Construction of the Asian American Family Conflicts Scale

Richard M. Lee
University of Texas at Austin

Jennifer Choe, Gina Kim, and Vicky Ngo
University of California, Davis

This study describes the construction and initial validation of the Asian American Family Conflicts Scale (FCS) with 3 samples of Asian American college students. The scale consists of 10 typical Asian American family conflicts that are rated for likelihood of occurrence (FCS–Likelihood) and seriousness of conflict (FCS–Seriousness). In Study 1, FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness had sound internal reliability, stability, and construct validity. In Study 2, FCS–Likelihood correlated with socioeconomic and cultural orientation variables. Ethnic, generation, and language differences, as well as the parent–child acculturation gap hypothesis, also were confirmed for FCS–Likelihood. In Study 3, FCS–Likelihood correlated with measures of family cohesion, adaptability, and parent–child communication. Although further validation is necessary, FCS–Likelihood in particular is a potentially useful research and clinical instrument for assessing the quality of Asian American parent–child relationships.

As psychologists become more sensitive to the mental health needs of racial and ethnic minority populations in the United States, there is a growing awareness and concern over the psychological and social effects of family conflicts within immigrant families (Rumbaut, 1994; Ying, 1998a). Chen, Greenberger, Lester, Dong, and Guo (1998), for instance, recently reported that parent–adolescent conflicts in Chinese American families, compared with European American families and Chinese families in China and Taiwan, were more highly correlated with school misconduct, antisocial behavior, and at-risk behaviors (e.g., cigarette smoking, drinking alcohol). Relatedly, within the counseling setting, it is not uncommon for Asian American students to attribute psychological distress to their relationships with their parents (Lee, 1997; Uba, 1994). For example, a Korean American high school student who is acting out in school reports feeling confused and frustrated by constant remarks from his parents that he is too "American" and not behaving like the children from other Korean families. Conflicts of this nature cannot be explained completely by the generation gap or the intergenerational conflict hypothesis that is often used to understand parent–child conflicts within the Western culture (Lerner, Karson, Meisels, & Knapp, 1975; Mead, 1970).

Family conflicts within immigrant families, such as the one described above, can be more fully explained by an acculturation gap or the different rates of acculturation between immigrant parents and their U.S.-raised children (Sluzki, 1979; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993). Acculturation differences between parents and children compound the typical generation gap within most families (Ying, 1998a). Children of immigrant parents generally acculturate to the majority culture at a faster rate than their parents. This rapid acculturation is seen in their acquisition of English as a primary language, adoption of Western values and lifestyles, and socialization into mainstream society. Immigrant parents, on the other hand, are more likely to retain their native language, cultural values, and traditional lifestyles despite the demands and pressures to socialize into mainstream society. Parents further expect their children to maintain the traditional values and lifestyles of their native culture. However, many children oppose the traditional values and lifestyles and seek to assume more Western or mainstream values and lifestyles. For example, Chao (1994) and Gorman (1998) found that immigrant parents (i.e., Chinese American) strongly emphasize conformity with parental expectations. By contrast, Kurtines and Miranda (1980) found that high acculturated immigrant children (i.e., Cuban American) negatively perceived traditional parental roles and expectations. Paradoxically, many immigrant parents recognize that they themselves and their children will have to adopt certain Western-oriented behaviors in order to be successful in school and society (Nguyen & Williams, 1989; Uba, 1994; Ying, 1998a). In the end, however, the failure within families to resolve these acculturation differences, particularly cultural value differences, complicates the normal generation gap, resulting in greater misunderstandings, miscommunications, and eventual conflicts among family members.

These types of family conflicts are conceptualized as a domain-specific form of acculturative stress (Sluzki, 1979). Other domains of acculturative stress include physical, marital, occupational, economic, and social. Like these other types of acculturative stress, family acculturation conflicts reflect the difficulties in transitioning from one cultural environment to another. Family acculturation conflicts are more likely to occur among recent immigrants where the gap between parents and children is greatest, but they also are found in older immigrant and later generation families where parents have maintained traditional cultural values. The psychological and social effects of family acculturation conflicts are just now beginning to be addressed by clinicians and researchers (McGoldrick, Giordano, & Pearce, 1996). These conflicts have been identified as a major contributor to a variety of psychological problems, including general adjustment problems, low self-esteem, anxiety, depression, problems with sexuality, physical abuse, and conduct disorder for immigrant populations (Cervantes, Padilla, & Salgado de Snyder, 1990, 1991; Gil, Vega, & Dimas, 1994; Lee, 1997; Szapocznik, Santisteban, Kurtines, Perez-Vidal, & Hervis, 1984; Uba, 1994; Vega, Khoury, Zimmerman, Gil, & Warheit, 1995). Unfortunately, there are few treatment models to address these culture-specific family conflicts (Landau, 1982; Szapocznik et al., 1984; Ying, 1998b).

