January 2017

Do Modernity and Traditionality Exist in Chinese Americans?

Pearl S. Chang
Clayton State University, pearlchang@clayton.edu

Stella Michael-Makri
Clayton State University, stellamichael-makri@clayton.edu

Eckart Werther
Clayton State University, eckartwerther@clayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/jpps

1

Abstract: American researchers have not clearly conceptualized nor quantified whether traditionality and modernity exist in the United States despite these constructs being psychological variables investigated in China and Taiwan. The article first begins with delineating the conceptual and measurement barriers when quantifying traditionality and modernity in previous empirical literature. Next a project is discussed that measured these two constructs through developing a quantitative scale for Chinese-Americans measuring traditionality and modernity. A 46-item scale was given to 172 self-identified Chinese-Americans after items were constructed through review by two panel of experts as well as presented at state, regional and international conferences. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using maximum likelihood with a promax rotation yielded a five factor structure with 21 items. The five factor structure included themes of *Family Relationships*, *Family Gender Roles, Indigenous Spiritual Practices*, *Image Management* and *Cultural Adherence*. The new themes presenting the conceptualization of these two constructs are discussed along with an analysis of how the scale items further elucidate traditionality and modernity.

Do Modernity and Traditionality Exist in Chinese- Americans?

There is a dearth of literature that has explored the concepts of *traditionality* and *modernity* amongst the Chinese-American population. *Traditionality* is described as an orientation that adheres to older, unchanging values from an individual's ancestral heritage (Chang, 2012, p. 18). *Modernity* is the cultural adaptation and incorporation of values at the individual level in order to accommodate a changing society (p. 19). Despite being crucial to understanding the everyday psyche of Asians (Hwang, 2003b; Pek & Leong, 2003), these constructs have been largely ignored by U.S. scholars in the recent decades (Hwang, 2003b). Eventually, research regarding quantification and conceptualization of modernity and traditionality changed fields from sociology to psychology in a cross-cultural manner from American to China. In an effort to better understand the enigmatic nature of these two constructs in American society, it is important to start with a historical account of how research changed from its American sociological etiology to the field of psychology through Chinese scholars (Chang, 2012).

Overview of Past Empirical Research

During the 1950's, Americans were increasingly coming into contact with international cultures due to the onset of the World Wars. This sparked interest in understanding the socialization processes and cultural structures of people from different countries. Western scholars began researching their version of traditionality after World War II which they termed *modernization* and *traditionalism* (Bendix, 1967; Zhang et al., 2003). Modernization and traditionalism were examined as macro-level societal changes (Armer & Schanibereg, 1972), rather than *modernity* and *traditionality*, which are micro-level variables influencing the individual psyche. However, American sociologists documented the research process to be

evasive and circular, resulting in researchers doubting the importance and existence of such concepts. The difficulty and frustration from creating consistent conceptualizations of traditionality and modernity could best be summarized by Schnaiberg (1970) when he explained the two constructs "must mean something other than its explicit definition here, [you] should feel free to substitute any other term or symbol provided he does so consistently" (p.11). Despite the various efforts by American sociologists to quantify modernity and traditionality between the 1950's through 1970's, the enigmatic nature of these constructs resulted in the abandonment of the research by Americans. Research would eventually begin to decline in the late 1960's in America (Hwang, 2003b), with no documented resurgence in western literature after the 1980's.

One of the issues with the lack of research from American camps may include the biases that erroneously conceptualized traditionalism as equivalent to social deviancy (Armer & Schnaiberg, 1972) and pertaining to nomadic, primitive cultures (Bendix, 1967). These misleading conceptualizations created frustration and doubt that traditionality existed in the U.S. (Schnaiberg, 1970; Armer & Schnaiberg, 1972). Despite decades of research in various cultures and countries, Inkeles (1983) agreed that the conceptualization of traditionality, and subsequently modernity, remained controversial given that both constructs were proposed to be related in an unidimensional fashion (Schaniberg, 1970).

Chinese psychological researchers began to examine the micro-level constructs of traditionality and modernity in the 1980's (Yang, 1981). These researchers associated traditionality with the agrarian lifestyle (Inkeles, Broaded & Cao, 1997; Inglehart & Baker, 2000). The agrarian culture facilitated collectivistic and familialistic values as a means of cultivating successful agriculture (Inglehart & Baker, 2000). The family unit and collectivistic values were largely emphasized as part of the agrarian lifestyle. The agricultural life "tightly

bound peasant men to their natal villages and peasant women to the natal villages of their husbands, thus preventing the large-scale rural-to-urban migration that otherwise would have occurred..." (Inkeles et al., 1997, p.32).

At the societal level, modernity is developed after agricultural societies shift to a more industrialized and mechanized economy (Patel, Power & Bhavnagri, 1996). The original, agrarian patriarchy is no longer needed after industrialization of the economy, where urbanized jobs are developed. This type of societal change influences child-rearing concepts to drive towards more individualistic orientations. Because the agrarian lifestyle is not as pertinent as before, egalitarian attitudes towards raising boys and girls, as well as more emphasis on individual rather than collectivistic achievement, evolved as societies shifted toward modernization (Patel, Power & Bhavnagri, 1996).

Contemporary Chinese researchers agree with previous American researchers that a key component of modernity is flexibility and changeability (Hwang, 2003b; Chang, 2012). Eastern researchers conceptualize modernity as the individual's ability to change and adapt one's attitudes, beliefs and values to an ever evolving society (Zhang et al., 2003). Furthermore, modernity has often been described as "relating to present or recent times as opposed to the remote past…" (Chang et al., 2003, p. 7) when impacted by societal changes, such as economic, political and technological development (Yang, 2003). As a result, people begin to change and develop new dimensions of their personality, whereas some other dimensions remain constant or resilient in the face of change (Chang, 2012). For instance, research has largely associated open-mindedness, optimism, assertiveness and egalitarianism as part of the evolutionary process of modernity (Zhang et al., 2003).

Contemporary cross-cultural researchers believe that modernity and traditionality are indispensable with understanding the Asian personality (Hwang, 2003b; Pek & Leong, 2003; Yang, 2003). Some scholars have even asserted that the research on modernity and traditionality is a subject best studied and understood by eastern researchers (Hwang, 2003a; Yang, 2006). One of the reasons noted for their assertion is the disconnect between eastern and western modalities of thought. For instance, Chinese scholars have suggested that traditionality may be non-existent in westernized cultures (Hwang, 2003a; Yang, 2006). Part of the disconnect in the history of this research could be due to the different cultural variables experienced by those in China versus the individuals in the U.S. For example, historically, Chinese society encouraged citizens to maintain the same "status quo" in order to "keep social order" (Talbani and Hasanali, 2000, p. 71) and remain cushioned from western influences during the days of strict communistic regime. Traditionality was used as a form of socialization to preserve and adhere to social norms despite changes in the global culture. Similarly, traditionality reflects a personality that is more likely to adhere to routine and espouse more reserved behaviors (Yang, 1981, Hwang, 2003b, Yang, 2006). A review of the literature suggests that there is no quantitative evidence that traditionality exists in the U.S. One reason could be due to lack of investigation since the 1980's and that Chinese scholars believe the exploration of this construct in the U.S. is not constructive (Hwang, 2013b). As a result, it was deemed appropriate from an empirical stance to use Chinese-Americans as the population to investigate for the current study as a means to integrate the two differing camps of thought.

