Few studies have investigated how the meanings attached to being of a particular culture vary within cultural groups. The meanings of "being Chinese" and "being American" were compared among three Chinese American groups: 122 American-born Chinese (ABC), 119 immigrant Chinese who arrived in the United States before or at age 12, and 112 immigrant Chinese who arrived in the United States after age 12. Participants completed the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (abridged version). For each group, the relationship between "being Chinese" and "being American" and the specific cultural domains (e.g., engagement in American activities, Chinese language proficiency) on which they were based were assessed. Results suggest that "being Chinese" and "being American" were unrelated for ABC, but were negatively related for immigrant Chinese. Results also suggest that for immigrants, the domains on which "being Chinese" and "being American" are based change with increased stay in the United States.

THE MEANING OF "BEING CHINESE" AND "BEING AMERICAN"
Variation Among Chinese American Young Adults

JEANNE L. TSAI
University of Minnesota

YU-WEN YING
PETER A. LEE
University of California, Berkeley

All of us are Chinese some of the time, I say. But I'm not certain what I mean.

—Chang (1993, p. 61)

The social science literature is replete with studies that relate levels of cultural exposure and experience with aspects of psychological functioning for immigrant and ethnic minority groups. For example, Latinos and Mexican Americans who are highly acculturated to mainstream American culture have been found to have higher levels of self-esteem and higher rates of alcohol consumption and substance abuse than their less acculturated peers (Caetano, 1987; Flaskerud & Uman, 1996; Markides, Krause, & Mendes De Leon, 1988). These studies are based on assumptions that the process of acculturation and the concomitant meanings of being of a particular culture

are similar for individuals *within a cultural group*. Surprisingly few studies, however, have actually tested these assumptions.

Studying within-group variation in the meaning of being of a particular culture is important for several reasons. First, such studies examine how individuals subjectively experience their culture, which may ultimately reveal the psychological mechanisms by which cultural variables affect psychological functioning. Second, if individuals do differ in their notions of being of a particular culture, such findings suggest that responses to acculturation and ethnic-identity instruments may have different meanings for individuals within cultural groups. Third, such findings raise important issues with regard to clinical interventions with ethnic minority populations. For example, it is possible that the effectiveness of "ethnic matching" between therapist and client depends on whether the two are similar in their notions of being of a particular culture rather than on overt characteristics, such as physical similarities.

In this article, we examine how the meanings of "being Chinese" and "being American" vary among Chinese American young adults by looking at how orientations to Chinese and American cultures are related to each other and at what cultural domains being Chinese and being American are based on. To do this, we devised a measure of cultural orientation, the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (abridged version).[1] Before delving into the empirical methods and results, we discuss our decision to study Chinese Americans and present the specific hypotheses regarding how being Chinese and being American may vary across Chinese American groups.

HETEROGENEITY AMONG CHINESE AMERICANS

We chose to study Chinese Americans for several reasons. First, Chinese Americans are the largest Asian group in the United States; they account for 23% of the Asian/Pacific Islanders currently residing in the United States. In 1990, the number of Chinese Americans in the United States was approximately 1.6 million, or about 0.5% of the entire U.S. population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992). Despite being one of the largest ethnic minority groups in the United States, relatively little research has been conducted with Chinese Americans. Second, since 1852, when the first Chinese sojourners arrived in the United States to work on the California railroads, generations of Chinese Americans have been born and raised in the United States (Takaki, 1989). Waves of Chinese immigrants continue to migrate to the United States from China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and other overseas Chinese communities for reasons that include political refuge, educational attainment, and

reunification with family members. As a result, there is tremendous variation in exposure to, and experiences with, Chinese and American cultures among Chinese Americans. This variation allowed us to examine how different levels of cultural exposure and experience influence the meaning of being Chinese and being American. Third, ethnographic descriptions of Chinese and mainstream American culture suggest that being Chinese and being American are two distinct cultural orientations. Chinese culture has been described as emphasizing interpersonal relationships and the collective, obedience to authority, and emotional moderation and control, whereas mainstream European American culture has been described as emphasizing rugged individualism, defiance of authority, and open emotional expression (Hsu, 1985; Lee, 1982; Russell & Yik, 1996; Zheng & Berry, 1991). Therefore, by studying Chinese Americans, we may examine how variation in cultural exposure and experience influences two cultural orientations that differ immensely in their values and beliefs.

VARIATION IN THE MEANING OF
BEING CHINESE AND BEING AMERICAN

To examine how the meanings of being Chinese and being American vary across Chinese Americans, we examined how being Chinese and being American relate to each other and on what cultural domains being Chinese and being American are based. Although few studies have examined these questions explicitly, hypotheses can be drawn from existing models of acculturation and ethnic identity.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN BEING CHINESE AND BEING AMERICAN:
BIDIMENSIONAL VERSUS UNIDIMENSIONAL MODELS
OF ACCULTURATION AND CULTURAL ORIENTATION

The unidimensional and bidimensional models of acculturation are the most popular descriptions of the relations between individuals' orientations to multiple cultures. Early models of acculturation were unidimensional and assumed that as individuals became more acculturated to their host (or majority) culture, they became less enculturated to their native (or minority) culture (Phinney, 1990). These unidimensional models have been critiqued as valuing assimilation to the host culture and as alienating "bicultural" individuals who are oriented to both host and native cultures. As a result, more recent models are bidimensional (Berry, 1995; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Phinney, 1990) and propose that individuals may be both

highly enculturated to their native (or minority) culture and highly accultur-ated to their host (or majority) culture.

Proponents of both models assume that they hold for all individuals within cultural groups. Few empirical studies, however, have actually investigated whether this is the case. Instead, it is possible that individuals within cultural groups vary in which model most accurately describes their cultural orienta-tion. For example, it is possible that for immigrants, who must relinquish aspects of their original culture to function in their host culture, the unidimen-sional model holds. However, for American-born ethnic minorities, who are exposed to multiple cultures at birth, the bidimensional model may hold. These hypotheses are described in further detail for Chinese Americans.

Bidimensional for American-born Chinese (ABC). For ABC, being Chi-nese and being American may be bidimensional or independent of each other. Because American-born Chinese are born in the United States, they are imbued with American culture; however, because they are born to Chinese parents, they are also influenced by Chinese culture. Unlike their exposure to American culture, their exposure to Chinese culture is limited to specific con-texts, such as at home with their families or in specific Chinese community settings such as Chinese church or Chinese-language school. Therefore, in specific contexts, ABC may be influenced by Chinese culture, whereas in other contexts (e.g., school, work), they may be influenced by mainstream American culture. Thus, their notions of being Chinese and being American may be context-specific and may develop independently of each other.

Unidimensional for immigrant Chinese. For immigrant Chinese, being Chinese and being American may be unidimensional or negatively related to each other. Unlike ABC, immigrant Chinese are immersed in Chinese culture prior to their migration. In all contexts of their lives, they are Chinese. Once they move to the United States, however, they encounter contexts that are American. To function effectively in these contexts, they must adopt certain aspects of American culture and relinquish certain aspects of Chinese cul-ture. Therefore, as immigrants become more American, they may become less Chinese.

THE BASES OF BEING CHINESE AND OF BEING AMERICAN

Differences within cultural groups in levels of cultural exposure and expe-rience may also influence what being Chinese and being American are based on. To examine whether this was the case for Chinese American young adults, we looked at whether individuals based being Chinese and being

American on American or Chinese cultural domains. We were also interested in whether the specific cultural domains (e.g., language, cultural activities) on which notions of being Chinese and being American were based would vary across Chinese American groups.