Few published studies on family conflicts have focused specifically on Asian Americans (Uba, 1994). Yet as Shon and Ja (1982), Yee and Hennessy (1982), and Lee (1997) have noted, Asian families in cultural transition are equally if not more likely to experience parent–child difficulties. In one early study on Asian Americans, Connor (1974) described the greater amount of acculturation conflicts in first-generation Japanese American families compared with second and third generations. Nah (1993) similarly reported that Korean immigrant parents had a difficult time rearing their children in two different cultures. Korean parents had a particular difficulty accepting the fact that their children were growing up in a different culture than theirs. On the basis of interviews with Chinese immigrant children, Sung (1985) identified bicultural conflicts in the value and life-style domains of aggressiveness, sexuality, sports, loyalty, physical affection, education, finances, autonomy, respect for authority, and heroes/heroines. Chambon (1989), Dinh, Sarason, and Sarason (1994), and Ying and Chao (1996) also identified family acculturation conflicts as a particularly serious problem in Southeast Asian refugee families. Rumbaut (1994) reported that Asian American immigrant adolescents (Filipino, Vietnamese, and Cambodian) had higher amounts of family acculturation conflict than Hispanic immigrant adolescents. Despite the growing clinical and research attention on acculturation conflicts in immigrant families, most published studies have assessed these family conflicts using interviews, single items, or ad hoc measures that have not been tested for reliability or validity.

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate a new measure of typical generational family conflicts—the Asian American Family Conflicts Scale (FCS)—that additionally taps into acculturation differences between parents and late adolescent and young adult children. In Study 1, internal reliability estimates and preliminary construct validity were examined. In Study 2, construct, concurrent, and criterion validity were examined. The FCS was compared with demographic and cultural orientation variables. In addition, the acculturation gap hypothesis, as well as ethnic, generation, language usage, and gender differences, for family conflicts was examined. In Study 3, a comparison of the FCS–Likelihood subscale with other family measures provided further validity.

Scale Development

On the basis of the suggestions by Sung (1985) and Uba (1994), an initial list of culture-specific family conflicts was generated by the present authors. Three focus groups composed of a total of 15 Asian American undergraduate and graduate students, as well as 3 experts in Asian American mental health (a clinical psychologist, a psychiatrist, and a sociologist), successively reviewed and refined the list of family conflicts. Each group of 5–7 people was also asked to identify and describe additional typical family conflicts that they believed were attributable in part to acculturation differences between parents and children. Richard M. Lee and Jennifer Choe, Gina Kim, or Vicky Ngo facilitated all focus groups.

The knowledge generated from the focus groups was used to create 10 typical situations that reflect parent–child differences in Asian American families where the child is an adolescent or a young adult. The family situations focus on disagreements in values and practices (e.g., decision making, education, and respect for elders) that can be construed as both intergenerational and acculturation conflicts. As previously mentioned, the two forms of conflict are not mutually exclusive. In many ways, acculturation differences between parents and children exaggerate typical intergenerational conflicts. The family situations also were written as two-part statements to reflect the discrepancy between parents' and children's values and practices (e.g., "Your parents tell you what to do with your life, but you want to make your own decisions"). In this case, the use of the word *but* as a conjunction in each statement was necessary given the underlying multidimensional construct that was being measured. By contrast, unidimensional variations of the items (e.g., "Your parents tell you what to do with your life" and "You want to make your own decisions") fail to capture adequately the conflict between parents and child. Finally, focus-group members cautioned that the occurrence of these family conflicts does not necessarily reflect a serious problem within families. Many focus-group members felt that these conflicts were a natural part of life and were not harmful to their family's well-being. To capture this distinction between likelihood and seriousness, we asked two separate questions for each family situation (i.e., "How likely is this type of situation to occur in your family?" and "How serious a problem is this situation in your family?").

The final scale was named the Asian American Family Conflicts Scale (FCS; see Appendix). The FCS contains two 10-item subscales (FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness).