Current particular interest amongst cross-cultural researchers include macro-level issues regarding globalization (Arnett, 2002). The ongoing integration of the global world has an impact on one's belief systems and personality at the micro-level. The disagreement between

American sociologists versus Chinese psychologists likely exist because the former group of scholars focused on macro level and the latter focused on the micro-level. Naturally, sociologists study macro-level societal shifts whereas psychologists study the micro-level, psyche and belief system changes. The disconnect between sociologists and psychologists may have resulted from inherent differing paradigms.

This research project continues with investigating how social level phenomena, like *modernization*, influence the development of personality variables, such as *modernity*. We believe that both macro and micro-levels are inherently intertwined. It is a disservice to separate modernization from modernity (and subsequently traditionalism from traditionality) because one ultimately leads to the other. Both macro and micro level principles will always be fundamentally connected. This project contributes to research by combining the strengths of both American and Chinese cultures as well as sociological and psychological perspectives. Thus, this project aims to investigate whether traditionality exists in the Chinese- American population through the quantitative means of scale development.

A scale quantifying traditional beliefs was created through scale construction utilizing exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to provide a stronger conceptualization and understanding of traditionality and modernity in the U.S. As indicated earlier, the research history of modernity and traditionality have been ambiguous and controversial. A lack of insight and gaps in the literature persist although traditionality and modernity have been proposed as indispensable to understanding certain people (Hwang, 2003b; Pek & Leong, 2003; Yang, 2003). The availability of research in certain Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) groups is minimal. Although AAPI scholars have long called for the recognition of the immense cultural diversity within the AAPI group (David & Okazaki, 2006), literature continues to combine the extensive APPI

groups together; thereby disregarding the pronounced differences between these heterogeneous population. The ultimate purpose of conducting research with scale design is to better understand constructs to further conceptualize them in theory and literature as well as understand the cultural connection between societal shifts and its influence on individual belief systems.

According to the U.S. Census (2010), the total population of AAPI increased from 281.4 million in 2000 to 308.7 million, indicating a 9.7 percent increase over the past ten years. Persons of Chinese descent make up the largest subset of the AAPI population in the U.S. at 3.3 million people (22.8% of the AAPI population in the U.S. This initial statistic is derived from individuals indicating "Chinese alone" on the Census. The census numbers rise dramatically to 4 million when one takes into consideration individuals who reported to be Chinese in-any-combination (i.e. combined with another ethnicity and/or race).

Furthermore, quantitative psychological research cannot continue without scales to measure psychological variables. Another likely reason for the pervasive lack of research in traditionality and modernity is because no assessment tools currently exist in America. Without any means of measuring personality variables, quantitative research is unable to continue in this area. Therefore, a review of previous constructed scales attempting to quantify traditionality and modernity will be reviewed first prior to introducing the project, data collection and subsequent analysis of results.

Review of Past Modernity and Traditionality Scale Construction

Western scale development in the arena of traditionality and modernity has largely focused on modernity. However with the proposed view that traditionality is conceptually related to modernity in a unidimensional fashion (Smith & Inkeles, 1966; Schnaiberg, 1970; Yang, 1981), previously constructed western scales used to measure modernity still provide unique

information on the combination of themes and factors that contribute to these two constructs.

The Overall Modernity (OM) Scale is a 14 item measure developed by Smith and Inkeles (1966). The OM scale was developed by interviewing a modest sample (N=150) of individuals from Argentina, Chile, India, Pakistan, Israel and Nigeria (Smith & Inkeles, 1966). Schnaiberg (1970) attempted a unidimensional scale measuring modernity and traditionality after interviewing sample of women (N=1,138) from Ankara, Turkey. The OM Scale and Schnaiberg's (1970) scale were similar in that both explored factors associated with egalitarianism (i.e. more traditional beliefs emphasized less on equal rights of women and men whereas more modernistic beliefs emphasized equality) and importance of family. The OM Scale noted that more traditional beliefs espoused larger households with more children than modernistic beliefs, which tended to correlate with less children and smaller households. Schnaiberg's (1970) scale particularly expanded on traditional individuals' deferring to older members of society, lower likelihood to use birth control as well as lower emphasis on attaining more education, particularly with women.

Open-mindedness was a theme also discovered in the OM-Scale (Smith & Inkeles, 1966). Those who were more modernistic endorsed more open-mindedness and curiosity than traditional individuals. Traditionalistic individuals where more likely to favor conservative views about adopting different beliefs. Furthermore, the OM Scale indicated that participants that evaluated themselves as more traditional were less likely to use birth control and more likely to uphold obligations to their family.

Other scales measuring modernity developed by American sociologists included Doob's (1967) scale on modernity and Kahl's (1968) scale, *Modernity-1* (M-1). Kahl (1968) drafted two versions of a modernity scale, *Modernity-1* (M-1) and the *Modernity-2* (M-2). Doob's (1967)

scale included 80 items developed from his studies in West Africa. His scale discovered that more modernistic individuals tended to be more confident and optimistic than those that endorsed more traditional values. Similarly to Schnaiberg's (1970) scale, a theme of political interest tended to be associated with modernistic values whereas traditional values tended to shy away from political activation. Another similarity between Schnaiberg's (1970) and Doob's (1967) scale included modernity's emphasis on education, particularly in the field of science. Finally, both scales emphasized the importance of family involvement. Doob (1967) termed this as *tribalism.*

 Similar to Smith and Inkeles' (1966) OM Scale, Kahl's (1968) scale indicated that modernistic individuals were more likely to participate in mass media (i.e. watching, TV, listening to the radio, etc.) than traditionally oriented individuals. Furthermore, Kahl's (1968) scale noted that more modernistic individuals tended to prefer living in more urbanized areas rather than traditional individuals.

Eastern scholars would also develop scales to measure these two constructs. One such example if Yang's (1981) *Chinese Individual Traditionality-Modernity Scale,* which utilized a unidimensional approach (Yang, 1981; 2003; 2006; Hwang, 2003a). A marked change occurred in 2003 when Yang produced two different scales, the *Multiple Traditionality Scale (MTS)* and *Multiple Modernity Scale (MMS)* with a new way of conceptualizing these two constructs as multidimensional (Yang, 2003). Some scholars have argued that the two scales developed by Yang (2003) could be combined into an unidimensional scale (Hwang, 2003a) instead of existing as two separate inventories.

Some of the factors for the MTS indicated that the traditional individual was more likely to endorse male superiority, worship his/her ancestors and engage in filial piety, be more

obedient and compliant with authority as well as be less likely to change his/her ways. The likelihood in believing male superiority was similar to the OM-Scale, which also indicated that endorsement in egalitarianism clearly delineated modernistic from traditional beliefs. Likewise, Yang's (2003) MMS, showed that modernistic individuals were more likely to encompass egalitarian values. Furthermore, the MTS implied that traditional individuals were more likely to endorse more conservative beliefs, or be less likely to change their already established opinions.

The five factors for modernity in the MMS included factors that measured open-mindedness, sexual equality, independence, optimism and valuing affections (Yang, 2003). Yang's (2003) MTS possessed a factor that measured filial piety whereas the MMS consisted of measuring independence and autonomy. These two factors were consistent with previous western scales, such as the OM-Scale's (1966) theme of *kinship obligations* and *family size*, Doob's Modernity Scale's (1967) *tribalism* and Kahl's M-1 and M-2 Scales (1968) of *low integration with relatives* that indicated the level of association and influence by the family was another hallmark that determined whether an individual possessed more modern or traditional value systems.

