonderful opportunities to learn. I promise to always work my hardest and make you proud! 사랑해요, jag älskar dig.

Thank you all so much!! ☺

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	2
Abstract.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Literature Review.....	6
Method	
<i>Participants</i>	31
<i>Measures</i>	32
<i>Procedure</i>	34
Results.....	35
<i>Tables</i>	40
Discussion.....	41
Appendices	
<i>Appendix A</i>	52
<i>Appendix B</i>	53
<i>Appendix C</i>	54
<i>Appendix D</i>	56
<i>Appendix E</i>	59
<i>Appendix F</i>	66
References.....	68

Abstract

The current study explored the adherence to Asian values and the use of English names and self-ethnic labeling among Asian/Asian-Americans. Fifty undergraduate students completed questionnaires to assess collectivistic values, acculturation, and reasons for using an English name. It was hypothesized that: 1) participants who choose Heritage National labels will have stronger Asian values than participants who choose other labels to describe the self; 2) the main reason for reported use of English names will be to avoid embarrassment and inconvenience for the other; and 3) contrary to current literature conjecture, acculturation and Asian values will be positively correlated. The results indicated that there was no relationship between acculturation scores and adherence to Asian values. However, the results did indicate that more acculturated participants selected hyphenated American labels to describe themselves. Implications for investigating the use of English names when assessing ethnic identity are discussed, along with future directions for research on the International Asian students' experiences.

Keywords: acculturation, Asian values, collectivism, ethnic identity, biculturalism, relational identity, Asians, Asian-Americans

The development of an individual's ethnic identity has been a phenomenon of interest for many researchers. It has been demonstrated in several studies that ethnic identity is positively linked with mental health (Sue & Sue, 1971) and stress (Hovey, Kim & Seligman, 2006). However, there is a paucity of research pertaining to the situational variability of ethnic identity labels among Asians/Asian Americans and the use of English names.

The United States has had a long history of the settlement of Asian immigrants and International students seeking education abroad. According to the US Census Bureau, in the year 2008, there were 15.5 million respondents who identified as being full or part Asian. Despite the influx of the Asian population, Asians/Asian-Americans continue to be a numeric minority compared to other groups. As a minority group, they are confronted by a culture that differs from their own and reminded of their differences. The contrast between the two cultures they are exposed to lead to the questions of "Who am I?" and "How did I become who I am?" (Huang, 2003). They are faced with the dilemma of maintaining their heritage culture, acculturating into the dominant culture, or finding a solution to balance the two cultures equally (Berry, 2005).

The existing literature, however, fails to acknowledge the ability of Asian/Asian-Americans to maintain their Asian values, or collectivistic values, upon moving to the United States. Specifically, previous research does not address how the decision to use an English name may be related to the collectivistic characteristics of Asian/Asian-Americans. Additional research also needs to be done to investigate the changing of ethnic self-labels in different situations and how the choice of labels is related to avoiding embarrassment and shame. The following review of literature will address constructs of

collectivism and its relation to the acculturation process and ethnic identity of Asian/Asian-Americans and their naming traditions and patterns.

Collectivism and Individualism

Triandis (1995), a well renowned researcher of individualism and collectivism, uses the following definitions of two types of social patterns to characterize dominant perspectives of societies:

Collectivism may be initially defined as a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who see themselves as parts of one or more collectives (family, co-workers, tribe, nation); are primarily motivated by the norms of, and duties imposed by, those collectives; are willing to give priority to the goal of these collectives over their own personal goals; and emphasize their connectedness to members of these collectives. (p. 2)

Asians are recognized as members of collectivistic cultures; for the purposes of this paper, the concept of collectivism will be more thoroughly discussed than individualism. However, it is also important to be exposed to the definition of individualism in order to understand the differences between the two social patterns.

A preliminary definition of *individualism* is the social pattern that consists of loosely linked individuals who view themselves as independent of collectives; are primarily motivated by their own preferences, needs, rights, and the contracts they have established with others; give priority to their personal goals over the goals of others; and emphasize rational analyses of the advantages and disadvantages to associating with others. (p.2)

As described in the definitions mentioned above, collectivistic cultures put a large emphasis on situational context and group desires, as opposed to individualistic cultures that value individual preferences and needs. Triandis (1995) indicates that Japan, China, the Philippines, and other Asian countries as collectivistic cultures; he also provides examples of individualistic cultures, which include, European countries (Scandinavia,

Italy, France) and the United States. While the terms collectivistic and individualistic are used to describe cultures, the terms allocentric and idiocentric are used to characterize individuals from either types of culture (Triandis, 1989).

Triandis (1995) discusses the differences in approaching situations between individualistic and collectivistic cultures. For example, a simple task of buying a new carpet for a house, according to Triandis, can be seen from several perspectives. An individual from a collectivistic culture will fulfill this duty in a much more complex way than an individualistic culture. For example, an allocentric individual will first try and establish a relationship with the storekeeper, inform him or her of the style and price range the buyer is seeking, and then purchase the carpet; on the other hand, an idiocentric individual would approach the situation more straightforwardly, by finding a carpet that he or she likes and is within budget and purchasing the carpet with little attention to establishing a relationship with the storekeeper (Triandis, 1995).

Triandis explains the differences in behavior between the two cultural characteristics by proposing defining attributes. When defining the self, allocentric individuals tend to use terms that display their attributes of the groups they belong to; behaving in a way that is expected and desired by the group, as opposed to using personal terms that may raise group conflict. Allocentric individuals also place a high priority on what is expected of them by cultural group norms, and enjoy their duty, even if it is inconsistent with their personal desires (Triandis, 1995). Triandis' research has furthered our understanding of these cultural patterns by providing reasons for which individuals behave differently in different situations.

Yeh and Huang (1996) explore the allocentric characteristics of Asians in relation to ethnic identity development. Specifically, their study focuses on the malleability of identity depending on social context, a common phenomenon among Asian-Americans (Yeh & Huang, 1996). In their study of 78 Asian-American college students from a university in California, participants indicated that external forces had a stronger influence on their ethnic identification than internal forces. Yeh and Huang use the participant's geographic locale, experiences traveling to or living in Asia, relationships with peers, and standards of others as variables of external factors, while internal factors refer to their private selves, or how they think of themselves. They concluded that ethnic identity formation is dynamic and situation-specific. They also suggested that one of the most influential factors to participants' ethnic identity development was shame.

The results of Yeh and Huang's (1996) research shed light on how shame motivates Asian-Americans in their formation of ethnic identity. The participants indicated that they conformed to "white society" as a way to avoid embarrassment and shame and to behave in a way that was expected indicating that ethnic identity is not motivated by anger, but rather, shame. In addition to the findings of Yeh and Huang (1996), previous research has also supported the notion that shame is an important factor in Asian-American ethnic identity development. Feelings of shame in Asian cultures have also been referred to as "losing face" (Huang & Ying, 1989). The term "face," as defined by Huang & Ying (1989) refers to one's public and private image; it is important in Asian cultures that individuals do not "lose face," which is a form of public embarrassment, disappointment, or humiliation. When one loses face, one experiences feelings of guilt and shame (Huang & Ying, 1989).

Huang (2003) notes that Asians are socialized to value the responses of others and to shape their behavior according to others. Yeh and Huang (1996) also support the importance of maintaining one's face and avoiding shame as integral factors of Asian cultures. Consistent with the findings of Triandis (1989), which suggest that Asians place a strong emphasis on situational and external factors, Yeh and Huang (1996) also indicate in their research that many Asian-Americans who question their identity find guidance from their social environment and peers

According to Huang (2003), Asians' behavior based on external conditions is a form of situational orientation, which is described as the priority placed on demands and expectations of an individual's environment over the individual's own preferences or desires. Huang suggests three concepts that can give rise to the situational orientation of Asians: collectivism, shame, and loss of face. This reiterates the findings of Triandis (1989) which indicated that Asians respond to the judgments and demands of the social environment and attribute their situation and values of society to their self. He also suggested that Asians value external influences more than self-inferences when going through the process of ethnic identification (Triandis, 1989). The findings of Triandis (1989), Huang and Ying (1989) and Huang (2003) reveal the significance of shame in Asian cultures and its role in ethnic identity formation.

Jetten, Postmes and Mcauliffe's (2002) also considered the relationship between ethnic identification and collectivistic values. Specifically, they investigated whether or not group norms of individualism and collectivism influenced the self-conception and behavior of people with low and high levels of group identification. They looked at the interaction between nationality [Indonesian or American] and identification level [low/

high levels of collectivism or individualism]. The participants in the study consisted of 101 Indonesian and American students with a mean age of 21 years; the Asian respondents were drawn from the University of Indonesia at Depok and the American participants were selected from the University of Kansas. The results of this study indicated that the individuals who identified strongly with their national identity were more likely to behave in accordance with the dominant culture's orientation. For example, participants who identified more strongly as being American exhibited more individualistic tendencies than those who considered a weaker American national identity. However, those who identified more strongly as Indonesian were less likely to display individualistic values than those who had a weaker national identity (Jetten, Postmes & Mcauliffe, 2002).

In addition to the research of Jetten, Postmes, and Mcauliffe (2002) exploring individuals' behaviors in accordance with the dominant culture's orientation, Triandis et al. (1988) examined the behaviors of individuals in a culture different from their own. They found that when allocentric or idiocentric individuals are in their ingroup culture, they willingly accept group norms. For example, when idiocentric persons are in an individualistic culture, they are used to their independence and find it normal to focus on their own needs. However, when allocentric or idiocentric individuals are in a culture different than their own, their transition is not as simple. Triandis and colleagues also found that when idiocentric persons are in collectivistic cultures, they tend to question the group norms. Despite their reluctance to accept the group norms, they tend to follow the majority and comply with the group too. Idiocentric individuals in collectivistic cultures

succumb to group norms more than allocentric persons in individualistic cultures (Bontempo, Lobel & Triandis, 1990).