Chinese versus American cultural domains. Because being Chinese and being American are context-specific and independent constructs for ABC, their notion of being Chinese may be based only on their engagement in Chinese culture, and their notion of being American may be based only on their engagement in American culture. In contrast, because being Chinese and being American are dependent and related to each other for Chinese immigrants, being American and being Chinese may be based on their levels of engagement in *both* cultures.

Furthermore, for immigrants, the relations between levels of engagement in Chinese and American cultures and their notions of being Chinese and being American may change over time. As immigrants spend more time in the United States, their levels of exposure to, and experiences with, Chinese and American cultures change. Prior to migration, Chinese immigrants view themselves as solely Chinese. This may be particularly true for individuals who remain in their Chinese homelands until adolescence, during which they may begin to form a Chinese identity (Phinney, 1990). Immediately after arriving in the United States, it is likely that they continue to view themselves as Chinese. For them, being Chinese is natural, intuitive, and effortless. Being Chinese is both internally and externally experienced as part of their self-concept (Baumeister, 1998). In their countries of origin, they were able to be Chinese all the time across a variety of contexts—home, school, and work. Consequently, asking how Chinese they are even after they have migrated to the United States may be tantamount to asking them *who* they are. In answering this question, they may examine their behavior across a number of contexts. Therefore, their notion of being Chinese may be based on their engagement in *both* American and Chinese cultures.

In contrast, being American may be a way of being that results from their need to engage in American culture in order to survive in the United States. Having only recently migrated to the United States, being American may be less integrated and less internalized into their self-concept than being Chinese. Thus, being American may be more relegated to the contexts in their lives in which they must be American (e.g., work, school) and therefore externally experienced as part of their self-concept (Baumeister, 1998). Thus, their notion of being American may be based on their engagement in American culture only.

As immigrants spend more time in the United States and their facility with American culture increases, they may begin to internalize being American. Over time, being American may become an integral part of their internal self-concept and may be synonymous with who they are. This may be particularly true for individuals who arrived in the United States prior to forming a strong Chinese identity. Thus, when asked how American they are, they may examine their behavior across a variety of contexts and base their response on their engagement in *both* American and Chinese cultures. In contrast, the opportunities afforded to immigrant Chinese to be Chinese in the United States may be limited and relegated to specific contexts (e.g., with family members, during Chinese community activities). Thus, the longer immigrants live in the United States, the more contextualized and externalized their notions of being Chinese may become, and the more they may base being Chinese solely on their engagement in Chinese culture.

Specific cultural domains. To examine acculturation and cultural orientation, investigators typically measure how oriented individuals are to a particular culture in different life domains, such as language use and proficiency and participation in cultural activities. It is possible that individuals within cultural groups vary in the extent to which their notions of being of a particular culture are based on these specific cultural domains.

Because of their limited direct exposure to Chinese culture, ABC may base being Chinese more on cultural domains that require less direct contact with, or immersion in, Chinese culture than immigrant groups, such as pride in Chinese culture. Similarly, early immigrants, that is, those who migrate to the United States before adolescence and who have spent a majority of their lives in the United States, may base being Chinese more on these cultural domains than recent immigrants, that is, those who have only recently arrived in the United States. Furthermore, immigrant Chinese may base being Chinese on cultural domains that require more direct contact with, or immersion in, Chinese culture, such as participation in Chinese activities, than ABC and earlier immigrants.

Following a similar rationale, it is possible that recent immigrants base being American more on cultural domains that require less direct cultural exposure, such as pride in American culture, than early immigrants or ABC, and that early immigrants base being American more on these cultural domains than ABC. Being American may also be based more on cultural domains that require more cultural exposure, such as participation in American activities, for ABC than for both immigrant groups, and for earlier immigrants than for recent immigrants.

MEASUREMENT OF CULTURAL ORIENTATION

To test these specific hypotheses about how the meaning of being Chinese and being American would vary within cultural groups, we sought a measure of acculturation or cultural orientation. Acculturation and cultural-orientation instruments are for the most part self-report questionnaires in which individuals are asked to rate how much they engage in various domains of cultural life (e.g., cultural activities). For example, Chinese Americans who report speaking English more, socializing with European Americans more, and participating in American activities more are considered more acculturated to American culture than Chinese Americans who report speaking English less, socializing with European Americans less, and participating in American activities less. Overall levels of acculturation and cultural orientation are calculated by averaging across participants' ratings.

Although a bidimensional acculturation instrument has been created for use with Latino populations (Marin & Gamba, 1996), the most popular acculturation instrument for Asian American groups is primarily unidimensional (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987). This instrument would not allow us to test the unidimensional *and* bidimensional models of acculturation across different Chinese American groups. Furthermore, we were interested in sampling a variety of cultural domains that were not found in a single instrument. Therefore, we created the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (abridged version), which will be described below.

HYPOTHESES

To examine how the meaning of being Chinese and being American varied among Chinese Americans, we administered the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (abridged version) to a college sample of (a) ABC; (b) "early" immigrants, those who arrived at the United States before or at age 12; and (c) "recent" immigrants, those who arrived at the United States after age 12. The following hypotheses regarding variation in the meaning of being Chinese and being American were tested:

1. Being Chinese and being American will be bidimensional (uncorrelated) constructs for American-born Chinese, but unidimensional (negatively correlated) constructs for immigrant populations.

2. For recent immigrants, being Chinese will be based on their engagement in American and Chinese cultures, whereas being American will be based only on their engagement in American culture. For early immigrants, being American will be influenced by their engagement in Chinese and

American cultures, whereas being Chinese will be influenced only by their engagement in Chinese culture.

3. The extent to which being Chinese and being American will be based on specific cultural domains will vary across the three Chinese American groups. Specifically, being Chinese will be based more on pride in Chinese culture and less on participation in Chinese activities for ABC than for the two immigrant groups, and for early immigrants than for recent immigrants. Being American will be based more on pride in American culture and less on participation in American activities for recent immigrants than for early immigrants or ABC. In addition, it was hypothesized that ABC would base being American less on pride in American culture and more on participation in American activities than would early immigrants.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Three hundred and fifty-three Chinese American college students (174 male, 179 female; mean age = 20.23 years, SD = 1.77, range = 17 to 32 years) participated in a study of the "psychological adjustment to college life." Participants were recruited via a variety of methods to create as large and representative a sample of Chinese American college students as possible. Participants were recruited from the General Psychology Subject Pool, student organizations, and by word of mouth at a large university in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Chinese American groups. To examine how varying levels of exposure to Chinese and American cultures would influence the meanings attached to being Chinese and being American, Chinese Americans were divided into three groups: (a) ABC, or those born in the United States (n = 122); (b) Imm ⊙ 12, or those who arrived in the United States at or before age 12 (n = 119); and (c) Imm > 12, or those who arrived in the United States after age 12 (n = 112). Among the ABC, 89.3% were second-generation; the remaining 10.6% were 2.5 generation (i.e., with at least one parent born in the United States) or higher.

Immigrants were divided into those who immigrated before or at age 12 and those who immigrated after age 12, because it was believed that this division would maximize differences among immigrants in their levels of cultural exposure and experience. After age 12, children's language acquisition skills decline considerably. Because immigrants who arrive in their host

country prior to age 12 are better able to acquire the language of their host culture, their cultural adjustment may be significantly easier than that of immigrants who arrive after age 12. Immigrants who arrive prior to adolescence may also be less likely to have adopted the cultural identity of their country of origin and, consequently, may be more likely to adopt the cultural identity of their host culture. Finally, among college student populations, on average, immigrants who arrived in the United States after age 12 have spent less time in the United States (and therefore have been exposed to American culture less) than those who arrived in the United States before age 12. In this immigrant sample, the average length of time spent in the United States was 12.64 years ($SD = 3.69$, range 4-20 years) for the Imm ◐ 12 and 4.78 years ($SD = 2.13$, range 1-13 years) for Imm > 12. Thus, it was postulated that dividing immigrants in this way would most likely result in different levels of cultural exposure and experience that might influence notions of being Chinese and being American.