Being more open-minded for modernistic individuals continues to be a theme that was found in both the MMS and OM-Scale whereas *optimism* was discovered to be a hallmark of modernistic beliefs according to both the eastern MMS and western Doob's (1967) scale. Furthermore, Yang's (2003) MMS scale indicated a difference in emphasizing emotions, termed *valuing affections*, rather than the conservative, stoic stance often found in traditional Asian expression. Most importantly, these three subscales (i.e. *open-mindedness, optimism, valuing affections*) from the MMS indicate that some sort of socio-emotional-behavioral component may exist, which is especially important when conceptualizing modernity and traditionality. Two of

these subscales are somewhat supported by western sociologists in their investigations with Doob's *government, confidence and optimism* theme as well as Inkeles' *open-mindedness* themes.

Methodology

Based on previous research on both eastern and western scales, traditionality and modernity was chosen to be measured due to the lack of clarity in understanding these two constructs in the U.S. These two constructs will be treated as existing in an unidimensional manner with modernity on one end of the spectrum and traditionality on the other end of the spectrum.

Having a strong theoretical definition is the first step when trying to quantify psychological constructs (DeVellis, 2003). Therefore, the working definition for this research defines modernity as *"the cultural adaptation and incorporation of values at the individual level in order to accommodate a changing society"* Chang 2012, p. 19), as indicated previously. Traditionality is defined as *"the perseverance of values reminiscent of one's ancestral culture at the individual level in reaction to changes at the societal level"* (Chang, 2012, p. 20).

A pool of items was created based on an extensive literature review, solicited feedback from researchers familiar with research involving Asian personality variables and belief systems in addition to numerous conference presentations and symposiums ranging from regional to international conferences from 2006- 2014. Two panel of experts were used to increase the rigor and selection of these items. Five themes were proposed as the result of this first stage of the scale development and conceptualization process in order to quantify both modernity and traditionality. After a second panel of experts reviewed this revised scaled, the final apriori scale length was determined to encompass 46 items. A six-point Likert scale ranged from "Strongly

Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" was utilized. Any participant who self-identified as "Asian" or "Other Pacific Islander" on the U.S. Census over the age of 18 qualified to participate. Participants were asked to identify the most predominant *ancestral cultural* in their family lineage. *Ancestral culture* was defined as the culture most dominant in one's family lineage.

A database was utilized for participants to take the scale online. Flyers and cards were circulated in areas with heavier traffic on college campuses and in the community. Paper copies were also available for participants who opted for this version. Over 100 colleges as well as local, regional and national organizations affiliated with the advancement of AAPI and/ or mental health issues were contacted via email for recruitment purposes. Psychological list-servers as well as popular blogs were further contacted for recruitment.

173 participants' data were analyzed after using only participants who self-identified as "Chinese" or "Taiwanese". Descriptive frequencies were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The age of participants ranged from 18 to 80 years old (M = 35.6; SD = 15.6) Analysis revealed that 60.7% (n = 105) were female participants and 39.3% (N = 68) were male participants. Most participants (57.8%; N = 228) revealed they were first generation immigrants (i.e. participants born overseas and immigrated to the U.S.). 17.3% (N = 30) of participants completed a high school education whereas 27.6% (N=65) completed an undergraduate degree and 42.4% (N=75) completed a graduate degree. When reporting marital status, 55.5% of participants (N = 96) reported "single, 37.0% (N = 64) reported "married" while 4% (N = 7) "divorced and 3.5% (N = 6) reported "other". In terms of income bracket, 42.8% (N= 74) of participants earned less than $25,000, 16.2% (N = 28) earned between $26,000- 50,999, 25.4% (N = 44) earned between 51,000-99,999 and 15.6% (N = 27) earned above 10,000. The top five religions reported were "unaffiliated/ non" (33.5%; N= 58), "nondenominational

Christian" (22%; N = 38), Buddhist (19.1%, N=33), Atheist (8.1%; N=14) and Agnostic (6.4%; N =11).

  54.3% (N = 95) of participants were first generation immigrants whereas 39.3% (N = 68) were born in the United States and identified as second generation immigrants. 3.5% (N = 6) of participants are third generation immigrants and 1.2% (N = 2) are fourth generation or above immigrants. 8.7% (N= 15) immigrated to the U.S. under the age of 10 years old whereas 19.7% (N= 50) immigrated between ages 11-29 and 18.5% (N= 32) between ages 20-49. 35% of participants' guardians have not visited the U.S. 12.1% (N = 21) participants have never traveled back to their country of origin whereas 16.2 % (N = 39) travel back at least once a year. 34.1 % of participants (N = 59) travel back to their country of origin on average every five years.

  An oblique exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used with a maximum likelihood, promax rotation. The entire scale revealed Cronbach's alpha to be .880, which suggests high internal consistency. Furthermore, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) statistic was determined to be .865. Eigenvalues were set to greater than 1.2 for extraction with the total eigenvalue to be 8.48. Total variance was 18.43. The Chi-Square of Goodness-of-fit Test totaled 350.115 (df = 271), p = .001. Table 1 illustrates the items retained after EFA along with the eigenvalues per factor.

  Although a 25 item structure was revealed after EFA although another five items were dropped when examining communalities with less than .4. Ultimately this scale revealed a 21 item structure as shown in Appendix A. The 21-item structure was determined after analyzing eigenvalues, communalities and the pattern matrix from the original pool of items. The new scale totaled 21 items with a five factor structure and provides a new conceptualization of traditionality and modernity in the Chinese-Americans population. This new structure provides

greater elucidation when attempting to understand the themes that are included with traditionality and modernity.

Current Conceptualization of Traditionality and Modernity

Through scale development, a compelling argument can be made that traditionality and modernity can be quantifiable in the Chinese- American population. The remaining items after exploratory factor analysis (EFA) revealed 21 items with five factors including *Family Relationships*, *Family Gender Roles, Indigenous Spiritual Practices, Image Management* and *Cultural Adherence*. Based on this project, the two themes of Family Relationships and Family Gender Roles were consistent with previous research with slight variations on the interpretation of gender roles. Family Relationships and Family Gender Roles replicate previous research and represent past factors concluded from both American sociological and Chinese psychological research. Three factors, *Indigenous Spiritual Practices*, *Image Management* and *Cultural Adherence*, have not been considered in previous literature. These new themes provide further clarity in the domains likely influenced by modernity and traditionality. These new areas provide more insight into the everyday psyche of Chinese-Americans, as will be discussed in a latter section.

Theme One: Family Relationships

The family unit and understanding of the relationships and hierarchical roles within each family has been a popularly researched topic by both eastern and western researchers regarding modernity and traditionality as indicated in previous sections. *Family Relationships* is a postpriori factor with four items that measures participant's commitment towards family responsibilities and observance of filial piety as shown in Table 1. Past studies have suggested that adherence to the family hierarchy as well as obligation to the family unit decline as

individuals move to more urbanized areas (Inglehart & Baker, 20000; Chang et al., 2003) with urbanization being correlated with modernistic transformation (Gough, 1977; Inglehart & Baker, 2000).