Under the two social patterns of individualism and collectivism, Triandis (1995) further breaks down the constructs into four categories—horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism, vertical individualism, and vertical collectivism. He describes horizontal as building a sense of cohesiveness and sameness within a group, while vertical includes a sense of hierarchy and accepts inequality (Triandis, 1995). He suggests that cultures can demonstrate different constructs in depending on the situation; for example, the United States is considered a horizontal culture in social contexts, but vertical when dealing with income or taxation. He provides a list of adjectives to describe the four different categories of individualism and collectivism: achievement oriented (vertical individualism), cooperative (horizontal collectivism), dutiful (vertical collectivism), and unique (horizontal individualism). (Triandis, 1995, p. 47).

Acculturation

Acculturation, as defined by Redfield, Linton and Herskovits (1936) is a “phenomena which results when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous firsthand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (p.149). Acculturation encompasses the social and environmental influences on an individual’s values and behaviors and it is experienced as a result of long-term contact with another culture. It is an ongoing process that promotes changes in how one views oneself and a challenge that many immigrants face (Lieber, Chin, Nihira, & Mink, 2001).

Traditional views that suggest that acculturation is a linear process have been criticized for being too simplistic. However, Berry (2003) points out that acculturation is a multifaceted process that can be experienced through various strategies. Acculturation is defined as the process of cultural and psychological change that occurs for two or more cultural groups and members when they are in contact with each other (Berry, 2005). Berry's model suggests that acculturation operates at a group level and at an individual level. Acculturation at a group level consists of changes in social structures and cultural practices, while an individual level involves changes in personal behaviors (Berry, 2005).

For acculturation at both the group and individual levels, Berry (2005) proposes four acculturation strategies that are applicable to non-dominant groups. The four strategies include: assimilation, marginalization, separation, and integration. He describes assimilation as a term used to categorize individuals that look to interact with other cultures, without having a desire to maintain their cultural identity; these individuals choose to adopt the dominant culture and move away from their heritage culture. On the opposing side of assimilation is the term separation, which is used for individuals that reject the dominant culture and maintain their identity of origin. The third strategy of acculturation is marginalization; marginalists are individuals that reject both the dominant culture and their heritage culture as an indicator of their identity. As Berry puts it, there is "little possibility or interest in heritage cultural maintenance, and little interest in having relations with others (Berry, 2005, p.698). The last strategy of Berry's acculturation model is integration, in which there is a degree of balance between both cultures. The integration strategy accounts for individuals who can identify with two separate cultures.

For the purposes of this study, the integration strategy will be discussed more critically than the other strategies.

Similar to Berry's integration strategy is the alternation process in LaFromboise, Coleman, and Gerton's (1993) model of acculturation. This model is closely related to Berry's model in that it also consists of the assimilation strategy, however, it proposes four additional ways to describe the processes that members of ethnic minority groups in the U.S undergo. The four strategies this model proposes are acculturated, fusion, alternation, and multiculturalist. The acculturation strategy is similar to the assimilation strategy in that they both indicate that an individual has a stronger preference for one culture, the majority group. However, the difference between the two strategies is that while an individual seeks to join the dominant culture, he or she still identifies as being a member of the minority group (LaFromboise et al, 1993).

Contrary to the principles of the assimilation and acculturation strategies is the fusion strategy. In this strategy, individuals fuse two cultures together to create a new culture; in the new culture, the individual is unable to distinguish the minority culture from the majority. The multicultural strategy is also one that promotes maintenance of both cultures. This strategy specifically addresses the possibility of "cultures maintaining distinct identities while individuals from one culture work with those of other cultures to serve common national or economic needs" (LaFromboise et al, 1993, p.401).

Although these strategies are also apparent in many individuals, the one that will be focused in this present research is the alternation strategy. The alternation group, as defined by LaFromboise et al, is a group of individuals that can continue to have a

positive relationship between both cultures, without choosing one over the other (LaFromboise et al,1993). This strategy is further described by Bacallao and Smokowski (2009) as a bi-directional change or adaptation that integrates cognition, attitudes, and behaviors from both cultures. It is suggested in Trueba's (2002) research that the integration of cognitions, attitudes, language and behaviors can lead to the development of multiple identities, and cognitive code-switching, which is when an individual switches between cultural codes to match environmental demands.

The adaptation and changing of self identities was demonstrated in the findings of Trueba (2002). He indicated in his research that because of the frequent contact Latino immigrants have with their country of origin and the U.S., they learn to code-switch and change their self-definitions in order to adapt to the different environments. He further suggests that what was previously understood as impossible to older generation immigrants is now a part of young immigrants' everyday lives; immigrant children are able to travel across linguistic and cultural borders without any problems.

Ethnic Identity

The Development

As indicated in the models of acculturation, the process of acculturation for members of ethnic minority groups in the U.S. is closely related to their ethnic identity. The formation of an ethnic identity is strongly influenced by an individual's feelings about his or her ethnicity. Phinney (1990,1992) has addressed components that construct an individual's ethnic identity. First, individuals' ethnic self-identification or label used when describing themselves is critical in identity development. Second, the feelings of belonging to a particular group can affect the strength of individuals' ethnic identities.

Third, the extent of an individual's ethnic identity development can be assessed by the feelings and understandings about the issues of their ethnicity and whether or not those issues have been resolved. Phinney suggests that these aspects are critical to succeed in forming an achieved ethnic identity, or acceptance of one's own group and the larger society (Phinney, 2003).

Phinney introduces three stages in the ethnic identity development model. This model illustrates the progressive stages an individual goes to reach a clear and positive sense of one's own ethnicity. In stage one, an individual lacks exploration of the heritage culture because of a lack of interest and preference for the dominant culture. An individual may progress to the second stage, which involves exploration of one's own ethnicity, after experiencing an event that may force the individual to be more aware of his or her own heritage. The exploration and newfound interest of one's own ethnicity can lead to a positive understanding of one's ethnicity (Phinney, 1990).

Ethnic identity can be described as one aspect of the acculturation process because the strength of the identity individuals have with their host and home cultures influence the strategy they choose during their acculturation process (Phinney, 2003). A conceptual model that presents a link between ethnic identity and acculturation has been presented by Leong and Chou (1994). Leong and Chou (1994) suggest that the assimilation stage reflects an individual's lack of exploration of and encounters with that individual's heritage culture. On the other hand, ethnic identity achievement, or acceptance of both one's heritage and host culture indicates an integrated strategy (Leong & Chou, 1994).

Linear models often assume that acculturation and ethnic identity have an inverse relationship in that acculturation implies the weakening of one's ethnic identity (Phinney, 1990). However, models that introduce acculturation as a two-dimensional process, such as Berry (1980), suggest that an individual's ethnic identity can continue to be maintained during acculturation, or possess a bicultural identity.

Bicultural and Relational Identity.

Recent research, which further suggests the implications that Asian/Asian-Americans face cultural changes, has indicated that "individuals can possess dual cultural identities and engage in active cultural frame switching, in which they move between different cultural meaning systems in response to situational cues" (Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002, p.493). The literature on acculturation and biculturalism has proposed that individuals can have more than one cultural identity.

Benet-Martínez and Haritatos (2005) suggest that one of the prime limitations of Berry's integration strategy is its failure to acknowledge "how" individuals integrate and maintain their two cultures; additionally, they suggest that Berry's integration stage also does not account for the reasons "why" an individual would experience biculturalism (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005).

Hong, Morris, Chiu, and Benet-Martinez (2000) assessed the way in which specific cultural triggers affect a bicultural individual's thoughts and interpretations of different situations. Westernized Chinese students in Hong Kong to participate in various priming studies that analyzed their interpretations of illustrations after being exposed to either American or Chinese iconic images. Participants who were exposed to American

symbols (e.g. an American flag) tended to attribute internal dispositions to their interpretation of the illustration, while those who were exposed to a Chinese symbol (e.g. the Great Wall) attributed external factors (Hong et al., 2000). Similar to the findings of Hong and her colleagues, Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris (2002) found consistent results in their study with Chinese American students who were born in China, but lived in the U.S. Participants who were primed with American symbols described situations with more internal attributions, than when they were shown Chinese symbols. The findings of the two studies reveal the ability of bicultural individuals to use their dual cultural backgrounds to process information. This concept of drawing on various identities in different situations has also been referred to in the research as relational identity.

Stemming from the previous findings and literature on multiple identities, Kiang and Fuligni (2009) have developed the term *relational ethnic identity*. This concept is defined as “individuals’ ethnic exploration and belonging when interacting within different relational contexts” (p. 733). Oyserman and Markus (1993) support this claim by indicating that their research has found that individuals present themselves and behave differently in different social contexts. Oyserman and Markus attribute this variation of identity to the diverse conceptions of the self that individuals possess. For example, the perception of the self may consist of social identities, role identities, and individual attributes. These multiple constructs enable an individual to identify as being Hispanic and American, a parent, a teacher, caring, hardworking, etc. (Oyserman & Markus, 1993). They describe the identity of individuals as active and constantly changing because people tend to define themselves in ways that best fit their immediate

environments and the messages that are transmitted from those contexts. An example they provide is of the different ways the message of “how to be” is conveyed in different environments; they suggest that children who grow up in a middle class, Mormon community are likely to view themselves differently from children raised in a working class, African American community (Oyserman & Markus, 1993).

It can be inferred from these findings on the variation of identities that the different environments in which individuals are situated in contribute to their ability to adopt multiple identities. Similar to the influence of contextual setting on identity, Kiang et al, (2007) suggest that other individuals can also affect one’s identity. Relational ethnic identity refers to the sense of ethnic pride an individual feels when interacting with people from different relationships (e.g. when with parents or peers). For example, Kiang et al, found that individuals from Chinese American backgrounds tended to express their ethnic identity the strongest when with parents, followed by Asian peers, and least when with European American peers.