The FCS–Likelihood subscale assesses the likelihood that these 10 conflicts occur between the person and his or her parents using a 5-point rating system (1 = *almost never* to 5 = *almost always*). The FCS–Seriousness subscale assesses how serious a problem the conflicts are for a person's family using a 5-point rating system (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *extremely*). Each subscale of the FCS has a response range from 10 to 50 with the higher score indicating greater likelihood or seriousness of conflict.

Study 1: Reliability and Initial Validation of FCS

The purpose of this study was to assess the initial psychometric properties of the FCS (i.e., both FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness). Internal reliability was estimated with Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Construct validity was tested by examining the relationship between each family situation and a measure of acculturative stress. It was expected that the correlations between the FCS scale items and acculturative stress would be moderate. Furthermore, measurement models of FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness were tested with confirmatory factor analyses.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 186 Asian American college students (99 men, 85 women, and 2 unidentified) enrolled at a large, public West Coast university. Participants' average age was 21.29 years ($SD = 2.08$), with a range from 17 to 30 years. The ethnic breakdown was 64 Chinese American, 61 Vietnamese, 24 Filipino American, 18 Korean American, and 19 other Asian ethnicities, including Japanese, Indian, Cambodian, Hmong, and Thai. Regarding generation status, 99 were first-generation immigrants, 79 were second generation, and 8 were third or more generations. The estimated median family income was between $50,000 and $75,000. Eighty-five percent of the participants reported that their parents were married; 7%, divorced; 6%, separated; 3%, widowed; and 1%, unmarried.

A smaller sample of 11 college students (5 men and 6 women) were recruited to serve as the sample for FCS stability analysis. Participants' average age was 21 years ($SD = 1.41$), with a range from 19 to 24 years. The ethnic breakdown was 3 Chinese American, 2 Vietnamese, 4 Indian American, 1 Korean American, 1 Japanese American, and 1 biracial Asian American. Regarding generation status, 6 were first-generation immigrants, 4 were second generation, and 1 was third or more generations.

Instrument

The 24-item Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Acculturation Stress Scale (SAFE; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987) was adapted from the original 60-item version (Padilla, Wagatsuma, & Lindholm, 1985) to measure acculturative stress in social, attitudinal, familial, and environmental contexts. Sample items include "I don't have close friends" and "It bothers me that I cannot be with my family." Scale items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not stressful* to 5 = *extremely stressful*) with the higher score representing greater acculturative stress. If the item is not applicable to the respondent, it is assigned a score of 0. The original 60-item scale was developed on a Japanese American

college sample; however, most scale validation has occurred on Hispanic college populations (Fuertes & Westbrook, 1996). Padilla et al. (1985) and Mena et al. (1987) found that first-generation immigrants (Hispanics and Japanese Americans) reported higher levels of stress than U.S. born respondents. The internal reliability estimate of the 24-item SAFE has been good ($\alpha = .89$). For this study, the internal reliability for the SAFE–Total was good ($\alpha = .89$), with a mean total scale score of 52.09 ($SD = 14.90$), with a possible range of 24 to 120. In addition to the total scale score, three items from the SAFE that specifically addressed family acculturation conflicts—"My family does not want me to move away but I would like to," "It bothers me that family members I am close to do not understand my American values," and "Close family members and I have conflicting expectations about my future"—were summed together (SAFE–Family: $M = 7.56$, $SD = 3.04$, range = 3 to 15, $\alpha = .65$). The remaining 21 SAFE items also were summed together (SAFE–Other: $M = 44.63$, $SD = 13.15$, range = 21 to 105, $\alpha = .89$).

Procedure

Students were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses to participate in this study on the Asian American family. Participants received course credit for being a part of the study. The administration occurred outside of class in groups of 10 to 20 people by at least one of the authors. Participants completed a questionnaire packet that included demographic information (i.e., sex, age, ethnicity, generation status, school year, parents' marital status, and family income), the FCS, and the SAFE (Mena et al., 1987; Padilla et al., 1985).

Participants for the FCS stability analysis were enrolled in an introductory Asian American Studies course at a large, southwestern public university. Their participation was completely voluntary. Participants completed a brief two-page survey in class that included demographic information (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, generation status, school year, parents' marital status, and family income), and the FCS twice over a 3-week period.

Results

Psychometric Properties

The mean total score for FCS–Likelihood was 31.24 ($SD = 10.10$), with a possible range of 10–50 ($n = 178$). The mean total score for FCS–Seriousness was 30.01 ($SD = 10.07$), with a possible range of 10–50 ($n = 175$). The mean item score for each subscale was within the "sometimes" and "moderately" ranges, respectively. Table 1 presents each individual scale item's mean score and standard deviation. FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness had strong internal reliability with alpha coefficients of .89 and .91, respectively. FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness subscales were highly correlated with each other ($r = .74$).