Descriptive similarities and differences among groups. The three groups were comparable in the distribution of gender, marital status, years in college, and the number of student organizations they had joined. The three groups differed in their grade point averages, $F(2, 324) = 3.40$, $p < .05$): ABC had lower grade point averages than Imm >12 (Scheffé post hoc test, p ◐ .05). The three groups also differed in their majors, $\chi^2(14) = 34.37$, $p < .01$, and current living situations, $\chi^2(14) = 45.58$, $p < .001$ (see Table 1).

PROCEDURE

To examine variation in the meanings of being Chinese and being American, participants completed the General Ethnicity Questionnaire (American and Chinese abridged versions). These instruments were presented to participants in simple English. It was assumed that to be a college student at the university, students had, at the very least, an elementary knowledge of English. No participants reported any difficulty understanding the questionnaires. The General Ethnicity Questionnaire (Chinese and American versions) was presented to participants with several other questionnaires to decrease attention paid to any one questionnaire. These additional questionnaires were not relevant to central questions asked in this article and therefore will not be mentioned further in this report. The General Ethnicity Questionnaire was both followed and preceded by these additional questionnaires; the order in which all questionnaires were presented to participants was the same for all participants. All participants completed the Chinese version before the American version of the General Ethnicity Questionnaire.

TABLE 1
Demographic Similarities and Differences
Among Chinese American Groups

	Cultural Group		
Category	ABC	Imm ● 12	Imm > 12
Gender (% female)	51.6	53.8	46.4
Marital status (% single)	98.4	97.5	92.9
Years in school (M, SD)	2.60 (1.20)	2.59 (1.14)	2.87 (1.18)
Number of student organizations	1.48 (1.37)	1.23 (1.36)	1.17 (1.18)
Grade point average[a]*	3.11 (.47)	3.14 (.49)	3.28 (.52)
Living situation*			
Dorms (%)	39.3	37.0	20.6
Off campus-housemates (%)	39.3	33.6	33.9
Off campus-alone (%)	5.7	14.3	28.6
Off campus-family (%)	3.3	8.4	11.6
Other (%)	12.4	6.7	5.3
Major*			
Architecture (%)	1.6	2.5	4.5
Biological sciences (%)	24.6	16.0	10.7
Business/economics (%)	13.9	10.9	15.2
Engineering (%)	13.9	24.4	40.2
Social sciences (%)	24.6	21.8	13.4
Humanities (%)	1.6	5.0	0.9
Other (%)	2.5	1.7	1.8
Undeclared (%)	17.2	17.6	13.4

NOTE: ABC = American-born Chinese; Imm ● 12 = immigrants who arrived before or at age 12; Imm > 12 = immigrants who arrived after age 12.
a. On a 4-point grading scale.
*$p < .05$.

Participants recruited through the psychology subject pool received course credit for their participation in the study; those recruited through student organizations and by word of mouth received tickets to a party given on their behalf at the end of the study. To examine the test-retest reliability of the General Ethnicity Questionnaire, 60 of the original participants were given a subset of the original questionnaires to complete at home approximately one month after their original testing date.

ASSESSING CULTURAL ORIENTATION:
THE GENERAL ETHNICITY QUESTIONNAIRE (GEQ)

The GEQ is different from most measures of cultural orientation in two important ways. First, it was created to test both unidimensional and

bidimensional models of acculturation. Therefore, two versions of the same instrument were created, differing only in their reference culture. This allowed respondents to report how oriented they were to Chinese and American cultures independently. Participants used a scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* to rate how much they agreed with statements about their cultural orientation (e.g., "I was raised in a way that was Chinese"). For items that inquired about participants' language proficiency, the scale ranged from 1 = *very much* to 5 = *not at all* (e.g., "How much do you speak English at home?"). Each scale was composed of the same 37 items, with the exception of one item that was asked only once and that was included as an item on the General Ethnicity Questionnaire-Chinese version ("Are you bilingual?"). See Appendix A for a copy of the General Ethnicity Questionnaire-Chinese version (GEQC) and Appendix B for a copy of the General Ethnicity Questionnaire-American version (GEQA).

The second way in which the GEQ differs from other instruments is that it was devised to sample multiple cultural domains. To this end, the most commonly used measures of cultural orientation were reviewed, including the Cultural Life Styles Inventory (Mendoza, 1989), the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980), the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (Suinn et al., 1987), and the Behavioral Acculturation Scale (Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & De los Angeles Aranade, 1978). Items that sampled the various domains represented in these inventories were created.[2]

Other than referencing different cultures, the two instruments were exactly the same. For parsimony, the items that asked participants how Chinese and how American they were overall were also included in the GEQC and GEQA (discussed below); however, they were treated separately and not included in any of the psychometric analyses of the GEQC and GEQA.

Specific cultural domains sampled. Factor analyses using varimax rotation were conducted to identify empirically the specific cultural domains sampled. Emergent factors were dropped if they contained items that were not conceptually related to each other. Furthermore, if (a) a questionnaire item appeared more conceptually related to a second factor than to the factor under which it was originally classified and (b) the correlation between that item and the second factor was greater than $r = .30$, the questionnaire item was reclassified under the second factor.

Six distinct and conceptually meaningful factors emerged for the GEQC: (a) Chinese language use and proficiency, (b) affiliation with Chinese people, (c) participation in Chinese activities, (d) pride in Chinese culture, (e) exposure to Chinese culture, and (f) preference for Chinese food.[3] Using the criteria

described above, one factor (containing Item 9) was dropped; two items (Items 4 and 12) were reclassified (see Table 2 for factor loadings). These factors were considered to be the specific domains of Chinese culture sampled by the inventories.

Six distinct and conceptually meaningful factors emerged for the GEQA: (a) English language use and proficiency, (b) affiliation with American people, (c) participation in American activities, (d) pride in American culture, (e) preference for media in English, and (f) preference for American food. Using the criteria described above, two factors (containing Items 3, 8, 9, 23, and 29) were dropped; one item (Item 12) was reclassified (see Table 3 for factor loadings). These factors were considered to be the specific domains of American culture sampled by the inventories.

Instrument reliability and validity. Internal reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) for both scales were high ($\alpha = .92$ for the GEQC and $\alpha = .92$ for the GEQA). Approximately one month after the initial test date (mean = 34.85 days [$SD = 8.15$], range = 16-32 days), test-retest data were collected for 60 of the participants. Test-retest reliability was .62 ($SD = .22$) for the GEQC and .57 ($SD = .16$) for the GEQA. As with other measures of cultural orientation, these test-retest reliabilities were lower than those found for other psychological instruments (Phinney, 1990).

The validity of the GEQ was assessed in two ways. First, correlations between average cultural orientation (i.e., the average across specific items) and standard indices of acculturation (age of arrival, generational status, and length of residence in the United States) as identified by Marin (1992, p. 243) were calculated. Average scores on the GEQC and GEQA were correlated with age of arrival ($r_{GEQC} = .56, p < .001; r_{GEQA} = -.63, p < .001$), generational status ($r_{GEQC} = -.50, p < .001; r_{GEQA} = .58, p < .001$), and length of residence in the United States ($r_{GEQC} = -.60, p < .001; r_{GEQA} = .64, p < .001$). Thus, the more oriented participants were to Chinese culture and the less oriented they were to American culture, the greater their age when they arrived to the United States, the lower their generational status, and the less time they had spent in the United States. These findings were in the direction predicted by Marin (1992) and, therefore, support the validity of the GEQ.