In terms of the relational identity among Asians, Yip and Cross (2004) present a method, known as the Daily Diaries that was created to measure daily ethnic identity salience, American identity salience, engagement in ethnic behaviors, and psychological well-being. Participants who take part in the daily diaries method are asked to complete questions assessing their daily ethnic identity salience and American identity salience over a span of 14 consecutive days. Example questions that are asked in the daily diaries include: “Of the friends you spent time with today, how many were of the same race/ethnicity as you?” or “How much did you feel like each of the following today? (e.g. good friend, a good student)”

Although the research above presents the variation of identity among Asian/Asian-Americans, Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris (2002) also suggest that biculturalism is not a path for all individuals. For example, many individuals view their cultural identities as two separate entities, as opposed to one identity; although they identify with both the dominant and ethnic cultures, they have difficulties integrating the two (Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002). For those who do identify as being bicultural, however, are capable of retrieving and applying cultural perspectives at different times and situations.

While the ability to apply different cultural perspectives in different situations, or biculturalism, has shown to initiate feelings of pride and uniqueness among biculturals, their dual identities have also revealed identity confusion and value clashes (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). In a related study by Bacallao and Smokowski's (2009), interviews with adolescents and their parents revealed that living between two cultures caused confusion. They indicated that they have experienced challenges in deciding what language to speak or which cultural values to support.

Ethnic identity confusion has been explored among members of Asian Ethnic groups living in the U.S. Many studies have provided evidence that there is a positive relationship between acculturation and the mental health of Asians Americans (Hovey, Kim & Seligman, 2006). The research of Hovey, Kim, and Seligman (2006) investigated the impact of ethnic identity, cultural values, and language maintenance on the mental health of Korean American college students. Participants were asked to complete sets of questionnaires that assessed their ethnic identity, adherence to Asian values, and self-esteem. Their results indicated that there was a strong correlation between higher scores

of adherence to Asian values and lower self-esteem and greater depression. They concluded from their findings that those participants who are more idiocentric may be able to better cope with the stress that may be induced from living in two cultures, also known as acculturative stress. Triandis (1995) also suggests that Asian-American's higher likelihood of experiencing feelings of embarrassment and shame contribute to mental health problems that many of them face.

Acculturative stress, as defined by Berry and colleagues (1987), is the type of stress in which identified stressors contribute to one's process of acculturation. The link between acculturative stress and mental health status is also supported in the findings of Hyun, Quinn, Madon, & Lustig (2007) who revealed that language barriers and unfamiliarity with Western cultural practices were two of the most prevalent problems for International students studying in America. Their results further suggested that 44% of their participants, the majority of which identified as being Asian, reported emotional or stress-related problems that impacted their well-being or academic performance (Hyun, Quinn, Madon, & Lustig, 2007). The findings that support a positive link between acculturative stress and mental health (Hyun et al., 2007; Berry et al., 1987; Hovey, Kim & Seligman, 2006; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Bacallao & Smokowski, 2009) describe the experiences of Asian/Asian-Americans who do not identify with the integration or alternation strategy discussed earlier.

The Ethnic and Racial Identity Development of Asian Americans.

The racial and ethnic identities of minority groups in America are constructed under the influences of social and cultural factors (Guido-DiBrito & Chavez, 1999).

Race, or the physical appearance of an individual, has been used as a method of organizing individuals into a racial hierarchy (Spickard, 1992). Researchers have introduced many models of racial minority identity development, one of which has been developed specifically for the identity development of Asian Americans. The Asian American Identity Development (AAID) Model was introduced by Jean Kim to describe the experiences Asian Americans face in their formation of racial identity in a Western culture. She reveals the way in which Asian people view themselves (the private self) is affected by other people (the public) because of their collectivistic, group oriented values (Kim, 2001). She further emphasizes the influence of social environment on their formation of identity and suggests five sequential stages that occur during the process of developing a positive Asian American racial identity.

The first stage of the model is *Ethnic Awareness*, which is described as the beginning period of ethnic identity development where a child becomes aware of his/her ethnicity from socializing with family members and relatives. During this stage, it is important that children develop a positive self-concept of their ethnic identity by active engagement and exposure to Asian ethnic activities. Children who grow up in predominately White neighborhoods often face the question of what it means to be a part of their Asian ethnic group much earlier than those who grow up in an Asian community. However, those who grow up having a clearer sense of what it means to be a part of their Asian ethnic group often experience a change in social environment when they enter a diverse school. This change in social setting moves individuals to the second stage, *White Identification*. During this stage, Asian Americans recognize that they are different from their peers; many children are taught through their experience that being different is

“bad” because of racial prejudice and teasing from their peers. These negative encounters have the potential to jeopardize children’s self-esteem and identity. Two types of identifications an Asian American child may develop is the *Active White Identification* or the *Passive White Identification*. The first identity refers to Asian individuals who actively associate themselves with their White peers, while distancing themselves from their Asian selves. The latter is used to describe individuals who grow up in predominately Asian neighborhoods and develop a strong sense of ethnic Asian identity as a child; they face identity dilemmas in their later school years and often experience fantasizing about being White (Kim, 2001).

The third stage of the AAID model suggests that Asian Americans are able to change their interpretation of the negative racial experience they encountered by adopting a new perspective of the world. In the *Awakening to Social Political Consciousness* stage, Asian Americans realize that their experiences with racial prejudice are not due to personal reasons, but rather, because of political and historical reasons. This stage is critical because Asian Americans recognize that although they are members of a minority group in the United States, it does not mean that they are inferior to Whites. After this recognition, Asian Americans are able to enter the next stage of *Redirection*. This stage is defined as the renewed connection of one’s Asian American heritage and culture in which an Asian American starts to develop a stronger sense of belonging. In this stage, individuals begin to understand what it means to be not just Asian or American, but Asian American. These feelings lead Asian Americans to the final stage of ethnic identity development, which is the *Incorporation* stage; this stage represents the confidence an individual feels in his/her Asian American identity. Individuals are able to blend their

Asian American identity with their other social identities (Kim, 2001). From this stage, Asian Americans recognize that their racial identity is merely a component of their entire social identity that can be described by just one term, Asian American.

This model fails to address the racial identity development of Asians who are currently in the United States, but do not identify as being Asian American. For example, international students who come to America to study for a short period of time have different experiences than those who were born in America. It is therefore important to acknowledge that there are several different terms individuals of Asian descent might use to describe themselves. Individuals who are identified as being Asian in America face negative messages and stereotypes (Kim, 2001) because of the perceptions people hold of them based on their physical appearance. However, it is important to understand that not all Asians in America have the same experiences or immigrant backgrounds; therefore, the AAID model cannot be applied to all Asians living in America.

In addition to the importance of racial identity development in a person's sense of self, ethnic identity has shown to be another integral factor of the overall framework of an individual's identity (Guido-DiBrito & Chavez, 1999). Ethnic identity development is a process composed of several elements that contribute to the feelings of belonging to a particular ethnic group (Chun, Organista & Marin, 2003). Ethnic identity models differ from racial identity development models in that ethnic identity development models emphasize the learning of their ethnic group from their community, family, and peers (Guido-DiBrito & Chavez, 1999; Sue & Sue, 1971). Sue and Sue (1971) present three types of ethnic identity for Asian-Americans. The *Traditionalists* are individuals who strongly identify with their ethnic heritage in an attempt to be obedient. The primary goal

of traditionalists is to be dutiful and respectful to their family. The *Marginal Man* describes individuals who seek assimilation into the dominant society; they often reject their ethnic culture in order to better accept the dominant one. Asian-Americans make up the third ethnic identity of Sue and Sue's (1971) model. They develop their ethnic identities by trying to integrate their past experiences with their present state. Asian-Americans often face difficulties obeying their parents while managing the demands of the dominant society (Sue and Sue, 1971).

As suggested in Kim's (2001) model of racial identity development and Sue and Sue's (1971) model of ethnic identity development, ethnic and racial identity are two constructs that contribute to the understanding of the self. Both models deal with the dilemma Asian-Americans face when trying to maintain their ethnic culture while also attempting to acculturate into the dominant culture. The models illustrate the relationship between people's ethnic identity and racial identity and the acculturation strategy they choose. Both models contribute to the understanding of how Asian-Americans integrate their heritage cultures with the culture of the dominant society. Another way of looking at how Asians in America identify themselves is through the labels they choose to self identify themselves (Phinney, 2003).

Ethnic Self-Labeling

The United States, widely known as the "melting pot," is composed of individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures; it is a necessity for people to ethnically label themselves for the purpose of demographics and categorization. For example, when submitting applications for schools and jobs, filling out surveys, and taking examinations,

there is often a question that asks the applicants or participants to identify the racial or ethnic group that most applies to them. However, this process of describing oneself by a single label is difficult for many individuals.

Phinney and Ong (2007) suggest that the context or situation of an individual highly influences one's ethnic self-label. They support their claim with the example of the various labels an Asian/Asian-American could use; for example, Chinese, Chinese American, Asian, or Asian/Pacific Islander. The label choices among Asians have been organized into five label types—*panethnic*, *heritage national*, *American*, *panethnic-American*, and *heritage national-American* (Kiang, 2008). Kiang's research focuses on the ethnic identity and labeling among Chinese youth, but the categories can also be applied to other Asian ethnic groups.

The first identity she proposes is the *panethnic* label (e.g. Asian), which is often used as a general term that is all-encompassing. Espiritu (1992) suggests that the reasons for which an individual might choose a panethnic label is because of a view derived from the perceived psychological commonality between many cultures in Asia, political or social reasons to identify with a larger group, or in order to strengthen the social power of Asians, a minority, in the U.S.

The second label commonly used amongst Asians is the *heritage national* identity (e.g. Chinese); this label accounts for those individuals who feel a strong connection and identity with one's specific country of origin and understands the meaning of being uniquely Chinese or Japanese, etc. The label that most contrasts this label is the *American*

identity; those that identify as an American are usually more assimilated into the dominant culture and choose to disengage from their heritage culture.

Two additional labels that have been apparent in Asian identity are *panethnic-American* (e.g. Asian-American) and *heritage national-American* (Chinese American) labels.(Kiang, 2008). Kiang describes the panethnic-American label as identification for those who relate with a broad Asian culture as well as the dominant US culture; they are able to acknowledge their roles in their ethnic heritage culture and U.S. culture. Similar to the panethnic-American identity is the *heritage national-American* label. This label refers to a more specifically ethnic related identity than the panethnic labels; it indicates an “identification with one’s specific ethnic culture as well as with mainstream America.”