Using a separate and smaller sample, we established test stability by examining the correlations of the FCS subscale scores over a 3-week period. The stability coefficients were high (FCS–Likelihood: $r = .80$; FCS–Seriousness: $r = .85$), suggesting that family acculturation conflicts are relatively stable across time.

Construct Validity

The FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness scores for each individual family situation were significantly corre-

Table 1

Study 1: FCS Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Individual Item Correlations With SAFE–Family

Family situation items	FCS–Likelihood			FCS–Seriousness		
	M	SD	r	M	SD	r
Decision making	3.30	1.30	.30***	3.04	1.25	.44***
Social life	3.33	1.45	.42***	3.17	1.38	.45***
Academic expectation	3.45	1.41	.24***	3.17	1.35	.23*
Personal vs. family interest	2.82	1.31	.40***	2.84	1.26	.36***
Comparison to others	3.47	1.42	.44***	3.28	1.35	.42***
Showing love	2.73	1.46	.38***	2.63	1.34	.34***
Avoiding shame/saving face	3.14	1.44	.46***	3.05	1.38	.43***
Proper Asian behavior	2.99	1.44	.50***	2.87	1.29	.52***
Expressing opinion	3.12	1.43	.33***	3.07	1.35	.36***
Respect for elders	2.82	1.52	.20*	2.93	1.44	.22*
SAFE–Total[a]			.38***			.30***
SAFE–Family[b]			.53***			.52***
SAFE–Other[c]			.32***			.22*

Note. n for FCS–Likelihood = 169. n for FCS–Seriousness = 166. FCS = Asian American Family Conflicts Scale; SAFE = Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental Acculturation Stress Scale.

[a]SAFE–Total was correlated with the total scores for both FCS subscales. [b]SAFE–Family refers to three family conflict items from the SAFE scale that were summed and correlated with the total scores for both FCS subscales. [c]SAFE–Other refers to the remaining 21 nonfamily conflict items from the SAFE scale that were summed and correlated with the total scores for both FCS subscales.
*p < .01. ***p < .001.

lated with the total score of the three family conflict items from the SAFE (see Table 1). Both FCS subscale total scores also were significantly correlated with SAFE–Total, SAFE–Family, and SAFE–Other. As expected, the FCS was more strongly correlated with SAFE–Family (r = .52–.53) than SAFE–Other (r = .22–.32), providing convergent and discriminant construct validity.

We performed confirmatory factor analysis, using EQS (Bentler, 1992), on independent measurement models for FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness to examine for construct validity. Separate measurement models were tested because each subscale uses the same items, thus making a two-factor correlated measurement model impractical. We initially estimated start values using the procedure described by Byrne (1994) to set the largest exogenous indicator at 1.0. The data were found to fit very well with both measurement models. The goodness-of-fit indices for FCS–Likelihood were $\chi^2(35, N = 178) = 56.48$, $p < .01$, with Bentler–Bonett normed fit index = .93, Bentler–Bonett nonnormed fit index = .96, and comparative fit index = .97. The goodness-of-fit indices for FCS–Seriousness were $\chi^2(35, N = 175) = 83.78$, $p < .001$, with Bentler–Bonett normed fit index = .91, Bentler–Bonett nonnormed fit index = .93, and comparative fit index = .95. Given the strong initial fit, no statistical modifications were made to the measurement models.

Study 2: Validation of FCS

The purpose of this study was to provide additional construct validation, as well as concurrent and criterion validation of the FCS. First, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted on a second independent sample of Asian

American college students to cross-validate the measurement models of both FCS subscales. Second, it was expected that the FCS would be positively correlated with years lived in the United States and greater identification with the Western culture (Lee, 1997; Uba, 1994). It was expected to be negatively correlated with family income and parents' levels of education (Berry & Sam, 1997; Sluzki, 1979). Third, the theoretical assumption that the FCS also measures the acculturation gap between parents and children was tested more directly by examining the interaction between children's levels of acculturation and perceptions of their parents' level of acculturation (Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993; Ying, 1998a). Students who report a high level of acculturation and perceive their parents' level of acculturation as low were hypothesized to report the highest amount of family conflict, whereas students who report a low level of acculturation and perceive their parents' level of acculturation as low were hypothesized to report the least amount of family conflict.