Table 1

Retained Items in Family Relationships

1. I prefer living near my extended family.

2. My parents and/or in-laws will live with me when I have my own family.

3. I believe fulfilling responsibilities to my family is my top priority.

4. I always obey and respect the elders in my family.

Items included in the constructed scale illustrate how Chinese-Americans adhere to a more traditional belief system involving family relationships, including an emphasis on collectivistic thinking and adherence to hierarchy. The modernistic personality is conceptualized to be characterized with a more autonomous, individualized thinking away from family influence where an individual is more likely to make decisions based on his/her own desires rather than the collectivistic desires of the family unit. For instance, "I believe fulfilling responsibilities to my family is my top priority" indicates that a traditional individual makes decisions on the collectivistic family unit rather than a modern individual, who will be less likely to factor in the family and make more individualistic goals.

A central piece to past scales measuring aspects of modernity and traditionality emphasized the importance of family as well as adhering to the family structure of power and showcasing familial piety. Collectivistic values in traditional Asian cultural norms stress interdependence, familial piety and family commitment in contrast to more individualistic values

found in the US and other Western societies (Juan, Syed & Takagi, 2007; Kuo, Chong & Joseph, 2008; Park, Kim, Cheung & Kim, 2010). For example, a study by Hwang and Wood (2009) indicated that the cultural expectation regarding the care of the aging parents is an added stressor among Asian Americans. Item #2 "*My parents and/or in-laws will live with me when I have my own fami*ly" reflects on this traditional family value.

Understanding the hierarchy in the family, especially towards parents and male figureheads is at the root of Asian culture and important when considering traditional familial attitudes (Yang, 1981; Yang, 2003). The traditional family system is usually hierarchical and patriarchal in structure, with males and older individuals designated higher status (Kim, 2011). In more traditional societies, the father of the family held absolute power, whose decisions are never challenged (Patel et al., 1996). Members of collectivistic Asian families are expected to prioritize their family's' needs and deemphasize personal goals in addition to abiding by the family's decision-makers. For instance, traditional South Asians tend to maintain beliefs such as obedience to elders and superiors, emphasis on family, sex role adherence and discouragement of autonomy in the younger and female family members (Patel et al., 1996). Communication runs from parents to children with children expected to comply with the elders out of obligation and duty (Lau, Fung, & Yung, 2010). The expectation for the sons is that they will carry on the family name and tradition even when they marry as their loyalty is always to the parents (Ina, 1997).

In another study, residents of Shanghai, also known as one of the more modernistic cities in Asia, revealed that 78% of retired parents preferred to live separately from their children citing reasons such as financial independence and avoidance of family conflicts to be the topmost priorities rather than preserving the family unit through living closely together as is found in

traditional values (Chang, Wong & Koh, 2003). Thus, indicating several facets that may be central to differentiation traditional versus modern beliefs.

It is important to note that Asian values discussions were developed in a time of deep uncertainty about the modernization ethos, and disseminated through journalism, academia, and politics (Jenco, 2013). Even though Asian values generally exclude direct mention of Hindu or Buddhist values, ''placing society above the self, upholding the family as the basic building block of society, resolving major issues through consensus instead of contentions, and stressing racial and religious tolerance and harmony'' (Shared Values, White paper, as cited in Jenco, 2013) illustrate far more similarity to the values of Eastern civilization than of any particular Confucian school (Jenco, 2013).

The marriage aspect of this scale was discarded. This is consistent with previous literature as marriage attitudes have been documented in any scale development articles. Although previous findings have suggested that emphasis on an arranged marriage (Talbani & Hasanali, 2000) could be associated with more traditional customs, the discarded items from this particular scale indicate that there is likely no association between marriage and either traditionality or modernity. However one item, "I believe a woman becomes part of her husband's family when she is married", moved to the *Family Gender Roles* factor after EFA, suggesting that gender obligations in marriage may be an important issue but more research is needed to understand the specific aspects of marriage and its association with traditionality and modernity.

Theme Two: Family Gender Roles

The items in this scale were generated to measure participant's attitudes towards one's socialized gender as well as asked participants their beliefs regarding egalitarianism. Although

examining norms surrounding gender roles is a common theme in previous scales, Family

Gender Roles differs from previous literature in that only gender roles as pertaining to family

responsibilities were retained items. *Family Gender Roles* is a postpriori factor with three items

that measure participant's attitudes towards one's socialized responsibilities according to gender

roles within the family unit. The original proposed theme also measured the presence of

egalitarian attitudes and notions of equality but this was discarded after EFA.

Table 2

Retained Items in Family Gender Roles

1. I believe a woman becomes part of her husband's family when she gets married.

2. I believe men should provide the main financial support for the family.

3. I believe the father/husband should be the only one who makes important decisions for
   the family.

Traditional socialization emphasizes more rigid gender normed behavior and beliefs. From

an early age, boys are encouraged to do well in academia as a means to secure a job to support

his future family whereas girls are taught to complete household work and take care of her future

family (Eyetsemitan et al., 2003). As part of a more traditional socialization process, boys are

allowed to be more vocal whereas girls are taught to be submissive. As they mature, traditional

women learn to define their identity in terms of their family and place her needs after her

husband and children whereas men become the head of the household and are expected to make

executive decisions for the family. Mothers are expected to be more responsive to the children's

needs and emotions, yet less nurturing than do Euro-American mothers (Kelly & Tseng, 1992). Often times they serve as the intercessor between the father and the children (Sue & Sue, 2013).

AAPI women often struggle with opposed gender roles as they try to adjust cultural traditions and norms with the ever-changing American culture (Pyke & Johnson, 2003). Many Asian American women are challenged in finding a balance between the "ethnic patriarchal structure" (Pyke & Johnson, 2003, p. 38) of family life and adapting to the greater sense of equality, power, and independence associated with American women. On the contrary, AAPI men are not challenged with such a dichotomous crisis of identity, since traditionally-oriented AAPI male-dominant gender roles are more compatible with normative American measures of male success (Pyke & Johnson, 2003).

Past research has been controversial in determining whether egalitarianism is associated with the development of modern or traditional value systems (Leong & Chang, 2003). Literature has shown that traditional values are correlated with sexist beliefs whereas modern values and egalitarianism are not necessarily related. For example, a study measuring Chinese student's attitudes from urban versus rural China discovered that males held more traditional notions of gender beliefs than their female counterparts (Zhang et al., 2003). Pek and Leong's (2003) study also concluded that modernity is unrelated to sexist attitudes. A study measuring Chinese student's attitudes from urban versus rural China discovered that men held more traditional notions of gender beliefs than their female counterparts (Zhang et al., 2003). Men endorsed less gender equality and were more content with current social standards whereas female students endorsed more gender equality and advocated for change in social standards.

Sexist behaviors often decrease as societies industrialize (Leong & Chang, 2003), thus allowing more women to join the workforce without fear of stigma or repercussion of going

against traditional collectivistic beliefs. However there appears to be a discrepancy between men and women's' expectations on this scale. The two items measuring egalitarian attitudes related to career and education achievement were dropped items after EFA, implying that egalitarianism may not be a variable associated with either traditionality or modernity. Previous research has documented that more traditional individuals prefer rigid gender roles and may express elements of sexism but did not necessarily equate egalitarianism with either modernity or traditionality (Leong & Chang, 2003; Zhang et al., 2003). It may also be that gender differences play a large part in the expression of sexism. Men are more likely to endorse sexist beliefs whereas no correlation has been shown with women regarding expressing sexist beliefs (Leong & Chang, 2003). Further studies might analyze the male/ female disparity in endorsing sexist beliefs.