In order to further investigate the claims of different labels among Asians, Kiang examined the ethnic label choices among American adults from Chinese backgrounds. The participants of the study consisted of 259 young adults whose parents were of Chinese ancestry; one condition that was required of the participants was that they had to have been born in the U.S. or lived in the U.S for at least 10 years in order to participate in the study. Using Phinney’s (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM), the subjects’ ethnic self-categorization was assessed. Other measures that were also examined included: the ethnic diversity of the participants’ communities, peer networks, language proficiency, self-esteem, and positive relationships with family and peers (Kiang, 2008).

Based on previous research findings, Kiang hypothesized that the young adults who selected a heritage national label to best describe their ethnicity would most likely be

foreign-born and proficient in their heritage language, while those who chose hyphenated American labels would more likely be born in the U.S. and were proficient in English (Kiang, 2008). Her results demonstrated that there were no dominant category chosen by the participants to describe their ethnicity-- 22 percent selected a heritage national identity, 35 percent used a heritage national-American label, and 42 percent used a panethnic-American label.

Kiang's findings further denote that it was possible for even highly acculturated young adults to identify with their national heritage by adding a hyphenated American to their self designated identity label. Kiang indicated that pairing a hyphenated American to either a panethnic or heritage national label was a way for young individuals to represent that they identify both their ethnic and mainstream cultures. This suggests that ethnic minorities, Asians in particular, have the ability to identify with two cultures, which further confirms Berry's (2003) integration stage and LaFramboise et al's (1993) alternation model of bicultural identities.

Names

Relating back to the previous discussion of the vast number of cultures that are represented in America raises the question of how individuals address each other. When immigrants begin their lives in a new host country, how do they introduce themselves? Do they use their ethnic names? What if their name is one that is difficult to pronounce or remember?

The concept of an individual's name has not been explored extensively enough to understand the reasons for which ethnic minorities may choose to adopt an English name,

or a name that is more familiar in the dominant culture. Edwards (2006) investigated the reasons for which mainland Chinese students changed or kept their names and how it was relevant to their identities and experience in the classroom. Her study consisted of Chinese students and lecturers from a university in the United Kingdom who were members of an English language program. She revealed that of the eighty subjects in her study, eighty-one percent of the students had adopted English names. 46 had self selected their English name, 14 had been assigned a name by a teacher, 5 had been given their names by friends or classmates, and 15 had kept their Chinese names (Edwards, 2006).

She further categorizes the use of English names by the derivation or selection of the name. First, many of the students were addressed by their English name because their teachers had told them that they needed to and therefore should choose an English name (Edwards, 2006). A particular student revealed that his teacher told him that his Chinese name was too difficult to remember, so he gave the student a book of names to choose from. Students also reported to choosing their English names by seeking one that was similar in sound to their Chinese names. For example, a student whose Chinese name is Weng De selected Wonder to be her English name because the similar pronunciation. Many Chinese students also translated the meanings of their Chinese names into an English name, for example, Sky, Ocean, and Summer.

The findings in Edwards (2006) study shed light on the ways Chinese students select their English names, but the study fails to address the collectivistic values of Chinese students as a reason for the adoption or changing of their names. Although the reason she suggests only addresses Chinese students' adoptions of English names, they are broad enough to be applied to other Asian groups.

Edwards (2006) suggests that the adoption of English names is a way for Chinese students to invest in the culture that they have newly acquired; she indicates that the selecting of English names are a way for students to respond to the ways in which they perceive is expected of them. In other words, they are adjusting themselves to adjust to the expectations and desires of their new culture, a characteristic of collectivistic cultures as described by Triandis (1995). When a student is asked by his or her professor to complete a task, it is part of that student's duty to fulfill what is asked by the teacher. A teacher's telling of a student to change his or her name reveals the hierarchical disposition of collectivistic societies; in a hierarchy, a teacher is of a higher ranking, which makes it a student's duty to obey his or her teacher.

In addition to studying the use of English names among Asian/Asian-American students as a way of assimilating into a newly acquired culture, previous research has also analyzed personal names from a socio-linguistic perspective (Thompson, 2006). Thompson (2006) presents the cultural significance the link between names and identities carries in his study of three Korean American women. Korean names are often valued differently than in the Western culture because they are believed to bring either good or bad luck to a family, are derived from Chinese characters that have different meanings, and are partially determined by generation names, or characters that alternate between generations. For example, if the character of "Jin" was the designated family name, or character, the male children of a family may all have names with the character "Jin" (Sang Jin, Ho Jin). These examples highlight the significance of one's name in Korea, Japan, and China, which all use Chinese characters in their language systems (Thompson, 2006).

In Thompson's (2006) study, participants revealed that their Korean names were used at home and with family, while their English names were used at school and with friends. This finding raises the question of why Asian/Asian-Americans choose to use their English name only in certain contexts? Rymes (1996) indicates that names illustrate a world of cultural assumptions that either helps or impedes an individual's access to different communities. These findings support that there is in fact a strong link between one's name, ethnic identity, and acculturation. Thompson (2006) describes the relationship between the three variables as a difficulty because while using an ethnic name provides them with access to their ethnic community, it may also hinder their acceptance into the communities of the dominant society.

Goals

The present study will further investigate the link between the three variables, by specifically examining the relationship between a student's collectivistic values and the adoption of an English name among several Asian groups. The purpose of the current study is to highlight collectivistic tendencies among many Asians continue to persist despite their acculturation strategies. Also, the use of English names is not positively correlated with acculturation levels, but rather, is used to pay respect to others and to fulfill one's duties and expectations.

Questions and Hypotheses

The questions of how Asians choose to self label their ethnic identity and why they choose those particular terms will also be examined. Another dimension of ethnic identity and acculturation that will be investigated is the use of English names among Asians and

Asian Americans. For the purpose of this study, the term *Asian* will be used to identify individuals that carry foreign passports; *Asian Americans* will refer to individuals that hold U.S. passports. This study will explore the reasons for adopting an English name and the relationship between adopting an English name and acculturation. The three questions addressed are: 1) Do Asian/Asian-Americans choose their self-ethnic labels and English names as a result of collectivistic values? 2) Why do some Asians/Asian-Americans have English names while others do not? 3) Is there a relationship between Asian/Asian-American students' acculturation and adherence to Asian values? Based on the examination of these three questions, it is hypothesized that: 1) participants who choose Heritage National labels will have higher mean Asian Values scores than participants who choose other labels to describe the self 2) the main reason for reported use of English names will be to avoid embarrassment and inconvenience for the other 3) acculturation and Asian values will be positively correlated. Although this study will not directly assess the ethnic identity development of Asian-Americans, the construct will contribute to the understanding of the acculturation process of Asian/Asian-Americans. The focus of this study will be on the link between Asian/Asian-American's acculturation processes, which is associated with one's ethnic identity, with their collectivistic values.

Method

Participants

The participants were 50 undergraduate students, attending universities and colleges across the United States. Subjects were recruited from the following 9 institutions: Wheaton College, New York University, University of California-Berkeley, Columbia University, Mount Holyoke College, Boston University, Stanford University,

and Wesleyan University. In order to participate in the study, participants were required to 1) be an undergraduate student and 2) be of Asian descent. The sample population represented Asians and Asian Americans who had different living experiences in and contact with Asia or America.

Measures

The Adoption of an English Name. For the purposes of this study, a questionnaire was created to assess the participants' derivation and adoption of English names (See Appendix B). The questions addressed the usage, derivation, reasons for, and timeline of the participants' English names. For example, "My English name is: (a) A derivation of my Ethnic name; (b) A shortened version or a nickname of my Ethnic name; (c) It is a translation of my Ethnic name; (d) It was assigned to me by an older person of higher ranking; (e) My own choice without help of others; (f) Given to me by a friend or classmate." The selected answers will be used to analyze the interaction between their answers and scores from the AVS and SL-ASIA. This was be a valid measure to use for the purposes of further understanding the participants' history of English names.

Adherence to Asian Values. Kim et al.'s (1999) Asian Values Scale (AVS) was used to assess the participants' adherence to cultural values (See Appendix C). The 36-item instrument presented Asian Values statements such as, "One should not deviate from familial and social norms" and "One should think about one's group before oneself." The statements were responded to according to a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Reliability studies done by Kim

et al. (1999) revealed coefficients of 0.81 – 0.83 for the entire AVS, which indicates its internal consistency. In addition to the adequate internal consistency, evidence of concurrent and discriminate validity has also been supported in a test for validity (Kim et al. 1999).

Acculturation. Suinn et al.'s (1987) Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation (SL-ASIA) was used to measure the acculturation of the participants (See Appendix D). The items on this scale assessed the participants' language use, identity, friendship choice, behaviors, generation/geographic history, and attitudes (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew & Vigil, 1987). The items were addressed in the form of multiple choices and rating questions; the rating questions will use a 5-point Likert-type scale where 1 is do not believe and 5 is strongly believe in Asian values. The multiple choice answers also provide bicultural identity responses such as "I write both an Asian language and English equally well" and "My food preference in restaurants is about equally Asian and American." The scores from the participants' responses indicate the individual's general acculturation, Asian identity and ethnic affiliation. Suinn et al. (1987) indicate that their reliability test shows a calculated coefficient of 0.88 on the 21 items, which provides evidence that the SL-ASIA is a reliable instrument. As suggested, this scale was appropriate to use in the present study.

Daily Level. The Daily Diaries, developed by Yip & Cross (2004) was used to assess the participants' ethnic self-labeling on a daily basis (See Appendix E). The items measured American and ethnic identity salience, engagement in ethnic behaviors, and psychological well-being. Sample questions include, "How much did you feel like each of the following today? (a good friend, a good student)" and "How Chinese or how

American did you feel today?” The participants were asked to complete the daily diaries for 14 consecutive days. Items also asked the participants about the ethnic activities they engaged in, such as, watching an Asian video/movie, or reading an Asian newspaper/magazine. The Daily Diaries have been noted as a reliable and valid way of collecting measurements of adolescents’ daily behaviors, activities, and feelings; this measure can provide more valid predictions than the traditional single surveys (Fuligni, Yip, & Tseng, 2002).