Fourth, although Study 1 revealed the FCS to be related more to family acculturation conflicts than other types of acculturative stress, it might be argued that the 10 family situations that compose the FCS reflect only intergenerational conflicts typical in most American families. To further test the FCS as a measure of acculturation conflict as opposed to strictly a measure of intergenerational conflict, we examined group differences on the FCS by generation, ethnicity, language, and gender for criterion validity. We hypothesized that there would be ethnic group differences on the FCS, given that past research has found certain Asian groups (e.g., Southeast Asians and Filipinos) to have high levels of family acculturation conflicts (Chambon, 1989;

Rumbaut, 1994; Ying & Chao, 1996). We hypothesized that first-generation immigrant children would report greater likelihood and seriousness of family conflicts than second-generation children, because the acculturation gap between these parents and children is likely to be greatest among recent immigrants (Conner, 1974; Nah, 1993; Sluzki, 1979). Families in which parents and children spoke in different languages to each other were also hypothesized to report greater likelihood and seriousness of family conflict. We also hypothesized that women would report greater likelihood and seriousness of family conflicts, given the typically stricter parental attitudes toward daughters (Uba, 1994). Furthermore, to confirm the FCS was specifically related to the acculturation gap between parents and children as opposed to only a generation gap, we hypothesized that acculturation levels rather than generation status would fully account for these group differences in family acculturation conflicts.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 153 Asian American college students (41 men, 109 women, and 3 unidentified) enrolled at a large, public West Coast university. The average age was 19.79 years ($SD = 1.52$), with a range from 17 to 24 years. The ethnic breakdown was 50 Chinese, 20 Filipino, 21 Vietnamese, 13 Japanese, 9 Korean, 7 Indian, 6 Hmong/Mien, 2 Laotian, 2 Cambodian, 20 biracial, and 3 unidentified. Regarding generation status, 81 were first-generation immigrants; 51 were second-generation; and 21 were third or more generations. The estimated median family income was between $25,000 and $50,000. Regarding family data, 86% of the participants reported that their parents were married; 9%, divorced; 1%, separated; and 4%, widowed. In addition, 37% of the sample reported that their parents speak to them in English, whereas 63% of the parents reportedly speak to their children in their native Asian language. By contrast, 53% of the sample reported speaking to their parents in English, and 47% spoke to their parents in their native Asian language.

Instruments

Modified Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans–II (ARSMA–II). ARSMA–II was originally developed for Mexican Americans by Cuellar, Arnold, and Maldonado (1995). The 30-item scale consists of two subscales that measure one's cultural orientation to the Mexican (17 items) and Anglo cultures (13 items). The items address language usage, ethnic identity and classification, cultural heritage and behaviors, and ethnic interaction. Respondents rate the items using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *extremely often*) with higher scores representing a greater cultural orientation to either Mexican or Anglo culture. The internal reliabilities for the subscales have been found to be good ($\alpha = .86$–.88; Cuellar et al., 1995). The utility of the ARSMA–II has been praised by ethnic minority researchers because of its flexibility as both a unidimensional and a multidimensional measurement of acculturation. Although the measure has not been used in published studies on Asian Americans, careful review of the items revealed easy modification for other ethnic and racial populations (e.g., changing the term *Mexican* to *Asian*, and changing Spanish language to Asian language; I. Cuellar, personal communication, 1997). Furthermore, this modification is consistent with Suinn,

Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, and Virgil's (1987) modifications of the original ARSMA for use with Asian Americans (Dana, 1998). For this study, the mean scores were 58.45 ($SD = 10.90$), with a range of 17 to 85, for Asian orientation, 50.18 ($SD = 5.63$), with a range of 13 to 65, for Western orientation, 108.63 ($SD = 10.17$), with a range of 30 to 150, for the total scale score. The internal reliability for the Modified ARSMA–II was adequate to good (Asian orientation $\alpha = .87$, Western orientation $\alpha = .74$, total score $\alpha = .87$). In addition to the two separate cultural orientation scores, a unidimensional acculturation score was obtained by reverse scoring the Asian orientation items and calculating a total score of all items. The higher score represents higher acculturation to the majority culture (Cuellar et al., 1995).