Closer examination of the retained items indicate a contrast between expectations of women versus men in the household, particularly regarding making important decisions and providing financial support with the traditional value system. A more modernistic personality profile will be less likely to believe that only men should provide the main financial support or the husband/father should be the one who makes important decisions. These findings are consistent with literature, which has shown that traditional socialization processes play an important role when teaching gender differentiated values in Asian societies (Patel et al., 1996; Talbani & Hasanali, 2000; Eyetsemitan et al, 2003). Traditionally, women support the family household through domestic tasks while men work outside the home for economic support (Chung, 2001). From an early age, boys are encouraged to do well in school in order to find a job to finance his future family whereas girls are taught to complete household work and take care of her future family (Eyetsemitan et al., 2003). As they mature, traditional women learn to define their identity in terms of their family and place her needs after her husband and children whereas

men become the head of the household. Families can maintain these segregated roles as long as a single male worker can financially support the family (Chung, 2001). However as countries industrialize and urbanize, economies often become more demanding where the solitary male financial earner is not enough to support the family unit; therefore an increase in women joining the workforce occurs (Chung, 2001), which likely leads to an increase in developing modern value systems and a decrease in beliefs that men provide the main financial support or make main household decisions.

Theme Three: Indigenous Spiritual Practices

Indigenous healing preferences is a novel discovery that adds a different dimension when conceptualizing traditionality and modernity from previous research. This postpriori factor contains five items and measures participants' practice, observance and understanding of participants' ancestral faith. As noted previously, there is scant research in past scale construction on religion and even lesser research in regards to the intersection between religiosity/ spirituality with modernity and traditionality. An analysis of past scale shows that Schnaiberg's (1970) Modernity Scale included a "religiosity" theme from the Turkish population. Yang's 1991 and 2003 traditionality scales included a subscale that was called "worship ancestors".

The items in this scale examined participants' adherence to everyday practices and observations of their identified spirituality or faith. According to this newly constructed scale, individuals who endorse more traditional beliefs also appear to adhere stronger to spiritual and/or religious practices that have been preserved over generations of individuals' ancestral lineage than modernistic individuals, who either do not practice a specific faith or do not adhere as strictly to religious teachings. These practices include wearing apparel as well as observing

specific customs, holidays and everyday practices. For instance, the items "My everyday practices are guided by the spiritual/religious beliefs of my ancestral culture(s)" and "I closely observe customs following my ancestral culture(s) most of the time" characterizes the traditional individual as more likely than the modern individual to adhere to long established conventions originating from their identified ancestral culture that likely were passed down through generations.

Table 3

Retained Items in Indigenous Spiritual Practices

1. I understand spiritual/religious values of my ancestral culture(s), even though I may observe a different faith/ religion

2. My everyday practices are guided by the spiritual/religious beliefs of my ancestral culture(s).

3. I closely observe spiritual/religious holidays of my ancestral culture(s).

4. I strongly prefer wearing apparel reflective of my ancestral culture(s) most of the time.

5. I closely observe customs following my ancestral culture(s) most of the time.

Inglehart and Baker (2000) analyzed the foremost values in 65 countries and discovered that stricter adherence to organized religion was the strongest value espoused by more traditional and non-industrialized countries. The stronger adherence to religion was a means to cope with political and economic unrest that more non-industrialized countries experience. When societies stabilize, people begin to feel more secure and comfortable enough to seek less orthodox or organized religion (Inglehart & Baker, 2000) and use religious devotion more as a form of social

activity (Schnaiberg, 1970), signifying a change in attitude towards adherence to traditional religious practices.

Indigenous spiritual preferences includes the observance of non-western faiths that impact different facts of life stemming from coping and healing practices to everyday activities. The wisdom of indigenous spiritual practices is manifested in "ways of knowing, seeing, and thinking that are passed down from generation to generation" (Day, Silva, & Monroe, 2014, p. 37). Eyetsemitan et al., (2003) claimed that no matter how modernized one's beliefs may be, certain customs and faiths will transpire in everyday activities, such as deference to the deceased. The researchers continued with noting that in South Asian populations, worship of the dead is associated with respect paid to the elderly.

Qualitative researchers noted that some participants experienced healing after attending a fortune teller/soothsayer in the much the same way that others experience after attending westernized counseling modalities (Yeh et al., 2006). Researchers who studied the coping strategies of participants after the 9/11 terrorist attacks found that Asian Americans, more so than other demographic groups, employed "non-church-based indigenous healing techniques (e.g., tarot card readers/fortune tellers, deep breathing/relaxation/meditation, and herbal medicine)" to cope with the aftermath of the attacks (Constantine et al., 2005, p. 303-304). This remains consistent with the items from this scale where the traditional individual may be more likely to prefer non-westernized forms of faith.

Geographical differences within societies also contributed to the importance in adherence of religious beliefs. People from rural areas are generally closer to God and feel religiously more grounded (Yasuda, Iwai, Yi, & Xie, 2011). A study of 2,469 people in Thailand from urban regions indicated that the two most important values for urban Thai was family and success

while the two most important values for rural Thai was national security and religion (Komin, 1990). Inkeles and Smith (1974) discovered that religion has consistently shown a negative correlation to modernity, with more modernistic belief systems espousing less religious adherence. Other studies have noted that traditional family belief systems in South Asians emphasize religion (Patel et al., 1996). Urban Chinese men and women scored lower on traditionality and higher on modernity than their counterparts in rural areas of China (Pek & Leong, 2003).

As mentioned previously, adherence to the family hierarchy is an important aspect of traditionality. Family structure and relationships are also influenced by the religious practices and traditions (Musa, Mat, Draman, Abdullah & Bujang, 2015). In order to avoid conflict, family members may have a passive, indifferent and reluctant approach (Philips, 1996), yet, families remain constant regardless of serious internal conflicts (Musa et al., 2015). Factors that contribute to resilience and their willingness to sacrifice are mostly ascribed to strong religious practices and traditions.

Theme Four: Image Management

Image Management is a novel discovery that adds different dimensions when conceptualizing traditionality and modernity from previous research. This factor had the largest number of items retained with six items remaining after EFA. As seen in Table 4, this postpriori factor continues to measure aspects such as coping techniques and the phenomena of LOF but also include an element of maintain a public façade to "honor" one's family

Table 4

Retained Items in Image Management

1. I believe that I should feel the same way that everyone else is feeling.

2. I ignore my emotions when I am upset.

3. I believe maintaining one's image at all times in public is extremely important.

4. I believe emotions should be hidden or controlled, especially in public.

5. My family would be ashamed of me if I did something bad in public.

6. I believe bringing prestige and honor to the family is more important than my self-satisfaction.

As discussed in a previous section, some scales by Yang (2003), Doob (1967) and Inkeles (1966) have hinted at a socio-emotional-behavioral components such open-mindedness, optimism or confidence but none delved as far in-depth as this scale when examining coping preferences and maintenance of one's image, particularly in public arenas. This subscale captured there different cultural phenomena of *forbearance coping, emotional suppression* and *loss of face* (LOF), as will be discussed. These retained items assess the collectivistic notion of adopting attitudes and beliefs that the greater group is experiencing over an individual's own experienced emotions. Furthermore, the results from this study imply that more traditional individuals will use social cues for orienting their own emotions rather than rely on their own individual interpretation of emotional reactions.