Second, mean scores on each of the subscales were calculated for each of the three Chinese American groups. We predicted that if the GEQ-Chinese version were a valid measure of orientation to Chinese culture, immigrant Chinese would report speaking Chinese more, affiliating with Chinese more, participating in Chinese activities more, and being more exposed to Chinese culture than ABC. Furthermore, this would be more true for Imm > 12 than Imm ⬤ 12. Similarly, we predicted that if the GEQ-American version were a

TABLE 2
Factor Loadings for General Ethnicity
Questionnaire-Chinese Version (abridged)

Item	Language (1)	Social Affiliation (2)	Activities (3)	Pride (4)	Exposure (5)	Food (6)
36 (fluently read Chinese)	.89					
37 (fluently write Chinese)	.86					
30 (speak Chinese with friends)	.85					
35 (fluently speak Chinese)	.84					
38 (fluently understand Chinese)	.77					
26 (speak Chinese at home)	.76					
34 (read literature in Chinese)	.75					
27 (speak Chinese at school)	.74					
31 (view TV in Chinese)	.73					
32 (view films in Chinese)	.66					
29 (speak Chinese at prayer)	.63					
15 (listen to Chinese music)	.60					
21 (when child, friends Chinese)	.58					
08 (children should speak Chinese)	.50					
28 (speak Chinese at work)	.44					
23 (wish to be accepted by Chinese)		.75				
22 (friends now are Chinese)		.71				
14 (prefer to live in Chinese community)		.67				
13 (admire Chinese people)		.65				
24 (date Chinese people)		.54				
10 (go to places were people are Chinese)		.52				
12 (relate to partner in Chinese way)		.38				
16 (perform Chinese dance)			.68			
33 (listen to radio in Chinese)			.55			
17 (engage in Chinese recreation)			.55			
06 (proud of Chinese culture)				.82		
05 (embarrassed/ashamed of Chinese culture)				.77		
07 (Chinese culture has positive impact)				.67		
04 (criticize Chinese culture)				.32		
02 (when growing up, exposed to Chinese culture)					.77	
01 (raised in Chinese way)					.71	
03 (now, exposed to Chinese culture)					.62	
11 (familiar with Chinese practices)					.50	
20 (at restaurants, eat Chinese food)						.68
19 (at home, eat Chinese food)						.66
18 (celebrate Chinese holidays)						.49

TABLE 3
Factor Loadings for General Ethnicity
Questionnaire-American Version (abridged)

Item	Language (1)	Social Affiliation (2)	Activities (3)	Pride (4)	Media (5)	Food (6)
35 (fluently speak English)	.88					
38 (fluently understand English)	.87					
36 (fluently read English)	.87					
37 (fluently write English)	.86					
27 (speak English at school)	.80					
30 (speak English with friends)	.77					
34 (read literature in English)	.67					
02 (exposed to American culture)	.59					
28 (speak English at work)	.58					
26 (speak English at home)	.52					
11 (familiar with American practices)	.50					
01 (raised in American way)	.42					
24 (date American people)		.79				
22 (friends now are American)		.73				
21 (when child, friends were American)		.59				
14 (prefer to live in American community)		.52				
12 (relate to partner in American way)		.52				
10 (go to places where people are American)		.42				
16 (perform American dance)			.74			
17 (engage in American recreation)			.65			
15 (listen to American music)			.61			
18 (celebrate American holidays)			.48			
06 (proud of American culture)				.75		
07 (American culture has positive impact)				.70		
04 (criticize American culture)				.62		
05 (embarrassed/ashamed of American culture)				.57		
13 (admire American people)				.42		
32 (view films in English)					.83	
31 (view TV in English)					.78	
33 (listen to radio in English)					.77	
19 (at home, eat American food)						.80
20 (at restaurants, eat American food)						.66

valid measure of orientation to American culture, ABC would report speaking English more, affiliating with Americans more, participating in American activities more, and being more exposed to American culture than would immigrant Chinese.

Analyses of variance by group and post hoc Scheffé tests supported these predictions and, therefore, the validity of the GEQ. The Chinese American groups varied significantly on the following cultural domains: Chinese language use and proficiency, $F(2, 352) = 211.01$, $p < .0001$; affiliation with Chinese people, $F(2, 352) = 12.71$, $p < .001$; participation in Chinese activities, $F(2, 352) = 47.32$, $p < .001$; and exposure to Chinese culture, $F(2, 352) = 9.45$, $p < .001$.[4] Specifically, ABC reported less exposure to Chinese culture than did the two immigrant groups. Imm > 12 reported greater affiliation with Chinese people than did ABC and Imm ≤ 12. Finally, Imm > 12 reported greater Chinese language use and greater participation in Chinese activities than did Imm ◐ 12 and ABC, and Imm ◐ 12 reported greater Chinese language use and proficiency and participation in Chinese activities than did ABC (see Table 4).

Chinese Americans also varied significantly on the American cultural domains sampled: English language use and proficiency, $F(2, 352) = 284.05$, $p < .0001$; affiliation with American people, $F(2, 352) = 88.93$, $p < .001$; participation in American activities, $F(2, 352) = 48.88$, $p < .001$; pride in American culture, $F(2, 352) = 8.36$, $p < .001$; preference for media in English, $F(2, 352) = 41.45$, $p < .001$; and preference for American food, $F(2, 352) = 13.27$, $p < .001$. Imm > 12 reported less positive attitudes toward American culture than did ABC or Imm ◐ 12. ABC reported greater preference for American food than did the two immigrant groups, who did not differ from each other. ABC reported greater use of, and proficiency in, the English language; greater affiliation with American people; greater participation in American activities; and greater preference for media in English than did the two immigrant groups. Imm ◐ 12 also reported greater use of, and proficiency in, the English language; greater affiliation with American people; greater participation in American activities; and greater preference for media in English than did Imm > 12. These findings also support the validity of the GEQ.

Overall assessments of being Chinese and being American. Participants were also asked to rate on a scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* the following statements: "Overall, I am Chinese" and "Overall, I am American." Test-retest reliabilities were .45 and .68 for these statements, respectively. To establish the validity of these items, we predicted that the three cultural groups would differ significantly in their ratings of how overall

TABLE 4
Differences Across Cultural Groups in Specific Cultural Domains

	ABC		Imm ● 12		Imm > 12	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
Chinese cultural domains						
Language*	2.17	(.59)	2.90	(.85)	4.02	(.60)
Social affiliation	3.41	(.66)	3.52	(.71)	3.84	(.64)[a]
Activities*	1.85	(.73)	2.27	(.97)	2.97	(.93)
Attitudes	3.92	(.67)	3.93	(.67)	3.98	(.66)
Exposure	3.74	(.68)[a]	3.95	(.59)	4.11	(.64)
Food	3.98	(.60)	4.10	(.64)	4.10	(.62)
American cultural domains						
Language*	4.56	(.35)	4.14	(.47)	3.13	(.57)
Social affiliation*	3.48	(.56)	2.93	(.66)	2.42	(.59)
Activities*	4.19	(.55)	3.92	(.69)	3.35	(.73)
Attitudes	3.38	(.60)	3.26	(.52)	3.08	(.55)[a]
Media*	4.83	(.50)	4.49	(.78)	3.96	(.87)
Food	3.33	(.79)[a]	2.87	(.80)	2.87	(.82)

NOTE: ABC = American-born Chinese; Imm ● 12 = immigrants who arrived before or at age 12; Imm > 12 = immigrants who arrived after age 12. Higher scores reflect greater engagement in the particular cultural domain.
a. Indicates group that is significantly different from other two ($p < .05$).
* Difference between all pairs of cultural groups is significant ($p < .05$).