Perceived Parents' Acculturation Index. Because of the absence of self-report data from the parents, only perceived parents' level of acculturation could be obtained for this study. Two items were developed to broadly assess children's perception of parents' level of acculturation. Similar to Cuellar et al.'s (1995) approach toward measuring individual acculturation, the items we used assessed the degree to which parents are perceived to be culturally traditional and mainstream. The items were "Rate your perception of how traditional (or Asian) your parents are in their attitudes and behaviors" and "Rate your perception of how mainstream (or Western) your parents are in their attitudes and behaviors." Respondents rate their perceptions using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *extremely often*). This single-item approach to measuring parents' level of acculturation has been used in past research and been found to be related to overall family functioning (Dinh, Sarason, & Sarason, 1996). Similar to the scoring of the ARSMA–II, a unidimensional acculturation score was obtained by reverse scoring the Asian orientation values and calculating a total score of all items ($M = 5.54$, $SD = 1.54$, range = 2–10). The higher score represents higher acculturation to the majority culture. For this study, the two items were significantly correlated with each other ($r = -.48$) and other indicators of acculturation. For example, perceived parents' Asian orientation was negatively correlated with income ($r = -.29$), father's educational level ($r = -.32$), and mother's educational level ($r = -.22$). Perceived parents' Western orientation was positively correlated with income ($r = .31$), father's educational level ($r = .35$), and mother's educational level ($r = .32$).

Multi-Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM). The MEIM was developed by Phinney (1992) to broadly measure ethnic identity across four major identity dimensions (identity achievement, belonging, ethnic behaviors, and other group orientations) in high school and college students, including Asian Americans, Hispanics, African Americans, and European Americans. The 23-item scale is rated with a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*) with higher scores representing greater group identification. Scale items include "I am happy that I am a member of the [ethnic] group I belong to" (belonging), "I have spent time trying to find out more about my own ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs" (identity), "I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group" (behavior), and "I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own" (other group). The scale has been correlated with general self-esteem (Phinney, 1992), acculturation using the ARSMA–II (Cuellar, Nyberg, Maldonado, & Roberts, 1997), and interethnic relations (Mack et al., 1997) for college students. Past internal reliability estimates for the MEIM were .90 (MEIM–total), .86 (MEIM–belonging), .80 (MEIM–identity), and .74 (MEIM–other) (Phinney, 1992). Phinney did not calculate the alpha coefficient for the MEIM–behavior because it contains only 2 items. For this study, the mean scores were 43.00 ($SD = 7.78$), with a range of 14 to 56, for MEIM total score, 16.77

(SD = 3.28), with a range of 5 to 20, for MEIM–belonging, 20.59 (SD = 4.01), with a range of 7 to 28, for MEIM–identity, and 19.76 (SD = 3.40), with a range of 6 to 24, for MEIM–other. The internal reliability estimates for this sample, excluding the MEIM–behavior which was not used in this study, were adequate to good (MEIM–total α = .89, MEIM–belonging α = .88, MEIM–identity α = .76, and MEIM–other α = .76).

Procedure

Students were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses to participate in this study on the Asian American family. Participants received course credit for being a part of the study. The administration (by at least one of the authors) occurred outside of class in groups of 10 to 20 people. Participants completed a questionnaire packet that included demographic information (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, generation status, school year, parents' marital status, family income, and primary language spoken at home), FCS, the ARSMA–II (revised for Asian Americans; Cuellar et al., 1995), Perceived Parents' Acculturation Index, and the MEIM (Phinney, 1992).

Results

Reliability

Similar to Study 1, the observed mean scores for FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness were 31.72 (SD = 7.66) and 28.14 (SD = 7.43), respectively. Cronbach's alpha coefficients also were calculated to confirm the initial internal reliability estimates from Study 1. FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness had good internal reliability with alpha coefficients of .81 and .84, respectively. Furthermore, FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness were moderately correlated with each other (r = .49).

Cross-Validation

Confirmatory factor analysis, with EQS (Bentler, 1992), was performed on independent measurement models for

FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness to cross-validate the measurement models. As in Study 1, start values were initially estimated with the procedure described by Byrne (1994) to set the largest exogenous indicator at 1.0. The data were found to fit very well with both measurement models. The goodness-of-fit indices for FCS–Likelihood were $\chi^2(35, N = 153) = 51.96$, $p < .01$, with Bentler–Bonett normed fit index = .88, Bentler–Bonett nonnormed fit index = .94, and comparative fit index = .96. The goodness-of-fit indices for FCS–Seriousness were $\chi^2(35, N = 153) = 55.59$, $p < .001$, with Bentler–Bonett normed fit index = .89, Bentler–Bonett nonnormed fit index = .94, and comparative fit index = .96. Given the strong initial fit, no statistical modifications were made to the measurement models.