Wong et al. (2010) discovered that when met with interpersonal difficulties, AAPI tended to value collectivistic oriented coping methods, which emphasize preserving harmony, rather than utilizing direct methods of coping such as using confrontation techniques. One of the cultural phenomenon captured in this scale includes *forbearance coping* when managing one's emotional state. *Forbearance coping* is a technique used by Chinese individuals to diminish and/or hide

individual concerns in order to maintain collective harmony (Liao et al., 2012). Indirect

methodologies of coping rely more on avoidance and social withdrawal (Wong & Tran, 2010), as

illustrated with the items in Table 4. Items such as "I believe emotions should be hidden or

controlled, especially in public" and "my family would be ashamed of me if I did something bad

in public" illustrate that traditional individuals prefer to preserve the collectivistic notion of

harmony over individual self-expression. This is a more common coping technique with AAPI

than Caucasian Americans due to socialization differences (Saw & Okazaki, 2010) and possible

cultural mistrust with those outside their own community (Constantine et al., 2005; Yeh et al.,

2006). Too much difference in expressing one's emotions may increase focus on a single

individual, which are contrary to collectivistic values (Wong et al., 2012), especially regarding

preserving harmony and avoiding contentious relationships.

It can be inferred from this scale that individuals who identify with more traditional beliefs in

the U.S. are less likely to express and/ or acknowledge their emotions. This is consistent with

literature showing that individuals with a stronger adherence to Asian values are more likely to

espouse muted affect than those that had a weaker adherence to Asian values (Saw & Okazaki,

2010). Items such as "I believe that I should feel the same way that everyone else is feeling" and

"I ignore my emotions when I am upset" illustrate the stark differences between how traditional

forms of emotional expression are highly muted and/or suppressed, as describes the phenomenon

of *emotional suppression*. Saw and Okazaki (2010) noted that weaker adherence to culture

values (ie. more modernistic values) prize overt expression and individual assertion of emotions.

For instance, outward displays of anger are viewed as immature and a shameful reflection of

one's family upbringing (Kim, Takeuchi & Hwang, 2002) in traditional belief systems whereas

American belief systems are more likely to endorse expression of anger as a direct coping style to let others understand when one is unhappy.

Another cultural aspect of the theme, Image Management, includes *loss of face* (LOF). Cross-cultural research suggests western cultures prefer direct coping styles (Choi, Rogers & Werth, 2009; Wong & Tran, 2010) whereas eastern cultures prefer indirect coping styles, or suppression of emotions (Saw & Okazaki, 2010). Part of the reasoning for the less direct, outward expression of emotion is due to LOF. LOF is an Asian socialization phenomena, where "face" is equivalent to maintaining a public reputation and social status (Zane & Yeh, 2002). However, the topic of whether LOF has a relationship to the more traditional personality is controversial. Some researchers believe there is no relationship (Chang et al., 2003; Saw & Okazaki, 2010) and others have found an indirect relationship through research on acculturation (Patel et al., 1996; Kim et al., 2001). For instance, younger and more highly educated Singaporeans were less likely to emphasize face in everyday situations, believing that face is no longer a socialization process vital to carrying oneself in public (Chang et al., 2003). For more traditional individuals, the fear of losing face is a powerful enough socialization tool that causes individuals to closely observe set norms including controlling or hiding one's emotions to avoid stigma and shame (Zane & Yeh, 2002).

Some literature have implied that LOF may be associated with traditional beliefs through a negative relationship with acculturation (Patel et al., 1996; Kim, Okazaki & Goto, 2001). One study showed that AAPIs born outside the U.S. placed more emphasis on face than their U.S. born counterparts (Kim et al., 2001), indicating a degree of acculturation associated with face. The degree of acculturation, as discussed in the next section, is likely related to more modernistic

values espoused by individuals. This particular study noted that LOF is likely associated with the more traditional (and subsequently less modern) persona.

Theme Five: Cultural Adherence

As of date, a theme such as *Cultural Adherence* has not been proposed. *Cultural Adherence* measures whether participants continue to maintain contact with their ancestral heritages through consistent, everyday maintenance of cultural activities despite living in the U.S. This is also a newly discovered facet of conceptualizing modernity and traditionality. Involvement in the social and cultural practices of one's ethnic group, such as language competency, pride of one's culture and socialization practices, are the most widely used indicator of ethnic identity (Talbani & Hasanali, 2000).

Scholars have increasingly deemed the concept of ethnic identity as an important variable (Ding, 2012). Ethnic identity is a social construct that encompasses factors such as race, nationality, religion, ancestry, shared history, group membership, group affirmation, and nationality (Harowitz, 1985, Smith, 1999, Ding 2012). Isajiw (1990) as cited in Lai (2012), asserted that ethnic identity is comprised of both external and internal variables. Examples of external variables includes maintaining ethnic traditions, speaking in a native language, and engaging with cultural events. Internal variables of ethnic identity include feelings about one's culture and cultural self-perceptions.

The postpriori factor contains three items which assess participants' adherence to their ancestral culture's influence, including language fluency and understanding of the folklore and history of their ancestral culture. Results indicated that participants who were less fluent in language, including reading, writing and speaking, were more likely to score higher on traditionality. This is consistent with previous theories surrounding language fluency and

observing customs indigenous to one's family ancestry. For instance, Chang et al. (2003) noted that preference in using the Chinese language helped participants in the study to attain and uphold traditional values. Additionally, exposure to media and language in Chinese has been correlated with the traditional persona. Preference for using the Chinese language reflects immersion in Chinese family and public culture. For example, exposure to Chinese television programs and newspapers has been noted as leading to higher enculturation to the traditional values (Chang et. al 2003). Choice of language also plays a factor in assessing everyday adherence of culture. In their construction of the Singapore Chinese Values Scale, Chang et al. (2003) used one of the markers of modernity as language preference. They discovered in their study that Singaporeans who preferred to use English more than Chinese also endorsed more modernistic values than Singaporeans that preferred to use Chinese more frequently.

The current modernity and traditionality scale further implies that traditional individuals also tended to rate themselves higher on understanding their cultures' history and folklore, which is also consistent with previous theories. Inglehart & Baker (2000) noted "people of traditional societies often have high levels of national pride…" (p. 25), indicating a preference for ancestral practices.

Table 5

Retained Items in Cultural Adherence

1. I understand my ancestral culture(s)' history and folklore very well.

2. I speak fluently in the language of my ancestral culture(s).

3. I read and write fluently in the language of my ancestral culture(s).

According to previous research, traditionality and modernity appear to correlate with acculturation (Leong & Chang, 2003). Berry (1980 & 1997) stated that acculturation occurs when individuals/groups come into contact with other individuals/ groups from dissimilar cultural backgrounds. As a result of this contact, adaption (or lack thereof) occurs (Berry, 1980, 1997). Acculturation has also been described as the "broad psychological experience of living in multiple distinct cultural contexts" (Miller, 2007, p. 119). The possible link between these three constructs are likely associated with cultural change. Oftentimes, immigration from one country to another creates a venue for identity reformulation, resulting in acculturation (Talbani & Hasanali, 2000). Thus the process of acculturation requires that immigrants shed some of their own cultural values from their native countries and adopt the societal values of the host country. Patel and colleagues (1996) noted that acculturation is a "selective, voluntary" and "bidirectional" process (p. 303). Asian Americans who do not acculturate as much or rapidly as others are labeled "traditionalists" (Leong & Chang, 2003, p.1).