Chinese and how overall American they were. Analyses of variance and Scheffé post hoc tests supported these predictions and therefore the validity of the items. As predicted, the cultural groups differed significantly in their ratings of how Chinese, $F(2, 350) = 26.90$, $p < .001$, and how American, $F(2, 350) = 134.10$, $p < .001$, they were. ABC reported being more American than did the two immigrant groups; Imm ● 12 reported being more American than did Imm > 12 (ABC = 3.82 [$SD = .70$], Imm ≤ 12 = 2.99 [$SD = 1.05$], Imm > 12 = 1.87 [$SD = .96$]). ABC also reported being less Chinese than the two immigrant groups, and Imm ● 12 reported being less Chinese than did Imm > 12 (ABC = 3.84 [$SD = .89$], Imm ≤ 12 = 4.24 [$SD = .79$], Imm > 12 = 4.60 [$SD = .68$]).

Given the reliability and validity of the GEQ and items regarding overall ratings of being Chinese and being American, we were able to use this instrument to test our specific hypotheses regarding variation in the meaning of being Chinese and being American in Chinese American young adults.

DATA ANALYSES AND RESULTS

We hypothesized that the relations between being Chinese and being American would vary across Chinese American groups. Specifically, for ABC, being Chinese and being American were predicted to be independent concepts, supporting the bidimensional model. For immigrant groups, being Chinese and being American were postulated to be dependent concepts, supporting the unidimensional model.

To test this hypothesis, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated for participants' overall ratings of how Chinese and American they were. Consistent with our hypotheses, for ABC, the two were *not* significantly correlated, whereas for immigrants, being Chinese and being American were *negatively* correlated (for Imm > 12, $r = -.26$, $p < .01$; for Imm ≤ 12, $r = -.33$, $p < .001$). Thus, for ABC, being Chinese and being American were independent constructs; however, the more Chinese immigrant groups were, the less American they were. These correlations were transformed into Fisher z's and a test of the difference between independent correlations was conducted (Bruning & Kintz, 1988). This analysis did not reveal a significant difference between the two immigrant groups in the magnitude of the correlation coefficients.

Bases of being Chinese and being American. For each Chinese American group, stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine whether being Chinese or being American was based on American cultural domains, Chinese cultural domains, or both. The stepwise analyses allowed for the identification of those cultural domains that explained the greatest percentage of variance in ratings of being Chinese and being American. It was hypothesized that for ABC, only Chinese cultural domains would predict overall ratings of being Chinese, and only American cultural domains would predict overall ratings of being American. For immigrant groups, it was predicted that being Chinese and being American would be based on engagement in both American and Chinese cultures. Specifically, it was hypothesized that for Imm > 12, being Chinese would be based on both Chinese and American cultural domains, and that being American would be based only on American cultural domains. For Imm ≤ 12, it was hypothesized that being American would be based on American and Chinese cultural domains, whereas being Chinese would be based on Chinese cultural domains only.

The participants' factor scores (from the factor analyses described above) for each cultural domain served as the predictor variables; overall ratings of

TABLE 5
Significant Predictors of Being Chinese by Cultural Group:
Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses
Standardized Beta-Coefficients

	ABC	*Imm ≤ 12*	*Imm > 12*
Chinese cultural domains			
Language	[a]	.37	[a]
Social affiliation	.17	.26	.26
Activities	—	.28	—
Pride	.37	.28	.23
Exposure	.39	.23	.33
Food	.16	—	.31
American cultural domains			
Language	—	—	[a]
Social affiliation	—	—	−.22
Activities	—	—	—
Pride	—	—	—
Media	—	—	−.24
Food	—	—	—
Adjusted R^2	.43	.38	.41
F	23.97***	15.74***	14.10***

NOTE: ABC = American-born Chinese; Imm ≤ 12 = immigrants who arrived before or at age 12; Imm > 12 = immigrants who arrived after age 12.
a. Dropped due to multicollinearity.
***$p < .001$.

being Chinese and being American were the criterion variables. To minimize the multicollinearity of predictor variables (cultural domains), predictor variables were excluded from the stepwise regression analyses if they were associated with extreme eigenvalues and condition indices and if a high proportion of their variance was associated with the same eigenvalue as that of another predictor variable (Norusis, 1993, pp. 355-357). Using these criteria, English language use and proficiency was excluded from the "being American" model and Chinese language was excluded from the "being Chinese" model for ABC and Imm > 12. In addition, English was excluded from the "being Chinese" model for Imm > 12. No cultural domains were excluded from the models for Imm ≤ 12.

As hypothesized, for ABC, only Chinese cultural domains predicted overall ratings of being Chinese (see Table 5), and only American cultural domains predicted overall ratings of being American (see Table 6), again supporting hypotheses that being Chinese and being American were independent constructs. Also as predicted, both American and Chinese cultural

TABLE 6
Significant Predictors of Being American by Cultural Group:
Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses
Standardized Beta-Coefficients

	ABC	Imm ● 12	Imm > 12
Chinese cultural domains			
Language	—	—	—
Social affiliation	—	—	—
Activities	—	–.19	—
Pride	—	—	—
Exposure	—	—	—
Food	—	.13	—
American cultural domains			
Language	a	.39	a
Social affiliation	.34	.54	.38
Activities	.26	.28	.17
Pride	.35	.29	.39
Media	—	.18	—
Food	.26	.26	—
Adjusted R^2	.35	.54	.27
F	16.96***	18.51***	14.59***

NOTE: ABC = American-born Chinese; Imm ● 12 = immigrants who arrived before or at age 12; Imm > 12 = immigrants who arrived after age 12.
a. Dropped due to multicollinearity.
***p < .001.

domains predicted overall ratings of being Chinese and being American for the immigrant groups, suggesting that they are dependent constructs.

    Our hypotheses regarding differences between the two immigrant groups were also supported by our findings. For Imm ● 12, being American was based on both American and Chinese cultural domains (see Table 6), whereas being Chinese was based on Chinese domains only (see Table 5). For Imm > 12, being Chinese was based on both American and Chinese cultural domains (see Table 5), whereas being American was based only on American cultural domains (see Table 6).

SPECIFIC CULTURAL DOMAINS

    It was predicted that the three Chinese American groups would vary in the extent to which their notions of being Chinese and being American were based on specific cultural domains (i.e., pride in Chinese and American cultures, participation in Chinese and American activities). To test this hypothesis,

the beta coefficients for each cultural domain from the regression analyses were transformed into Fisher z's. Tests of the difference between independent correlations were conducted to compare the magnitude of the beta–coefficients for pride in Chinese and American cultures and participation in Chinese and American activities across the three Chinese American groups. No significant differences were found. However, informal inspection of the beta coefficients suggests trends in favor of our hypotheses. Specifically, the beta coefficient of pride in Chinese culture diminished as the Chinese American groups increased in exposure to Chinese culture. Also consistent with our hypotheses, the beta coefficient of participation in Chinese activities was greater for Imm●12 than for ABC, for whom participation in Chinese activities did not emerge as a significant predictor of being Chinese. However, it was also greater for Imm ● 12 than for Imm > 12, which was not consistent with our hypotheses. In terms of being American, the beta coefficient of attitudes toward American culture was larger for Imm > 12 than for Imm ● 12. Contrary to our predictions, however, the beta coefficient was greater for ABC than for Imm ● 12. Also as predicted, the beta coefficient of participation in American activities was larger for Imm ● 12 than for Imm > 12; it was also slightly larger for Imm ● 12 than for ABC.

DISCUSSION

Findings from the present study suggest that the meanings that individuals attach to being of a particular culture vary within cultural groups. In a sample of Chinese American young adults, differences were found in (a) the relations between being Chinese and being American and (b) the specific cultural domains on which being Chinese and being American were based.