Concurrent Validity

A series of Pearson product–moment correlations were calculated between FCS and four demographic items and eight cultural orientation variables to establish the concurrent validity (see Table 2). FCS–Likelihood was significantly correlated with 6 of the 12 variables. FCS–Seriousness was significantly correlated with 2 of the 12 variables. More specifically, socioeconomic status (i.e., family income level and fathers' level of education) was positively related with FCS–Likelihood but not with FCS–Seriousness. FCS–Likelihood also was positively correlated with participants' Asian orientation and parents' Asian orientation, but negatively correlated with parents' Western orientation. FCS–Seriousness was positively correlated with participants' Western orientation and identification with non-Asians.

Criterion Validity

Initial criterion validity was demonstrated by testing the acculturation gap hypothesis for family conflicts. If the FCS

Table 2
Study 2: FCS Correlations With Demographic and Cultural Orientation Variables

	FCS subscales			
Variable	Likelihood	Seriousness	M (SD)	n
Demographic				
Number of years in United States	−.12	.03	1982 (3.76)[a]	81[b]
Family income level	−.31***	−.07	$50–75,000	150
Fathers' education level (avg: college)	−.34***	−.01		153
Mothers' education level (avg: high school)	−.20**	.05		152
Cultural orientation				
Participants' Asian orientation	.22**	.01	58.65 (11.41)	127
Participants' Western orientation	−.02	.19*	50.01 (5.76)	142
Parents' Asian orientation	.35***	.15	3.47 (0.91)	153
Parents' Western orientation	−.36***	−.02	3.00 (0.88)	153
Ethnic identity–total score	.05	.08	43.01 (7.78)	153
Ethnic identity–belonging	.01	.02	16.77 (3.23)	153
Ethnic identity–identification	.05	.14	20.59 (4.01)	153
Ethnic identity–other	.07	.24**	19.76 (3.39)	153

Note. FCS = Asian American Family Conflicts Scale.
[a]Year of immigration. [b]Immigrant sample only.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

measures family conflicts that are attributable to the acculturation gap between parents and children, then the interaction effect between children's level of acculturation and perceived parents' level of acculturation on both FCS subscales should be significant. To test this hypothesis, we used a hierarchical multiple regression with the main effects of children's and parents' unidimensional scores on acculturation entered in Step 1 and the interaction effect of these two variables entered in Step 2 of the equation. This procedure allows for the testing of interactions by partialing out any main effects (Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

For FCS–Likelihood, perceived parents' level of acculturation had a significant main effect, $R^2 = 17\%$; $B = -1.99$; $\beta = -.40$; $F(2, 150) = 24.86$, $p < .001$, whereas children's level of acculturation had no significant main effect. When the interaction effect of children's level of acculturation by perceived parents' level of acculturation was entered into the regression equation at Step 2, it uniquely and significantly accounted for an additional 3% of the variance, $R^2 = 20\%$; $B = -1.62$; $\beta = -1.38$; $F(3, 149) = 4.71$, $p < .05$. To identify the direction of the interaction, we used a mean split procedure on the two independent variables to plot the interaction effect. Consistent with the hypothesis, higher acculturated children with higher perceived acculturated parents—the group with the smallest acculturation gap—were less likely to report family conflict than other parent–child interactions ($M = 28.74$ vs. 31.86–33.74). No significant main or interaction effects were found for FCS–Seriousness.

Criterion validity also was established by examining other group differences on FCS. Group differences on FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness by ethnicity, generation status, language usage in the home, and gender were tested by a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs). In order to control for familywise Type I error in these analyses, we adjusted the alpha level using the Bonferroni procedure ($.05 \div 4 = .013$). One-way ANOVAs revealed significant differences on FCS–Likelihood by ethnicity, generation, and language usage, but not by gender. No significant differences were found on FCS–Seriousness by any of the group variables. First-generation participants ($M = 33.22$) reported significantly higher scores on FCS–Likelihood than U.S.-born participants ($M = 29.75$), $F(1, 144) = 7.71$, $p < .01$. There was a significant difference on FCS–Likelihood across some ethnic groups, $F(7, 143) = 4.88$, $p < .01$. A Scheffé post hoc analysis revealed that Japanese American children reported significantly less family conflicts ($n = 13$, $M = 23.08$) than Filipino ($n = 20$, $M = 32.70$), Vietnamese ($n = 21$, $M = 35.43$), Southeast Asian (Hmong, JuMien, Cambodian, and Laotian, $n = 10$, $M = 35.80$), and biracial Asian American ($n = 17$, $M = 33.24$) children. There was no significant difference between Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans ($n = 50$, $M = 30.40$) and Korean Americans ($n = 9$, $M = 30.28$). Furthermore, a one-way ANOVA with Scheffé post hoc analysis revealed that families in which parents and children speak to each other in their native Asian language reported higher FCS–Likelihood scores ($M = 34.18$) than families in which parents and children speak in English ($M = 28.55$), but not more than families in which only

children speak in English ($M = 31.46$), $F(2, 143) = 8.67$, $p < .001$.