Various scholars have explored the concept of acculturation. One of the most cited is Berry (1980) and his Model of Acculturation. The traditionalists in Berry's (1980) model would likely be categorized as *separationist*, where the person "identifies with his or her identity of origins and rejects all the host cultures' values and beliefs" (Mio, Barker & Domenech-Rodriguez, 2016, p. 162). Separationists strongly adhere to their indigenous values from their country of origin and "refuse to observe any traditions of the host country" (p. 162). Patel and colleagues (1996) concluded that modernity and acculturation were moderately related. Most notably, they discovered that the length of residence in the U.S. was moderately related to acculturation and modernity for first generation fathers but not for mothers residing in the U.S. As a result, it seems that acculturation plays a part in either maintaining traditional beliefs or

adopting modern beliefs, but the association needs further research to understand how close a relationship exists between acculturation, traditionality, modernity and gender.

Conclusion

No studies have examined the relationship between modernity and traditionality in the Chinese- American population. This study supports the notion that traditionality and modernity exist in the U.S. Furthermore, this study more clearly supports the interworking relationships between five factors as discovered from exploratory factor analysis (EFA) that combine together to form a conceptualization of traditionality and modernity. These factors include *Family Relationships*, *Family Gender Roles, Indigenous Spiritual Practices*, *Image Management*, and *Cultural Adherence*. These five factors form a basis for speculation on how traditionality and modernity are quantified, conceptualized and co-exist in the U.S. Hence, this study clarifies the differences between a more traditional versus modernistic belief system. Based on this scale, the perseverance of beliefs regarding aspects of family, gender, spirituality, image management and cultural practices conserved from older ancestral practices continue to flourish in the current age despite changes at a societal macro- level and individual micro-level.

Results differed from previous research involving American sociologists and Chinese psychologists with these findings discovering a quantifiable measurement scale relating modernity and traditionality in a unidimensional fashion for Chinese-Americans. Furthermore, this project challenges eastern psychologist's claim that traditionality is unable to exist in western society. The results in this research supports previous eastern psychological researchers that understanding constructs, such as traditionality and modernity, are important to consider when trying to understand the beliefs and personalities of different Asian ethnicities.

As with taking any form of self-evaluation assessment tool, questions remain about the capability of the Likert scales' ability to capture personality variables as well as how accurate participants may have rated themselves and their values. Moreover, because this scale was mostly offered in English, there may have been potential language barriers for the participants who took this scale given the large amount of AAPI that do not use English as their first language.

Future studies may want to generalize the definitions of modernity and traditionality beyond the Chinese- American population. Previous studies have included studies in different countries including Turkey (Schnaiberg, 1970), Africa (Doob, 1967), China and Taiwan (Yang, 1981; 2003) indicating that components of traditionality and modernity can be quantified in different cultural societies. It may be interesting to expand this research into broader conceptualizations on the general American population to assess whether modernity and traditionality can be construed as a viable personality variable in the United States. Additionally, new aspects discovered in this project such the role of spirituality, emotional regulation, coping and cultural adherence need to be further clarified on their relationship to modernity and traditionality.

References

Armer, M. & Schnaiberg, A. (1972). Measuring modernity: A near myth. *American Sociological Review, 37*(3), 301-316.

Arnett, J. (2002). The psychology of globalization. *American Psychologist, 57*(10), 774-783.

Bendix, R. (1967). Tradition and modernity reconsidered. *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 9, 3, 292- 346.

Berry, J. W. (1980). *Acculturation as varieties of adaptation.* In.Padilla, A.M. (Ed.), Acculturation: Theory, models, and some new findings (pp. 9–25). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 46,* 5–34.

Chang, P. (2012). *A study of scale construction for the measurement of traditionality and modernity in the Asian-American/Pacific Islander population.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Electronic Theses and Dissertations database: https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/chang_pearl_s_201208_phd.pdf.

Chang, W.C., Wong, K.W., & Koh, J.B.K. (2003). Chinese values in Singapore: Traditional and modern. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 5-29.

Chung, R. H. (2001). Gender, ethnicity, and acculturation in intergenerational conflict in Asian American college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*(4), 376-386.

Choi, J. L., Rogers, J. R., & Werth Jr., J. L. (2009). Suicide risk assessment with Asian American college students: A culturally informed perspective. *The Counseling* Psychologist, *37*(2), 186-218.

Constantine, M.G., Alleyne, V.L., Caldwell, L.D., McRae, M.B., & Suzuki, L.A. (2005). Coping responses of Asian, Black, and Latino/Latina New York city residents following the september 11, 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority* Psychology, *11*(4), 293-308.

David, E. J. R., & Okazaki, S. (2006). Colonial mentality: A review and recommendation for Filipino American psychology. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 12,* 1-16.

Day, D., Silva, D. K., & Monroe, A. O. (2014). The wisdom of indigenous healers. *Creative Nursing, 20,* 37-46.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications, second edition*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ding, S. (2012). Embracing the Tension Between Ethnic Identity and Academic Identity: An Analysis of Challenges to Chinese American Political Scientists' Presentation of Knowledge. *Journal of Chinese Political Science, 17*, 379 – 399. DOI 10.1007/s11366-012-9214-2

Doob, L. W. (1967). Scales for assaying psychological modernization in Africa. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 31*(3), 414-421.

Eyetsemitan, F., Gire, J. T., Khaleefa, O., & Satiardama, M. P. (2003). Influence of the cross-cultural environment on the perception of aging and adult development in the developing world: A study of Bahrain, Brazil and Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *6,* 51-60.

Gonzales-Backen, M., Bámaca-Colbert, M.Y., Allen, K. (2016). Ethnic Identity Trajectories Among Mexican-Origin Girls During Early and Middle Adolescence: Predicting future psychosocial adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 52(5),* 790- 797.

Gough, H. G. (1977). Further validation of a measure of individual modernity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *41*(1), 49-57.

Horowitz, D.L (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hwang, K.K. (2003a). Critique of the methodology of empirical research on individual modernity in Taiwan. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 241-262.

Hwang, K.K. (2003b). In search of a new paradigm for cultural psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 287-291.

Hwang, W.C. & Wood, J. J. (2009). Acculturative family distancing: Links with self-reported symptomatology among Asian Americans and Latinos. *Child Psychiatry Human Development, 40,* 123-138.

Ina, S. (1997). Counseling Japanese Americans. In C. C. Lee (Ed.), *Multicultural issues in counseling* (2nd ed., pp.189-206). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Inglehart, R. & Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values. *American Sociological Review*, *65*, 19-51.

Inkeles, A. (1983). *Exploring individual modernity.* New York: Columbia University Publishers.

Inkeles, A., Broaded, C. M., & Cao, Z. (1997). Causes and consequences of individual modernity in China. *The China Journal*, *37*, 32-59.

Inkeles, A. & Smith, D. H. (1974). *Becoming modern: Individual change in six developing cultures.* Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Isajiw, W. W. (1990). Ethnic-identity retention. In W. W. Isajiw (Ed.), *Ethnic identity and equality.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jenco, L. (2013). Revisiting Asian values. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 74*, 237-258.

Juan, L.P., Syed, M., & Takagi, M (2007). Intergenerational discrepancies of parental control among Chinese American families: Links to family conflict and adolescence depressive symptoms. *Journal of Adolescence, 30*, 965-975.

Kahl, J. A. (1968). *The measurement of modernism: A study of values in Brazil and Mexico.* Texas: University of Texas Press.

Kelly, M. & Tseng, H. (1992). Cultural differences in childbearing: A comparison of immigrant Chinese and Caucasian American mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23,* 444-455.