BEING CHINESE AND BEING AMERICAN: BIDIMENSIONAL FOR AMERICAN-BORN, UNIDIMENSIONAL FOR IMMIGRANT CHINESE

The findings from this study supported our hypotheses that being Chinese and being American are independent constructs for ABC and dependent constructs for immigrant Chinese. Overall ratings of being Chinese and being American were uncorrelated for ABC, but negatively correlated for immigrant Chinese. Also consistent with this hypothesis, for ABC, being American was based only on American cultural domains, and being Chinese was based only on Chinese cultural domains, whereas for immigrant Chinese, being American and being Chinese were based on both Chinese and

American cultural domains. These findings suggest that ABC and immigrants attach different meanings to being Chinese and being American.

CHANGES IN BEING CHINESE AND BEING AMERICAN

Important differences also emerged among immigrant Chinese, suggesting that the meaning of being Chinese and being American may change with increased exposure to, and experience with, American culture. These differences may have to do with the extent to which cultural orientation is internalized in one's self-concept (Baumeister, 1998).

When immigrants first arrive in the United States, they consider themselves Chinese. Being Chinese is a central part of their self-concept, particularly for those who immigrated during adolescence, when their cultural identity was forming. In comparison, being American is something that they must learn to survive in the United States. Therefore, although they live in the United States, Imm > 12 may continue to perceive themselves as Chinese, across a number of social contexts. In this sample, Imm > 12 strongly agreed with the statement "Overall, I am Chinese" (mean = 4.60 [SD = .68], on a scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) and disagreed with the statement, "Overall, I am American" (mean = 1.87 [SD = .96], on a scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Thus, their notions of being Chinese are less contextualized and instead are based on their engagement in both Chinese and American contexts. However, because they are unfamiliar with American culture, their notions of being American are not yet integrated into their self-concepts and may instead be highly contextualized. Thus, their notions of being American are based on their engagement in American culture only.

After spending more time in the United States, the meaning of being American and being Chinese may change for immigrants. Notions of being American may become less contextualized as immigrants have increased exposure to, and experience in, American culture, that is, immigrants may begin to internalize an American identity. In this sample, Imm ⚈ 12 agreed strongly with the statement, "Overall, I am Chinese" (mean = 4.24 [SD = .79], on a scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) but did not agree or disagree with the statement, "Overall, I am American" (mean = 2.99 [SD = 1.05], on a scale from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Thus, being American may be based on their engagement in both American and Chinese cultures. Notions of "being Chinese," however, may become more contextualized (and externalized) as their contact with Chinese culture diminishes and becomes limited to specific contexts. Thus, being Chinese is based on engagement in Chinese culture only.

We have suggested that the differences between immigrant Chinese reflect a process of change in the meaning of being Chinese and being American that occurs as individuals become more exposed to American culture. Clearly, only longitudinal studies can directly test this hypothesis. In this study, the developmental stage during immigration was naturally confounded with length of stay in the United States. It is possible that relations between being American and being Chinese in immigrants are influenced by age of migration more than length of time spent in the United States. Having immigrated to the United States during childhood, the Imm $\leq$ 12 group may have been too young to have a sense of being American or being Chinese. Therefore, they may have been more susceptible to adopting an American identity. The Imm > 12 group, however, may have already developed a Chinese identity prior to migration. Thus, our suggestion that recent immigrants come to the United States being Chinese may be specific to immigrants who moved to the United States after the beginning of identity formation (i.e., around adolescence). In this study, we maximized the likelihood that the two immigrant groups would have different levels of cultural exposure and experience by creating a group division that naturally confounded age at migration with length of stay in the United States. Future studies that include individuals who migrated to the United States at different stages of identity development will be better able to tease apart these influences.

SPECIFIC PREDICTORS OF BEING CHINESE AND BEING AMERICAN

The hypothesis that the predictive power of specific cultural domains would vary in the "being Chinese" and "being American" models for the different Chinese American groups was not statistically supported; however, informal inspection of beta coefficients reveals trends in the hypothesized direction. Being Chinese and being American appear to be based more on pride when individuals have had limited contact with a culture and based more on cultural activities when individuals have been immersed in a culture. The absence of significant differences among the coefficients may be specific to the site of this study. The San Francisco Bay Area is one of the most ethnically and culturally heterogeneous regions of the United States, where multiculturalism is highly valued and where the Chinese American community is relatively large. As a result, the differences in coefficient magnitudes may be weaker than they would have been if the study had been conducted in another region of the United States where the presence of mainstream European American culture is stronger.

Somewhat contrary to our predictions, the beta coefficient for pride in American culture was greater for ABC than for Imm $\leq$ 12. We suspect that

this may be due to our society's emphasis on taking pride in American culture. Also contrary to our hypotheses, participation in Chinese activities was not greater for Imm > 12 than for Imm ◐ 12 in the "being Chinese" model. In fact, for Imm > 12, participation in Chinese activities did not emerge as a significant predictor of being Chinese. Participation in Chinese activities may be so natural for Imm > 12 that there is very little variation in the reported participation in Chinese activities for this Chinese American group. Also contrary to our predictions, the beta coefficient for participation in American activities was not greater for ABC than for Imm ◐ 12 in the "being American" model. Spending 12 of their formative years in American culture may be enough for Imm ◐ 12 to resemble ABC in their participation in American activities.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study was limited in a number of ways that we wish to explore in future studies. First, because the instruments were administered in English, we do not know whether participants' responses would have differed if the immigrant groups had completed the GEQ in Chinese. Research in the counseling domain suggests that the clients' language may influence their affective experience (Guttfreund, 1990) and expressions of affective symptoms (Altarriba & Santiago-Rivera, 1994). Similarly, it is possible that completing the instruments in English altered participants' ratings of cultural orientation. Although very little research has investigated this question, existing evidence suggests that language may affect cultural identification. For example, Yang and Bond (1980) found that when Chinese-English bilinguals completed cultural identity instruments in English, they reported identifying more with their Chinese heritage than when they completed the instruments in Chinese. Thus, it is possible that our participants reported being more oriented to Chinese culture than they would have if they had completed the instruments in Chinese. Yang and Bond (1980) suggest that this effect is due to the salience of one's ethnic identity during the testing situation. We administered these questionnaires in the context of other questionnaires not related to cultural orientation to reduce respondents' awareness of our interest in aspects of their cultural identity. Clearly, understanding the impact of language on perceptions and reports of cultural identity will have important implications in research and counseling settings.

It is also possible that differences in English-language proficiency across Chinese American groups may have confounded the differences between the groups. We believe this unlikely for the following reasons: (a) The items were worded simply so that minimal English reading comprehension was required

to understand the items, (b) all participants were students at an American university and spoke English in their classes, (c) immigrant groups had higher grade point averages than ABC, suggesting at least a moderate level of English proficiency, and (d) no participants reported misunderstanding the questionnaire items. Despite this evidence, future research should examine whether responses to this instrument vary when it is administered in Chinese rather than English.

Second, the assessments of being Chinese and being American as well as the cultural domains sampled were limited. In this study, only one item was used to measure being Chinese, and only one item was used to measure being American. Despite its face validity, for statistical purposes, it would be important to include other measures of being Chinese and being American. Similarly, future research should examine whether placing these items in the beginning, middle, or end of the GEC would have altered participants' responses. It is possible that both the order in which the items were presented and the context in which these items were placed in the GEC may have affected participants' ratings of how Chinese and how American they were (Schwarz, Strack, Hippler, & Bishop, 1991; Sudman, Bradburn, & Schwarz, 1996). Of course, for all participants in this study, the items were presented in the same order, and therefore, if order and context effects existed, it is likely that they affected all three groups similarly. In addition, it is unclear which other factors explain the 60% of the variance in conceptions of culture that are not accounted for by the current measures of cultural orientation. Thus, future studies should include cultural domains not represented in this study such as political interest and activity (Phinney, 1990; Wang, 1991).