Procedure

Before carrying out this project and examining the use of English names among Asians/Asian Americans from different degrees of acculturation and adherence to Asian Values, it was mandatory that this study received an approval from Wheaton College’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). In addition to getting this research approved by the IRB at Wheaton, it was also required to receive consent from the Review Boards at the institutions that participants were recruited from.

After receiving the required approvals, participants were then contacted via email, facebook, and word of mouth. In order to gather participants at Wheaton, fliers and advertisements at on-campus events and meetings were used. With the help of the Center for Global Education and the Marshall Center for Intercultural Learning, the Asian/Asian-American students on campus were contacted. The participants were provided with the link to the consent form and questionnaire of this study in a mass email.

Students from other universities were recruited differently from Wheaton students, but a chain-referral method was still employed. Club leaders and participants were contacted via email and facebook, however, there was limited person-to-person communication. The link to the instructions of the questionnaire were sent in email and facebook messages to my friends studying in the United States, and were then distributed to Asian/Asian-American students at their schools.

The online questionnaire consisted of the statements and questions from the Use of an English Name survey, the Asian Values Scale (AVS) and the Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation survey. Participants were instructed to submit a consent form before completing the questionnaire. The second part of study asked participants to fill in the Daily Diaries over a span of 14 days. The participants were sent daily email reminders at 7 PM with a link to the survey to encourage them to assess their daily activities and interactions.

In order to maintain participant anonymity and confidentiality, participants were asked to create an Identification Number using their school initials, last 4 digits of their phone number, and school mailbox number. Their ID number was recorded on each of the daily diaries and questionnaire they completed. The ID numbers were also used in a raffle to win 1 of 4 iTunes gift cards. After collecting data from 50 participants, several statistical analyses were used to assess the results.

Results

For the analysis of the data, parametric test statistics were used to measure the categorical nature of the data. First, an independent-samples t-test was used to compare

the variance of scores for the Asian Values Scale (AVS) measure, Suinn-Lew Asian Self Identity Acculturation (SL-ASIA) measure, and self-ethnic label. Second, an independent-samples t-test was also used to compare the mean measures scores of the participants in the Panethnic label and Heritage National label conditions. Third, percentages and correlations were calculated to assess the responses of and relationships between individual variables.

These procedures were included to analyze the variance of measure scores between participants in the different self-ethnic label conditions. These four statistical analyses were used to examine the relationship between the participants' ethnic identity and self-ethnic labels, reasons for using certain self-ethnic labels and English names, and the relationship between the participant's acculturation and adherence to Asian values.

The overall results of the analysis suggests that there were significant differences in mean scores for acculturation and choice of self-ethnic label or use of English names. Participants with higher mean scores for acculturation tended to have both an English and Ethnic name and also were more likely to use hyphenated American labels to describe themselves.

Acculturation and Names

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the acculturation scores for Asian/Asian-American students with either both an English and Ethnic name and those with only an English name. As indicated in Table 1, there was a significant difference in mean acculturation scores for participants with English and Ethnic names

[$M = 57.89$, $SD = 8.19$, $Min = 21$, $Max = 105$) and only Ethnic names [$M = 50.09$, $SD = 9.25$, $Min = 21$, $Max = 105$]; $t(48) = 2.72$, $p = 0.009$].

Adherence to Asian Values and Names

An independent-samples t-test was also conducted to assess the difference in mean scores on the Asian Values Scale (AVS) for participants with both an English and Ethnic name and those with only an English name (Table 2). There was no difference in mean Asian Values scores for participants of the two conditions. Participants with both an English and Ethnic name ($M = 154.97$, $SD = 19.85$, $Min = 36$, $Max = 252$) and only an Ethnic name ($M = 153.00$, $SD = 23.87$, $Min = 36$, $Max = 252$) scored similarly in the Asian Values measure.

English names and Collectivism

English and Ethnic Names:

The majority of the participants (34.5%) indicated that they used an English name because they were currently in America and should therefore have an English name. Also, another notable number of participants (27.6%) revealed that they chose to use an English name for the convenience of others and 10.4% said they were told by another person that they should have an English name. The remaining participants recorded that they used an English name to fit in with their peers (3.5%), for the convenience of themselves (7.0%), a combination of the reasons, (13.5%), and no response (3.5%)

In an analysis of why the participants with both an Ethnic and English name chose to use their English name more than their Ethnic names at school, more than half (57.7%)

of the students revealed that they prefer being addressed by their English name because it is easier for others to pronounce.

Ethnic Name Only

For those participants who only have an Ethnic name, they reported not having an English name because they like their Ethnic name and do not want to change it (35.7%), they were given their Ethnic name and should use it as a form of respect (14.3%), they are not American and therefore do not need an English name (14.3%), they never thought about it (7.1%) and a combination of the four responses (28.6%).

Acculturation and Adherence Asian Values

The relationship between acculturation (as measured by the SL-ASIA) and adherence to Asian values (as measured by the AVS) was investigated using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. No correlation between the two variables [$r = -0.021$, $n = 50$, $p > 0.05$] was found.

Self- Ethnic Labels and Acculturation

Ethnic vs. –American

To analyze the self-ethnic labels used among the participants to describe themselves, an independent-samples t-test was conducted. There was a significant difference in acculturation scores for participants who used an Ethnic label ($M = 51.69$, $SD = 11.02$) and a hyphenated American label ($M = 58$, $SD = 6.10$).

Panethnic vs. Heritage National, Heritage National-American and Panethnic-American

There was also a significant difference found in the acculturation scores for the participants who selected the Panethnic label to describe themselves ($M = 50.13$, $SD = 8.53$) and Heritage National, Heritage National- American, or Panethnic-American labels ($M = 57.13$, $SD = 8.58$). These findings indicate that the mean acculturation scores for participants who chose a panethnic label were significantly lower than those who selected one of the other three labels.

Engagement in Asian Activities and Self-Ethnic Labels

The frequency of the changing of self-ethnic labels during the 14 days of the daily diaries survey was computed to assess the variability of labels used among the participants. Of the 28 participants who filled in the daily diaries for more than 1 day, 19 of them reported changes in their ethnic labels (67.9%). However, there was no correlation [$r = 0.14$, $N = 39$, $p > 0.05$] between the number of daily Asian activities participants engaged in during the 14 days and the changing of their Ethnic labels. Of the 28 participants who filled in the daily diaries for more than 1 day, there was a dominant category chosen by the participants to describe their ethnicity—42.5% selected Heritage National-American identity, 20% used a Panethnic identity, 20% used a Heritage National identity, and 17.5% reported a Panethnic-American identity.

Table 1

Mean SL-ASIA totals of English/Ethnic and Ethnic Only Condition

Condition	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig. (2-tailed)
English and Ethnic Name	39	57.90	8.27	0.009**
Ethnic Name Only	11	50.10	9.27	

Note: Calculated at *p*-value of 0.107 due to small sample size.

Table 2

Mean AVS totals of Ethnic/English and Ethnic Only Condition

Condition	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig. (2-tailed)
English and Ethnic Name	39	155.00	19.85	0.782**
Ethnic Name Only	11	154.00	23.87	

Note: Calculated at *p*-value of 0.107 due to small sample size.

Disussion

The goal of this research study was to address the following three questions: 1) Do Asian/Asian-Americans choose their self-ethnic labels and English names as a result of collectivistic values? 2) Why do some Asians/Asian-Americans have English names while others do not? 3) Is there a relationship between Asian/Asian-American students' acculturation and adherence to Asian values? Based on these three research questions, it was hypothesized that 1) participants who choose Heritage National labels will have higher mean Asian Values scores than participants who choose other labels to describe the self 2) the main reason for reported use of English names will be to avoid embarrassment and inconvenience for the other 3) acculturation and Asian values will be positively correlated,.

The results indicated that although there was no relationship between the participants adherence to Asian values and acculturation, participants with high levels of acculturation were more likely to have both an Ethnic and English name, as opposed to just an Ethnic name. Participants revealed that they chose to use an English name because they are in America and should therefore have an English name, for the convenience of others, they were told by another person that they should have an English name, to fit in with peers, for their own convenience, or a combination of the reasons. More than half of the participants also indicated that they chose to be addressed by their English name because it is easier for others to pronounce. These results are consistent with past research findings suggesting that individuals from collectivistic cultures will behave in a way that

is expected and desired by group norms, even if it is inconsistent with their personal desires (Triandis, 1995).

Participants in the present study revealed similar responses to the reasons for why they used English names as suggested in research of Hurh and Kim (1984). However, it is important to acknowledge that the participants in their study were a part of the earlier waves of immigration where ethnic names were anglicized. For example, a Korean name pronounced as “Ae-ri” could be anglicized to Eddi (Thompson, 2006). Despite this difference in participant groups, both indicated the same two main reasons for using English names—for the convenience of other people and because they are in America, they should have English names. The similarities between the two surveyed groups reveal that the reasons for which Asians, or Koreans in the previous case, use English names has not changed over the past 33 years, suggesting a consistent adherence to the collectivistic character of giving priority to the other (Triandis, 1995). It can be understood from this finding that collectivistic tendencies among allocentric individuals in the Asian culture have continued to persist in the values of present day Asians/Asian-Americans.

The findings of this study suggest that participants continue to hold collectivistic values when choosing the name to be addressed by. In a question asking the participants why they used an English name, the three most frequently selected answers were the options that focused on the expectation and convenience of other people. Participants’ responses support Triandis’ (1989) claim that Asians place a strong emphasis on situational and external factors, as opposed to internal factors.

However, not all of the participants possessed both an English and Ethnic name. Unlike the previous group of participants who indicated that they were motivated by the group to use their English names, students without English names revealed that they decided not to stick with their Ethnic name because they did not want to change their name and because they are not American and therefore do not need an English name. Although these responses may appear as a more individualistic and independent approach to choosing what name to go by, it can also be inferred that these participants chose to go by their Ethnic name as a form of respect to their family or the individuals who gave them their names.