Kim, B. S. K. (2011). *Counseling Asian Americans*. Belont, CA: Cengage.

Kim, J. A., Okazaki, S., & Goto, S. G. (2001). Unidimensional versus multidimensional approaches to the assessment of acculturation Asian American populations. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7* (3), 232-246.

Kim, J., Takeuchi, D., & Hwang, W. C. (2002). Predictors of help seeking for emotional distress among Chinese Americans: Family matters. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 70* (2), 1180-1190. doi: 10.1037///0022-006X.70.5.1186

Komin, S. (1990). Culture and work related values in Thai organizations. *International Journal of Psychology*, *25* (3), 681-705.

Kuo, B.C., Chog, V., & Joseph, J. (2008). Depression and its psychosocial correlates among older Asian immigrants in North America: A critical review of two decades' research. *Journal of Aging Health, 20,* 615-652.

Lai, D.W.L. (2012). Ethnic Identity of Older Chinese in Canada. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology, 27*(2), 103-117. doi:10.1007/s10823-011-9157-7

Leong, F, & Chang, W.C. (2003). Guest editors' introduction: Traditionality/ Modernity as a psychological construct: Current research and future directions. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 1-4.

Lau, J. S., Fung, J. & Yung, V. (2010). Group parent training with immigrant Chinese families: Enhancing engagement and augmenting skills development. *Journal of Clinical Psychology: In Session, 66,* 880-894.

Mio, J. S., Barker, L. A., & Domenech Rodriguez, M.M. (2016). *Multicultural psychology: Understanding our diverse communities- 4th edition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Musa, R., Mat, A., Draman, S., Abdullah K. & Bujang, M.A.(2015). Designing and validating a new Asian family scale. *The International Medicine Journal Malaysia, 14,* 23-28.

Park, I. J., Kim, P.Y., Cheung, R. Y., & Kim. M (2010). The role of vulture, family processes, and anger regulation in Kprean American adolescents' adjustment problems. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 40*, 123-138.

Patel, N., Power, T. G., & Bhavnagri, N. P. (1996). Socialization values and practices of Indian immigrant parents: Correlates of modernity and acculturation. *Child Development, 67,* 301-313.

Pek, J. C. X. & Leong, F. T. L. (2003). Sex-related self-concepts, cognitive styles and cultural values of traditionality-modernity as predictors of general and domain-specific sexism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 31-49.

Philips, W. (1996). Culturally competent practice: Understanding Asian family values. *Journal of the National Resource Center for Special Needs Adoption, 10,* 1-2.

Pyke, K. D., & Johnson, D. L. (2003). Asian American women and racialized femininities: "Doing" gender across cultural words. *Gender and Society, 17,* 33-53.

Saw, A. & Okazaki, S. (2010). Family emotion socialization and affective distress in Asian American and White American college students. *Asian American Journal of Psychology, 1*(2), 81-92.

Schnaiberg, A. (1970). Measuring modernism: Theoretical and empirical explorations. *American Journal of Sociology*, *76*, 399-425.

Sue, D. W. & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the Culturally Diverse: Theory and Practice.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Smith, A.D. (1999). *Myths and memories of the nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, D. H., & Inkeles, A. (1966). The OM Scale: A comparative socio-psychological measure of individual modernity. *Issue of Cross- Cultural Studies, 29*(4), 353-377.

Schnaiberg, A. (1970). Measuring modernism: Theoretical and empirical explorations. *American Journal of* Sociology*, 76*, 399-425.

Talbani, A. & Hasanali, P. (2000). Adolescent females between tradition and modernity: Gender role socialization in South Asian immigrant culture. *Journal of Adolescence*, *23*, 615-627.

Tsai, J. L., Mortensen, H., Wong, Y., & Hess, D. (2002). What does "being American" mean? A comparison of Asian American and European American young adults. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *8*(3), 257- 273.

United States Census Bureau. (2010). *The Asian population: 2010*. Retrieved June 2, 2016 from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf.

Wei, M., Liao, Y.H., Heppner, P. P., Chao, R. C. & Ku, T. Y. (2012). Forbearance coping,

Identification with heritage culture, acculturative stress and psychological distress among Chinese international students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39* (1), 97-106. doi: 10.1037/a0025473

Wong, Y. J., Kim, S. H., & Tran, K. K. (2010). Asian Americans' adherence to Asian values, attributions about depression and coping strategies. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*(1), 1-8.

Wong, Y.J., Nguyen, C.P., Wang, S., Chen, W., Steinfeldt, J. A., & Kim, B.S.K. (2012). A latent profile analysis of Asian American men's and women's adherence to cultural values. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*(3), 258-267.

Worthington, R. L. & Whittaker T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 6, 806-838.

Yang, K.S. (2006). Indigenized conceptual and empirical analyses of selected Chinese psychological characteristics. *International Journal of Psychology*, *41*(4), 298-303.

Yang, K.S. (2003). Methodological and theoretical issues on psychological traditionality and modernity research in an Asian society: In response to Kwang- Kuo Hwang and beyond. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 262-285.

Yang, K. S. (1981). Social orientation and individual modernity among Chinese students in Taiwan. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 11,* 159-170.

Yasuda, T., Iwai, N. Yi, C., & Vie, G. (2011). Intergenerational coresidence in China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan: Comparative analyses based on the East Asian social survey. *Journal of Communication Family Studies, 42,* 703-722.

Yeh, C.J., Inman, A.G., Kim, A.B., & Okubo, Y. (2006). Asian American families' collectivistic

coping strategies in response to 9/11. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *12*(1), 134-148.

Zane, N. & Yeh, M. (2002) The use of culturally-based variables in assessment: Studies of loss of face. In K. S. Kurasaki & S. Sue (Eds.) *Asian American mental health: Assessment, methods, and therapy* (pp. 123-138). New York: NY: Kluwer.

Zhang, Z., Zheng, X., & Wang, L. (2003). Comparative research on individual modernity of adolescents between town and countryside in China. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *6*, 61-73.

Appendix A

Postpriori Factors

Family Relationships

1. I prefer living near my extended family.

2. My parents and/or in-laws will live with me when I have my own family.

3. I believe fulfilling responsibilities to my family is my top priority.

4. I always obey and respect the elders in my family.

Family Gender Roles

5. I believe a woman becomes part of her husband's family when she gets married.

6. I believe men should provide the main financial support for the family.

7. I believe the father/husband should be the only one who makes important decisions for the family.

Indigenous Spiritual Practices

8. I understand spiritual/religious values of my ancestral culture(s), even though I may observe a different faith/ religion

9. My everyday practices are guided by the spiritual/religious beliefs of my ancestral culture(s).

10. I closely observe spiritual/religious holidays of my ancestral culture(s).

11. I strongly prefer wearing apparel reflective of my ancestral culture(s) most of the time.

12. I closely observe customs following my ancestral culture(s) most of the time.

Image Management

13. I believe that I should feel the same way that everyone else is feeling.

14. I ignore my emotions when I am upset.

15. I believe maintaining one's image at all times in public is extremely important.

16. I believe emotions should be hidden or controlled, especially in public.

17. My family would be ashamed of me if I did something bad in public.

18. I believe bringing prestige and honor to the family is more important than my self-satisfaction.

Cultural Adherence

19. I understand my ancestral culture(s)' history and folklore very well.

20. I speak fluently in the language of my ancestral culture(s).

21. I read and write fluently in the language of my ancestral culture(s).