Third, we presented hypotheses that were predicated on the assumption that Chinese Americans reference different social contexts when assessing how Chinese and how American they are. This may, in fact, explain the low test-retest reliabilities of our instrument. Therefore, in future studies, we will include direct measures of the various social contexts our participants live in as well as experimentally manipulate which social contexts our respondents reference when assessing their "Chineseness" and "Americanness." These studies will test more directly hypotheses that Chinese American groups vary in how contextualized their notions of being Chinese and being American are.

Fourth, like most studies of cultural orientation, acculturation, and cultural identity processes, our findings are limited to a specific moment in time. Clearly, cultural processes are dynamic in nature (Berry, 1995; Marcia, 1980). In fact, the relatively low test-retest reliabilities of the study measures (as well as other measures of acculturation and ethnic identity, as discussed by Phinney, 1990) may reflect how cultural orientation and related processes

are constantly changing. Thus, longitudinal studies are necessary to capture better the dynamic nature of cultural change. It is also quite possible that low test-retest reliabilities reflect how participants' ratings are vulnerable to changes in reference groups. For example, ratings of how Chinese one is may depend on whether one compares oneself with a recent immigrant from China or with someone who does not demonstrate any trace of his or her Chinese heritage. In future studies, we will experimentally manipulate participants' reference groups to examine whether this factor explains the low reliability of self-reports of cultural orientation. Although only a few studies have used experimental methods to manipulate conceptions of culture, these findings support these hypotheses (Christian, Gadfield, Giles, & Taylor, 1976).

Fifth, our exploration of the meanings of being Chinese and being American are limited to self-report data and therefore, in some ways, to the conscious aspects of cultural processes. Cultural influences are both conscious and nonconscious in nature. Thus, it is possible that there are aspects of cultural influence that are inaccessible by these methods of psychological research (Rogler, Cortes, & Malgady, 1991). Future investigations must consider ways of tapping into the aspects of culture that are not easily articulated but that may exert even stronger influences on the meanings attached to being of a particular culture.

Sixth, future studies should be conducted on other cultural groups and in other countries to determine the generalizability of our findings. It is possible, for example, that the process of acculturation proposed here is applicable only to Chinese Americans. Members of Asian cultures have been described as being particularly attuned to changes in the social context. Therefore, the role of the social context on acculturation may be significantly less important for other cultural groups. Furthermore, host cultures differ in their acceptance of minority groups and in their "multicultural ideologies" (Berry, 1995). Whereas some cultures may be tolerant of cultural diversity, others may not. This may influence the meanings individuals impart to being members of a particular cultural group (Berry, 1995).

Finally, future work should examine how cultural orientation affects different aspects of mental health and psychological functioning within cultural groups. It is possible that engagement in specific cultural domains may have different effects on mental health and psychological functioning within cultural groups. For example, having a social network of the same cultural background may facilitate the retention of one's cultural heritage for ABC, whereas it may prevent the integration of immigrant Chinese into mainstream American culture. As a result, having a social network of the same cultural

background may have different effects on the psychological health of different Chinese American groups.

We have demonstrated that within cultural groups, individuals vary in the meanings they attach to being of a particular culture. Our findings have significant implications for cultural research and counseling with ethnic minority populations. For example, our data suggest that the subjective experience of being influenced by a particular culture varies across individuals. Therefore, when assessing acculturation or other forms of cultural orientation, investigators must consider the possibility that similar responses to their instruments may assume different meanings by individuals within cultural groups. Our findings also indicate that when working with individuals of different cultural backgrounds, clinicians cannot assume they know what their clients mean when they identify themselves as being of a particular culture. In fact, the effectiveness of ethnic matching or other culturally sensitive clinical interventions may hinge on clinicians' abilities to assess accurately what being of a particular culture means to their clients.

APPENDIX A
General Ethnicity Questionnaire-Chinese Version (abridged)

Please use the following scale to indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Circle your response.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I was raised in a way that was Chinese.	1 2 3 4 5
2. When I was growing up, I was exposed to Chinese culture.	1 2 3 4 5
3. Now, I am exposed to Chinese culture.	1 2 3 4 5
4. Compared to how much I negatively criticize other cultures, I criticize Chinese culture less.	1 2 3 4 5
5. I am embarrassed/ashamed of Chinese culture.	1 2 3 4 5
6. I am proud of Chinese culture.	1 2 3 4 5
7. Chinese culture has had a positive impact on my life.	1 2 3 4 5
8. I believe that my children should read, write, and speak Chinese.	1 2 3 4 5
9. I have a strong belief that my children should have Chinese names only.	1 2 3 4 5
10. I go to places where people are Chinese/Chinese American.	1 2 3 4 5
11. I am familiar with Chinese cultural practices and customs.	1 2 3 4 5
12. I relate to my partner or spouse in a way that is Chinese.	1 2 3 4 5

13. I admire people who are Chinese/Chinese American.   1 2 3 4 5
14. I would prefer to live in a Chinese/Chinese American community.   1 2 3 4 5
15. I listen to Chinese music.   1 2 3 4 5
16. I perform Chinese dance.   1 2 3 4 5
17. I engage in Chinese forms of recreation.   1 2 3 4 5
18. I celebrate Chinese holidays.   1 2 3 4 5
19. At home, I eat Chinese food.   1 2 3 4 5
20. At restaurants, I eat Chinese food.   1 2 3 4 5
21. When I was a child, my friends were Chinese/Chinese American.   1 2 3 4 5
22. Now, my friends are Chinese/Chinese American.   1 2 3 4 5
23. I wish to be accepted by Chinese/Chinese Americans.   1 2 3 4 5
24. The people I date are Chinese/Chinese American.   1 2 3 4 5
25. Overall, I am Chinese.   1 2 3 4 5

Please use the following scale to answer the following questions. Circle your response.

1	2	3	4	5
Very much	Much	Somewhat	A little	Not at all

26. How much do you speak Chinese *at home*?   1 2 3 4 5
27. How much do you speak Chinese *at school*?   1 2 3 4 5
28. How much do you speak Chinese *at work*?   1 2 3 4 5
29. How much do you speak Chinese *at prayer*?   1 2 3 4 5
30. How much do you speak Chinese *with friends*?   1 2 3 4 5
31. How much do you view, read, or listen to Chinese *on TV*?   1 2 3 4 5
32. How much do you view, read, or listen to Chinese *in film*?   1 2 3 4 5
33. How much do you view, read, or listen to Chinese *on the radio*?   1 2 3 4 5
34. How much do you view, read, or listen to Chinese *in literature*?   1 2 3 4 5
35. How fluently do you *speak* Chinese?   1 2 3 4 5
36. How fluently do you *read* Chinese?   1 2 3 4 5
37. How fluently do you *write* Chinese?   1 2 3 4 5
38. How fluently do you *understand* Chinese?   1 2 3 4 5
39. Are you bilingual? (please circle)   Yes No
     If yes, what languages?
          1) _____
          2) _____

APPENDIX B
General Ethnicity Questionnaire-American Version (Abridged)

Please use the following scale to indicate how much you agree with the following statements. Circle your response.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