As demonstrated earlier, names in Asian cultures are derived differently than that of Western culture. Asian names, Korean names in particular, are chosen based on the meaning of the name and whether or not it will bring good luck to the family. It is common for the eldest male relative on the father's side to choose potential names for a newborn child, illustrating the emphasis of hierarchy and familial respect in the Korean culture. The significance of the family in Korean culture is also illustrated in the passing down of certain names, or in this case characters, across generations. (Hurh & Kim, 1984, pp. 181).

The findings of the present study reflect previous research done by Hurh and Kim (1984), who found that participants who chose to go by their ethnic names did so because they did not see a need to change their name, to preserve their Korean identity, and to respect the name given to them by their parents. From this, it can be inferred that Koreans have maintained a strong sense of pride from the earlier waves of their

immigration. Their reasons for keeping their Ethnic names shed light on the present participant group's reasonings.

From these findings, we can infer that 1) many Asian/Asian-American students use English names to convenience the situation for the person they are interacting with and 2) Asian/Asian-American students who do not have English names have pride in their Ethnic names and therefore do not feel that they need to adopt an English name. Both of these conclusions can be attributed to the collectivistic orientation of the participants to pay respect to the individuals who gave them their names and the people they interact with.

Not only did the participants with both an English and Ethnic name reveal collectivistic reasons for using an English name, but they also indicated patterns of assimilation to the Western culture from their high scores on the acculturation scale. This display of both Western and Asian tendencies in the participants' responses suggests that it is a possibility for participants to possess a bicultural identity. LaFromboise (1993) defines this strategy of acculturation as a way for individuals to continue to preserve a positive relationship between the two cultures they identify with, without having to choose over the other. Results that support the concept of biculturalism among the participants with both an English and Ethnic name is evident in their alternation of self-ethnic labels during the daily diaries. More than half of the participants who participated in the daily diaries (67.9%) indicated a change in the labels they selected to describe themselves. Although there was no relationship between the choice of label and the number of Asian activities the participant engaged in, the change of labels continues to suggest that there is variability. As Kanno (2003) suggested, it is possible for immigrants

to adopt a transnational identity that enables them to engage in activities that cross borders of their host and heritage cultures. He suggests that immigrants in America possess a unique position in the U.S. because they live their lives between two worlds.

The concept of biculturalism is also supported in the research of Oyserman and Markus (1993), where they found that individuals are able to behave according to the social contexts that they are in. Biculturalism also appears in previous literature (Thompson, 2006; Trueba, 2002; Kiang, 2008) as a potential identity for Asian-Americans, while bilingualism also plays an important role in an individual's identity and assimilation into a new culture. Although this study did not focus heavily on the language ability of the participants, it is a condition that could have had a significant impact on the participant's identities and is an area that is in need of further investigation.

The variation of self-ethnic labels displayed among the participants of this study and the concept of relational identity (Kiang & Fuligni, 2009) reiterate the strong weight of collectivistic values in the behavior of Asian/Asian-American students. The results of this study suggest that more acculturated individuals are more likely to use panethnic or hyphenated American labels to describe themselves. According to Kiang and Fuligni (2009), a panethnic term provides a broad and simple representation of a racial group that highly acculturated individuals would be aware of. This potential for Asian/Asian-Americans to identify with a panethnic label is consistent with previous literature on collectivistic cultures because it confirms their tendency to behave in a way that is expected of others (Triandis, 1995).

Kiang and Fuligni (2009) also suggested in their research that language fluency was significantly associated with ethnic label choice. Individuals who were more

proficient in English were less likely to choose a heritage national label alone. Participants who revealed being fluent in English displayed higher frequencies in reporting a hyphenated American label. It can be derived from their findings that although their choice in label seems to be motivated by their language proficiency, an underlying factor that has not been acknowledged in Kiang and Fuligni's discussion is the allocentric tendencies of the individuals. As Triandis (1995) suggests, one of the prominent motivations of collectivistic cultures is their focus on the norm and expectations. Individuals of Asian descent who are perceived as more "American" because of their proficiency in the English language, or other characteristics will, according to the literature, supporting the tendencies of allocentric individuals to behave in a way that is expected. Responding in the manner that is expected may imply identifying as Asian-American or Korean-American to account for their English fluency, or describing oneself as simply Korean to provide an explanation for the accent that individuals might have.

From the findings of previous studies on Asian-Americans and the results of the present study, it can be concluded that Asian-Americans are capable of adopting a bicultural identity (Berry, 2003; LaFramboise et al, 1993; Leong & Chou, 1994; Kiang & Fuligni, 2009; Hong, Morris, Chiu, and Benet-Martinez, 2000; Oyserman & Markus, 1993; Kiang et al, 2007). Through the reasons for choosing to use an English or an Ethnic name, the participants indicated that they were able to maintain adherence to their Asian values (the mean score was 156 with 252 as the highest score possible). Their relatively high Asian values scores and acculturation scores (the mean score was 56 with 105 as the highest score possible) suggest that it is possible to be acculturated to the dominant

culture while possessing collectivistic characteristics. In addition to implying a bicultural identity through the use of an English or Ethnic name, their choice in self-ethnic labels also hinted at their dual identities. The frequent changing of labels among the participants suggests that the participants are able to identify with both their heritage culture and the dominant one. The findings of this study confirm past literature indicating that bicultural identities is possible for Asian-Americans.

However, as with any other study, this study should be considered in light of several limitations. First, the greatest concern is the issue of external validity; the results cannot be generalized to the larger population because the findings represent only a small sample of Asian/Asian-American students in the U.S. In addition to the small sample size, most of the participants are U.S. citizens and lived in the U.S. for more than 5 years; this raises a problem because it is possible that their experiences with the Western culture were different from that of students born and raised in Asia. With the small sample size also comes the possibility of committing a Type II error. It is feasible that due to the small sample size, the null hypothesis was mistakenly accepted as true.

Second, due to the long length of the questionnaire given to the participants, many of them may have experienced disinterest or boredom while completing the questions. This could have influenced their ability to answer the questions to their full interest or ability. This was a major problem in the participants' choice to complete the daily diaries surveys for the entire 14 days. Third, many participants complained that it was hard for them to remember to fill in the daily diaries survey at the end of each night. Coming up with a more effective system to motivate participants to fill in the form each night could have alleviated this difficulty and made the process more convenient for the participants.

Fourth, the definition of an “English” and “Ethnic” name could have been explained more clearly. One of the participants noted in his/her questionnaire that he/she did not know how to fill in the questionnaire because his/her English and Ethnic name was the same. Indicating at the beginning of the questionnaire that English names derived from Ethnic names should be considered Ethnic names would have been helpful. Last, but not least, a limitation from the Daily Diaries survey that could have potentially influenced the results of this research was the use of the term race/ethnicity. Two participants asked to clarify the question “Of the friends that you spent time with today, how many were of the same race/ethnicity as you?” because they were confused as to what would be considered the same race/ethnicity. This was a major limitation because the participants could have interpreted race/ethnicity differently, which would have an influence on their responses.

Despite these limitations, the findings of this study have important implications for the understanding of the acculturation and use of English names among Asian/Asian-American students. Literature has suggested that Asian Americans are capable of developing a bicultural identity in which they identify with and balance both their ethnic and western cultures (Berry, 2005; LaFramboise et al., 1993; Bacallao & Smokowski, 2009; Trueba, 2002; Benet-Martinez et al., 2002; Oyserman & Markus, 1993; Kiang & Fuligni, 2009; Kiang et al., 2007). The findings of this study further suggest that Asian/Asian-American students are able to identify with both cultures and change their identity labels according to the situations they are in. Their identity with either their ethnic or western culture was not only revealed through the label that the participants chose to identify themselves, but it was also suggested in their use of an English name.

Participants who were more acculturated tended to have both an Ethnic and English name, while those who were more inclined to identifying with their Asian identity had only an Ethnic name. With this in mind, it is possible that the use of an English name is a variable that can help improve research on Asian/Asian-American Identity development.

Another implication that can be derived from the present research is that not all Asians in America fit the developed models of Asian American Identity development. The AAID model introduced by Kim (2001) presents the possible identify formation process of Asian American individuals that attended school in the United States from certain stages of their lives. However, the findings of this research study indicate that there is a large group of individuals who have U.S. passports and would technically be considered Asian American, but lived in Asia for the majority of their lives and therefore identify as Asian, not Asian American. This study presents another group of Asian Americans that have different encounters with their ethnic identity than those individuals that go through the stages of the AAID model. Assessing the use of an English name among Asians/Asian-Americans can help lead research to another dimension of identity development. This study provides evidence to suggest that there is a relationship between one's acculturation and use of an English name.

Although this study presented a relationship between acculturation, ethnic identity, and use of an English name, it failed to address the different experiences for Asian Americans and Asian International students. It would be beneficial for future research to explore the experiences of Asian International students. For example, a potential question that researchers could explore is whether or not the social setting of schools that International students may attend influences their decision to adopt an

English name. Are Asian international students who attend schools with smaller Asian student populations more likely to adopt an English name than students at a school with a larger Asian population? As previous literature suggests, Asian individuals are strongly influenced by contextual and environmental factors, so it is possible for the presence or absence of Asians to influence one's decision to use or not to use an English name. The link between an individual's name and identity has been presented in both previous research and the findings of this research study. It is an area in need of more investigation to better understand ethnic identity development and strategies of acculturation for not only Asian/Asian-Americans, but other minority groups in America.

There are several future directions for research that would contribute to our understanding of the significance of collectivistic values in an individual's ethnic identity development and strategies of acculturation. First, it would be beneficial to investigate the ethnic identity development and acculturation strategies among specific cultures, for example, looking specific at Koreans, Japanese, or Chinese, rather than combining them into one group. It can also be suggested that investigating the acculturation process, ethnic identity, and the use of English names among not only East Asians, but also among Southeast Asians, South Asians, North Asians, Central Asians, and Western Asians would be a potential area of future research. Second, as indicated in the research, significant effects of bilingualism has appeared in its relation to ethnic identity development; it would be valuable to further explore that relationship. Third, while no relationship between Asian values and acculturation were found in this study, the small sample size may have been a major reason for the lack of statistical significance.

Reassessing the relationship between the two variables with a larger pool of participants would be useful.

A final direction that could contribute greatly to the research of Asian/Asian-Americans is assessing the link between one's ethnic identity and the use of an English name and self-ethnic label. The present study investigated participants' acculturation with their decision to use an English name and choice of self-ethnic label, but using ethnic identity as a direct construct of analysis could lead research in another direction. Future studies could incorporate using the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM; Phinney, 1992) and assess scores in relation to use an English name among Asian/Asian-Americans. The flexibility of identity formation among Asian-Americans (Yeh & Huang, 1996) reveal the complexity of one's identity and the multiple directions an individual can take.

Appendix A
Consent Form

Hello,

My name is Jennifer Park and I am currently a senior at Wheaton College. For my Honors Thesis in Psychology, under the supervision of Professor Fhagen-Smith, I am interested in investigating the variation of self-ethnic labels and the adoption of English names among college students. In order to collect meaningful data, I require several participants who are willing to take part in my study. If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

1. Complete four questionnaires that will assess your use of an English name, Asian Values, Acculturation, and daily experiences and feelings of ethnic belonging.
2. Three of the four questionnaires will only take approximately 30 minutes to complete altogether; the last questionnaire will ask you to answer a list of identical questions about your daily experiences and feelings during a span of 14 days.

This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Wheaton College to ensure your safety and confidentiality as a participant. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable; you will have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. To guarantee that your name and responses to the questionnaires are confidential, you will be assigned an identification number to use in lieu of using your name. If you are willing to participate in the study, please indicate your willingness by signing the form below. As a participant in this study, your ID number will be entered in a lottery one for four \$25 iTunes gift cards.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns you may have regarding this study. You can contact me at: park_jennifer@wheatonma.edu or at 808-542-9696.

Jennifer Young Mi Park



_____ I give my informed consent for participation in this research.

OR

_____ I do NOT give consent for participation in this research.

Note: To be eligible to participate in this study, you must be at least 18 years of age

Name of Participant (Please Print): _____

Signature of Participant: _____ Date: _____

Email Address: _____ (*Your email address will be used solely for contact purposes*)

Appendix B

Demographics

ID Number : _____

1. Gender
 - a. Female
 - b. Male

2. What school do you currently attend?
 - a. Boston University
 - b. Wheaton College

3. What year in school are you?
 - a. Freshman
 - b. Sophomore
 - c. Junior
 - d. Senior

4. Are you a US citizen ?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Dual
 - d. Other: _____

5. Where were you born? (city/region, country)

4. How long have you lived in the U.S.?
 - a. 0-5 years
 - b. 6-11 years
 - c. 12-17 years
 - d. 18 or more years

5. Is English your first language?
 - a. Yes

- b. No
- c. Bilingual

6. Religious Affiliation: How important is religion to you?
 (very) 1 2 3 4 5 (not at all)

Appendix C

The Use of an English Name

ID Number : _____

1. Do you have an English name? Yes No
 If you selected *Yes*, please answer questions #3 – #11

 Do you have an Ethnic name? Yes No
 If you selected *No*, please answer question #2 and skip #3 - #11

 Do you have both an English and Ethnic name? Yes No
 If you selected *Yes*, please answer questions #3 – #11
- 1a. Which name do you use most often?
 - a. English
 - b. Ethnic
 - c. Both Equally
2. If you answered “No” to having an English name, why have you chosen not to have an English name? (Circle as many that apply)
 - a. I was given my Ethnic name by an elder and should use my Ethnic name as a form of respect
 - b. I am not American, I do not need an English name
 - c. I like my Ethnic name and do not want to change it
 - d. I have never thought about using an English name
3. Which of the following are applicable to your English name? (Circle as many that apply)
 - a. It is a derivation of my Ethnic name
 - b. It a shortened version or a nickname of my Ethnic name
 - c. It is a translation of my Ethnic name
 - d. It was assigned to me by an older person of higher ranking (parent, teacher, relative)
 - e. I chose my own English name without the help of others
 - f. It was given to me by a friend or classmate
 - g. It was chosen for religious reasons
 - h. I was born with only an English name

4. When did you adopt your English name? (Circle as many that apply)
 - a. I was born with my English name
 - b. In Elementary, Middle or High School
 - c. When I came to college
 - d. I have never been given or selected an English name

 5. When did you begin to use your English name? (Circle as many that apply)
 - a. I was born with my English name
 - b. In Elementary, Middle or High School
 - c. When I came to college

 6. Why have you decided to go by your English name? (Circle as many that apply)
 - a. I wanted to fit in with my classmates and peers
 - b. For the convenience of others to pronounce my name because it is embarrassing for **the other** person when it is mispronounced
 - c. I was told by another person that I should have an English name
 - d. For the convenience of others to pronounce my name because it is embarrassing for **me** when it is mispronounced
 - e. I am in America, and therefore should have an English name

 7. Who addresses you by your English name? (Circle as many that apply)
 - a. My parents (on a daily basis)
 - b. My parents (only when I am being scolded)
 - c. My siblings
 - d. My friends of the same ethnicity
 - e. My friends of a different ethnicity

 8. Do you use your Ethnic name as your middle name? Yes No

 9. When you introduce yourself to someone for the first time, you use your Ethnic / English / Depends (Circle one)
- If you selected Depends,
- a. In what situations do you use your Ethnic name?
 - b. In what situations do you use your English name?
10. My Facebook name is my Ethnic / English / Both (Circle one) name

 11. I prefer being addressed by my English name because (Circle as many that apply):
 - a. I do not like to stand out from others
 - b. It is easier for others to pronounce
 - c. I like it more than my Ethnic name
 - d. My Ethnic name is embarrassing
 - e. I do not like to be associated with being Asian

Appendix D

Asian Values Scale (AVS)

ID Number : _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you agree with the value expressed in each statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree **2** = Moderately Disagree **3** = Mildly Disagree **4** = Neither Agree nor Disagree **5** = Mildly Agree **6** = Moderately Agree **7** = Strongly Agree

- _____ 1. Educational failure does not bring shame to the family.

- _____ 2. One should not deviate from familial and social norms.

- _____ 3. Children should not place their parents in retirement homes.

- _____ 4. One need not focus all energies on one's studies.

- _____ 5. One should be discouraged from talking about one's accomplishments.

- _____ 6. One should not be boastful.

- _____ 7. Younger persons should be able to confront their elders.

- _____ 8. When one receives a gift, one should reciprocate with a gift of equal or greater value.

- _____ 9. One need not follow one's family's and the society's norms.
- _____ 10. One need not achieve academically in order to make one's parents proud.
- _____ 11. One need not minimize or depreciate one's own achievements.
- _____ 12. One should consider the needs of others before considering one's own needs.
- _____ 13. Educational and career achievements need not be one's top priority.
- _____ 14. One should think about one's group before oneself.
- _____ 15. One should be able to question a person in an authority position.
- _____ 16. Modesty is an important quality for a person.
- _____ 17. One's achievements should be viewed as family's achievements.
- _____ 18. Elders may not have more wisdom than younger persons.
- _____ 19. One should avoid bringing displeasure to one's ancestors.
- _____ 20. One need not conform to one's family's and the society's expectations.
- _____ 21. One should have sufficient inner resources to resolve emotional problems.

- _____ 22. Parental love should be implicitly understood and not openly expressed.
- _____ 23. The worst thing one can do is to bring disgrace to one's family reputation.
- _____ 24. One need not remain reserved and tranquil.
- _____ 25. The ability to control one's emotions is a sign of strength.
- _____ 26. One should be humble and modest.
- _____ 27. Family's reputation is not the primary social concern.
- _____ 28. One need not be able to resolve psychological problems on one's own.
- _____ 29. Following familial and social expectations are important.
- _____ 30. One should not inconvenience others.
- _____ 31. Occupational failure does not bring shame to the family.
- _____ 32. One need not follow the role expectations (gender, family hierarchy) of one's family.
- _____ 33. One should not make waves.
- _____ 34. Children need not take care of their parents when the parents become unable to take care of themselves.

_____ 35. One need not control one's expression of emotions.

_____ 36. One's family need not be the main source of trust and dependence.

Appendix E

Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale

(SL-ASIA)

ID Number : _____

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. Choose the one answer which best describes you.

1. What language can you speak?

1. Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
2. Mostly Asian, some English
3. Asian and English about equally well (bilingual)
4. Mostly English, some Asian
5. Only English

2. What language do you prefer?

1. Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
2. Mostly Asian, some English
3. Asian and English about equally well (bilingual)
4. Mostly English, some Asian
5. Only English

3. How do you identify yourself?

1. Oriental
2. Asian
3. Asian-American

4. Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Korean-American, etc.
5. American

4. Which identification does (did) your mother use?

1. Oriental
2. Asian
3. Asian-American
4. Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Korean-American, etc.
5. American

5. Which identification does (did) your father use?

1. Oriental
2. Asian
3. Asian-American
4. Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Korean-American, etc.
5. American

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

1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic group
5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

7. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child from 6 to 18?

1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

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

1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

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

1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups

10. What is your music preference?

1. Only Asian music (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
2. Mostly Asian
3. Equally Asian and English
4. Mostly English
5. English only

11. What is your movie preference?

1. Asian-language movies only
2. Asian-language movies mostly
3. Equally Asian/English English-language movies

4. Mostly English-language movies only
5. English-language movies only

12. What generation are you? (circle the generation that best applies to you:)

- 1 1st Generation = I was born in Asia or country other than U.S.
- 2 2nd Generation = I was born in U.S., either parent was born in Asia or country other than U.S.
- 3 3rd Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S., and all grandparents born in Asia or country other than U.S.
- 4 4th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S., and at least one grandparent born in Asia or country other than U.S. and one grandparent born in U.S.
- 5 5th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S., and all grandparents also born in U.S.
- 6 Don't know what generation best fits since I lack some information.