 1. I was raised in a way that was American.   1 2 3 4 5
 2. When I was growing up, I was exposed to American culture.   1 2 3 4 5
 3. Now, I am exposed to American culture.   1 2 3 4 5
 4. Compared to how much I negatively criticize other cultures,
       I criticize American culture less.   1 2 3 4 5
 5. I am embarrassed/ashamed of American culture.   1 2 3 4 5
 6. I am proud of American culture.   1 2 3 4 5
 7. American culture has had a positive impact on my life.   1 2 3 4 5
 8. I believe that my children should read, write, and speak English.   1 2 3 4 5
 9. I have a strong belief that my children should have American
       names only.   1 2 3 4 5
10. I go to places where people are American.   1 2 3 4 5
11. I am familiar with American cultural practices and customs.   1 2 3 4 5
12. I relate to my partner or spouse in a way that is American.   1 2 3 4 5
13. I admire people who are American.   1 2 3 4 5
14. I would prefer to live in an American community.   1 2 3 4 5
15. I listen to American music.   1 2 3 4 5
16. I perform American dance.   1 2 3 4 5
17. I engage in American forms of recreation.   1 2 3 4 5
18. I celebrate American holidays.   1 2 3 4 5
19. At home, I eat American food.   1 2 3 4 5
20. At restaurants, I eat American food.   1 2 3 4 5
21. When I was a child, my friends were American.   1 2 3 4 5
22. Now, my friends are American.   1 2 3 4 5
23. I wish to be accepted by Americans.   1 2 3 4 5
24. The people I date are American.   1 2 3 4 5
25. Overall, I am American.   1 2 3 4 5

Please use the following scale to answer the following questions. Circle your response.

1	2	3	4	5
Very much	Much	Somewhat	A little	Not at all

26. How much do you speak English *at home*?   1 2 3 4 5

27. How much do you speak English *at school*?	1 2 3 4 5
28. How much do you speak English *at work*?	1 2 3 4 5
29. How much do you speak English *at prayer*?	1 2 3 4 5
30. How much do you speak English *with friends*?	1 2 3 4 5
31. How much do you view, read, or listen to English *on TV*?	1 2 3 4 5
32. How much do you view, read, or listen to English *in film?*	1 2 3 4 5
33. How much do you view, read, or listen to English *on the radio*?	1 2 3 4 5
34. How much do you view, read, or listen to English *in literature*?	1 2 3 4 5
35. How fluently do you *speak* English?	1 2 3 4 5
36. How fluently do you *read* English?	1 2 3 4 5
37. How fluently do you *write* English?	1 2 3 4 5
38. How fluently do you *understand* English?	1 2 3 4 5

NOTES

1. An abridged version of the General Ethnicity Questionnaire was used for this study. The original version was created by the first author for her studies of culture and emotion with Robert W. Levenson. Comparable versions of the original instrument have also been developed for use with Mexican American and African American populations.

2. Instruments vary in how specific their items are. For example, some instruments may include items that tap into specific cultural knowledge (e.g., "Do you play mah-jong?"), whereas others may include items that are more general (e.g., "Do you engage in Chinese recreation?"). Both types of items are important, depending on one's specific research question. This study was primarily interested in the meanings that different Chinese American groups attach to being Chinese and being American. Therefore, our items were worded in a general way so that they would be applicable to our different Chinese American groups.

3. This domain was labeled "preference for Chinese food" because Chinese food is an integral part of Chinese holidays and celebrations.

4. Items 5 and 26-38 for both scales were reverse-coded prior to calculating the mean scores for each cultural domain.

REFERENCES

Altaribba, J., & Santiago-Rivera, A. L. (1994). Current perspectives on using linguistic and cultural factors in counseling the Hispanic client. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *25*, 388-397.

Baumeister, R. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, 4th ed., pp. 680-740). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Berry, J. W. (1995). Psychology of acculturation. In N. Goldberg & J. Veroff (Eds.), *The culture and psychology reader* (pp. 457-488). New York: New York University Press.

Bruning, J. L., & Kintz, B. L. (1988). *Computational handbook of statistics* (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Caetano, R. (1987). Acculturation and drinking patterns among U.S. Hispanics. *British Journal of Addiction*, *82*, 789-799.

Chang, D. (1993). Falling free. In J. Hagedorn (Ed.), *Charlie Chan is dead: An anthology of contemporary Asian American fiction*. New York: Penguin.

Christian, J., Gadfield, N. J., Giles, H., & Taylor, D. M. (1976). The multidimensional and dynamic nature of ethnic identity. *International Journal of Psychology*, *11*, 281-291.

Cuellar, I., Harris, L. C., & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *2*, 199-217.

Flaskerud, J., & Uman, G. (1996). Acculturation and its effect on self-esteem among immigrant Latina women. *Behavioral Medicine*, *22*, 123-133.

Guttfreund, D. G. (1990). Effects of language usage on the emotional experience of Spanish-English and English-Spanish bilinguals. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *58*, 604-607.

Hsu, F. (1985). The self in cross-cultural perspective. In A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos, & F.L.K. Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self: Asian and Western perspectives* (pp. 24-55). New York: Guilford.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 395-412.

Lee, E. (1982). A social systems approach to assessment and treatment for Chinese American families. In M. McGoldrick & J. Giordano (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 527-551). New York: Guilford.

Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.)., *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: John Wiley.

Marin, G. (1992). Issues in the measurement of acculturation among Hispanics. In K. F. Geisinger (Ed.), *Psychological testing of Hispanics, APA Science Volumes* (pp. 235-251). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Marin, G., & Gamba, R. J. (1996). A new measurement of acculturation for Hispanics: The Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (BAS). *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *18*, 297-316.

Markides, K., Krause, N., & Mendes De Leon, C. F. (1988). Acculturation and alcohol consumption among Mexican Americans: A three-generational study. *American Journal of Public Health*, *78*, 1178-1181.

Mendoza, R. H. (1989). An empirical scale to measure type and degree of acculturation in Mexican American adolescents and adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *20*, 372-385.

Norusis, M. J. (1993). *SPSS for Windows base system user's guide. Release 6.0*. Chicago, IL: SPSS.

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 499-514.

Rogler, L. H., Cortes, D. E., & Malgady, R. G. (1991). Acculturation and mental health status among Hispanics: Convergence and new directions for research. *American Psychologist*, *46*, 585-597.

Russell, J. A., & Yik, S. M. (1996). Emotion among the Chinese. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The handbook of Chinese psychology*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Schwarz, N., Strack, F., Hippler, H. J., & Bishop, G. (1991). The impact of administration mode on response effects in survey measurement. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *5*, 193-212.

Sudman, S., Bradburn, N. M., & Schwarz, N. (1996). *Thinking about answers: The application of cognitive processes to survey methodology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *47*, 401-407.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M. A., Kurtines, W., & de los Angeles Aranade, M. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, *12*, 113-130.

Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. New York: Penguin.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, P25-1092. (1992). *Population projections of the United States by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1992 to 2050*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Wang, L. L. (1991). Roots and changing identity of the Chinese in the United States. *Daedalus*, *120*, 181-206.

Yang, Kuo-Shu; Bond, Michael H. (1980). Ethnic affirmation by Chinese bilinguals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *11*(4), 411-425.

Zheng, X., & Berry, J. (1991). Psychological adaptation of Chinese sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, *26*, 451-470.

Jeanne L. Tsai received her Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the University of California, Berkeley, and is currently an assistant professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Campus. In addition to acculturation and ethnic identity, her research examines the influence of culture on emotion, intimate relationships, and the expression of emotional distress.

Yu-Wen Ying received her Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the University of California, Berkeley, and is currently a professor in the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley. Her research focuses on ethnic minority populations, especially Asian Americans. She has studied acculturation and ethnic identity formation, family relationships of immigrants and refugees, culture-specific mental health problem conceptualization, and effective intervention methods.

Peter A. Lee received his Ph.D. in social welfare from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1998 and is a lecturer there. His research interests include mental health issues and social work with Asian American youths and families.