13. Where were you raised?

1. In Asia only
2. Mostly in Asia, some in U.S.
3. Equally in Asia and U.S.
4. Mostly in U.S., some in Asia
5. In U.S. only

14. What contact have you had with Asia?

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

15. What is your food preference at home?

1. Exclusively Asian food
2. Mostly Asian food, some American
3. About equally Asian and American
4. Mostly American food
5. Exclusively American food

16. What is your food preference in restaurants?

1. Exclusively Asian food
2. Mostly Asian food, some American
3. About equally Asian and American
4. Mostly American food
5. Exclusively American food

17. Do you

1. Read only an Asian language?
2. Read an Asian language better than English?
3. Read both Asian and English equally well?
4. Read English better than an Asian language?
5. Read only English?

18. Do you

1. Write only an Asian language?
2. Write an Asian language better than English?
3. Write both Asian and English equally well?
4. Write English better than an Asian language?
5. Write only English?

19. If you consider yourself a member of the Asian group (Oriental, Asian, Asian-American, Chinese-American, etc., whatever term you prefer), how much pride do you have in this group?

1. Extremely proud
2. Moderately proud
3. Little pride
4. No pride but do not feel negative toward group
5. No pride but do feel negative toward group

20. How would you rate yourself?

1. Very Asian
2. Mostly Asian
3. Bicultural
4. Mostly Westernized
5. Very Westernized

21. Do you participate in Asian occasions, holidays, traditions, etc.?

1. Nearly all
2. Most of them
3. Some of them
4. A few of them
5. None at all

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

- | | | | | |
|----------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (do not | | | | (strongly believe |
| believe) | | | | in Asian values) |

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

- | | | | | |
|---------|---|---|---|-------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| (do not | | | | (strongly believe |

believe)

in Asian values)

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

1	2	3	4	5
(do not fit)				(fit very well)

25. Rate yourself on how well you fit when with other Americans who are non-Asian (Westerners):

1	2	3	4	5
(do not fit)				(fit very well)

26. There are many different ways in which people think of themselves. Which ONE of the following most closely describes how you view yourself?

1. I consider myself basically an Asian person (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.). Even though I live and work in America, I still view myself basically as an Asian person.
2. I consider myself basically as an American. Even though I have an Asian background and characteristics, I still view myself basically as an American.
3. I consider myself as an Asian-American, although deep down I always know I am an Asian.
4. I consider myself as an Asian-American, although deep down, I view myself as an American first.
5. I consider myself as an Asian-American. I have both Asian and American characteristics, and I view myself as a blend of both.

Appendix F

The Daily Diaries

ID Number: _____

Day Number (Circle 1): 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

Date: _____

Time: _____

Asian will be used for standardization in all of the Daily Diary Questionnaires. However, please answer the questions according to your National Heritage Identity (Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Filipino, Indian, Vietnamese, Thai, Cambodian, etc.)

How much did you feel like each of the following today?

1. A good friend
 (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (extremely)
2. A good student
 (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (extremely)
3. A good son/daughter
 (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (extremely)
4. How Asian did you feel today?
 (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (extremely)
5. How American did you feel today?
 (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (extremely)
6. How much pride for your National Heritage group did you feel today?
 (not at all) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (extremely)

7. I participated in the following uniquely Asian activities today: (Circle as many that apply)
- a. Speaking an Asian Language
 - b. Eating Asian Food
 - c. Watching a Asian Video/Movie
 - d. Spending time in an Asian Area
 - e. Reading an Asian Newspaper/ Magazine
 - f. Celebrating an Asian Holiday
 - g. Attending/Studying/Preparing for an Asian Class
 - h. Attending an Asian club meeting
 - i. Other: _____
8. Of the friends that you spent time with today, how many were of the same race/ethnicity as you?
- (none) 1 2 3 4 5 (all)
9. Which of the following would you use to ethnically label yourself today?
- a. Panethnic (Asian)
 - b. Heritage National (Chinese, Korean, Japanese etc.)
 - c. Panethnic-American (Asian-American)
 - d. Heritage National-American (Chinese-American, Korean-American, Japanese-American)
10. Were there times of the day you would have labeled yourself differently? Yes
No

References

- Bacallao, M. L., & Smokowski, P. R. (2009). Entre dos mundos/Between two worlds: Bicultural development in context. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 30*(3-4), 421-451.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality, 73*(4), 1015-1050. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00337.x
- BenetMartinez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 492-516.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In *Acculturation, theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 9). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, Inc.
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista & G. [J. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (1st ed., pp. 17). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, 21(3, Special Issue: Migration and Health), pp. 491-511.
- Berry, J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(6), 697-712. doi:DOI: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.013
- Bontempo, R., Lobel, S., & Triandis, H. (1990). Compliance and value internalization in brazil and the U.S.: Effects of allocentrism and anonymity. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21(2), 200-213.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022190212004>
- Chun, K. M., Balls Organista, P., & Marin, G. (2003). Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research. (2003). *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research. Xxvii, 260 Pp. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association; US,*
- Edwards, R. (2006). What's in a name? chinese learners and the practice of adopting 'english' names. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 90-103.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (1992). *Asian american panethnicity: Bridging institutions and identities*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press.

- Fuligni, A. J., Yip, T., & Tseng, V. (2002). The impact of family obligation on the daily activities and psychological well-being of chinese american adolescents. *Child Development, 73*(1), pp. 302-314.
- Guido-DiBrito, F. & Chavez, A. F. (1999). Race and ethnicity in development. In C. Clark & R. Caffarella (Eds.), *An update on adult development theory* (pp. 39-47). New Directions in Adult and Continuing Education, no. 84. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hong, Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & BenetMartinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*(7), 709-720.
- Hovey, J. D., Kim, S. E., & Seligman, L. D. (2006). The influences of cultural values, ethnic identity, and language use on the mental health of korean american college students. *The Journal of Psychology, 140*(5), 499-511.
- Huang, L. N. (2003). An integrative view of identity formation: A model for asian americans. In E. P. Sallett, & D. R. Koslow (Eds.), *Race, ethnicity, and self* (pp. 37). Washington, DC: National MultiCultural Institute Publications.
- Huang, L. N., & Ying, Y. (1989). Chinese american children and adolescents. In J. T. Gibbs, & L. N. Huang (Eds.), *Children of color: Psychological interventions with minority youth* (pp. 30-66). San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass; US.

- Hurh, W. M., & Kim, K. C. (1984). *Korean immigrants in america: A structural analysis of ethnic confinement and adhesive adaptation*. United States of America: Associated University Presses, Inc.
- Hyun, J., Quinn, B., Madon, T., & Lustig, S. (2007). Mental health need, awareness, and use of counseling services among international graduate students. *Journal of American College Health, 56*(2), 109-118.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JACH.56.2.109-118>
- Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & McAuliffe, B. J. (2002). "We're all individuals": Group norms of individualism and collectivism, levels of identification and identity threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32*(2), 189-207.
- Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating bilingual and bicultural identities*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Kiang, L. (2008). Ethnic self-labeling in young american adults from chinese backgrounds. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*(1), 97-111.
- Kiang, L., & Fuligni, A. J. (2009). Ethnic identity in context: Variations in ethnic exploration and belonging within parent, same-ethnic peer, and different-ethnic peer relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(5), 732-743.
- Kiang, L., Harter, S., & Whitesell, N. R. (2007). Relational expression of ethnic identity in chinese americans. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*(2), 277-296.

- Kim, J. (2001). Asian american identity development theory. In C. L. Wijeyesinghe, & B. W. I. Jackson (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 67). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Kim, B. S. K., Atkinson, D. R., & Yang, P. H. (1999). The asian values scale: Development, factor analysis, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*(3), 342-352.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*(3), 395-412.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Chou, E. L. (1994). The role of ethnic identity and acculturation in the vocational behavior of asian americans: An integrative review. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*(2), 155-172. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1994.1011>
- Lieber, E., Chin, D., Nihira, K., & Mink, I. T. (2001). Holding on and letting go: Identity and acculturation among chinese immigrants. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*(3), 247-261.
- Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. R. (1993). The sociocultural self. In J. M. [.] Suls (Ed.), *The self in social perspective* (pp. 187-220). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; England.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 499-514.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The multigroup ethnic identity measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7(2), 156-176.

Phinney, J. S. (2003). Ethnic identity and acculturation. In K. M. [.] Chun, P. [.] Balls Organista & G. [.] Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 63-81). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association; US.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(3), 271-281.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). MEMORANDUM FOR THE STUDY OF ACCULTURATION. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149.

Rymes, B. (1996). Naming as social practice: The case of little creeper from diamond street. *Language in Society*, 25(2), 237-260.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500020625>

Spickard, P. R. (1992). The illogic of American racial categories. In M. P. P. [.] Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 12-23). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc; US.

Sue, S., & Sue, D. W. Chinese-American personality and mental health. *Amerasia Journal*, 1971,1,36-49.

- Suinn, R. M., RickardFigueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The suinn-lew asian self-identity acculturation scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*(2), 401-407.
- Thompson, R. (2006). Bilingual, bicultural, and binominal identities: Personal name investment and the imagination in the lives of korean americans. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education, 5*(3), 179-208.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96*(3), 506-520.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism & collectivism. (1995). *Individualism & Collectivism.Xv, 259 Pp.*Boulder, CO, US: Westview Press; US,
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(2), 323-338.
- Trueba, H. T. (2002). Multiple ethnic, racial, and cultural identities in action: From marginality to a new cultural capital in modern society. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 1*(1), 7-28.
- U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. (2008). *Facts on the the Asian population*
Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/minority_links/asian.html
- Yeh, C. J., & Huang, K. (1996). The collectivistic nature of ethnic identity development among asian-american college students. *Adolescence, 31*(123), 645-661.

Yip, T., & Cross, W. E. J. (2004). A daily diary study of mental health and community involvement outcomes for three chinese american social identities. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 10*(4), 394-408.