To confirm that FCS–Likelihood reflected acculturation differences between parents and children, in addition to the generational gap, we hypothesized that acculturation levels rather than generation status would fully account for the group differences found on the FCS–Likelihood. A series of analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) were performed with generation level, ethnicity, and language usage as the independent variables. The first ANCOVA examined generation differences on FCS–Likelihood after covarying the interaction between participants' and their parents' acculturation levels as a measure of the acculturation gap. Generation status no longer had a significant main effect on FCS–Likelihood. However, consistent with the acculturation gap hypothesis, the interaction effect between participants' and parents' acculturation levels was significant, $F(1, 142) = 24.47$, $p < .001$. The second ANCOVA examined group differences on FCS–Likelihood by language usage after covarying both generation status and the interaction between participants' and parents' acculturation levels. Language usage no longer had a significant main effect on FCS–Likelihood, but the interaction between participants' and parents' acculturation levels was significant, $F(1, 133) = 12.89$, $p < .001$. Generation status as a covariate did not have a significant effect. The third ANCOVA examined group differences on FCS–Likelihood by ethnicity after covarying generation status and the interaction between participants' and parents' acculturation levels. Ethnicity still had a significant main effect on FCS–Likelihood, even after covarying generation status and the interaction between participants' and parents' acculturation levels, $F(7, 132) = 3.61$, $p < .001$. The interaction between participants' and parents' acculturation levels, however, had a stronger main effect on FCS–Likelihood than ethnicity, $F(1, 132) = 19.67$, $p < .001$. Generation status, on the other hand, did not have a significant effect.

Study 3: Further Validation of FCS–Likelihood

The results from the first two studies suggest that the FCS represents a reliable and valid measure of Asian American family conflicts. At the same time, it was determined that FCS–Likelihood was a better measure of both parent–child intergenerational and acculturation conflicts than FCS–Seriousness. This decision was based on two important points that emerged from the refinement of the measure. First, from a theoretical perspective, it is reasonable to assume that a high amount of family conflict (on the basis of FCS–Likelihood scores) is a serious problem regardless of whether the participant subjectively reports that the conflicts are serious problems (on the basis of FCS–Seriousness scores). Even if late adolescents and young adults downplay the seriousness of family conflicts, the conflicts likely will have negative effects on overall family functioning, as indicated by the high intercorrelation between FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness ($r = .49$–$.74$; Chen et al., 1998; Fuligni, 1998). Second, criterion validity was evident only with FCS–Likelihood and not FCS–Seriousness. This

discrepancy between FCS subscales suggests FCS–Likelihood more accurately measures the underlying construct of Asian American family conflicts. Given these considerations in the refinement of the FCS, the purpose of Study 3 was to provide validation for only FCS–Likelihood. FCS–Likelihood was hypothesized to be moderately correlated with family cohesion and flexibility and the quality of parent–child communications—important aspects of family functioning. In addition, we examined criterion validity for FCS–Likelihood by looking at group differences across four family types (balanced, moderately balanced, moderately unbalanced, and unbalanced). We hypothesized that balanced families would report lower FCS–Likelihood scores than unbalanced families.

Method

Sample

The sample consisted of 109 Asian American college students (49 men and 60 women) enrolled at a large, public southwestern university. The average age was 20.14 years ($SD = 4.26$) with a range from 16 to 52 years. The ethnic breakdown was 43 Chinese, 10 Filipino, 19 Vietnamese, 1 Japanese, 11 Korean, 20 Indian, 8 Taiwanese, 3 biracial, and 5 undisclosed. Regarding generation status, 49 were first-generation immigrants, 44 were second-generation, 12 were international, and 4 were third or more generations. The estimated median family income was between $40,000 and $60,000. Regarding family data, 22% of the sample reported that their parents speak to them in their native Asian language but that the children speak to their parents in English, 48% of the parents and children reportedly speak to each other in their native Asian language, and 29% of the parents and children reportedly speak to each other in English.

Instruments

Family Adaptation and Cohesion Evaluation Scales II (FACES–II). The 30-item FACES–II is a self-report measure developed by Olson and colleagues (Olson, Portner, & Bell, 1982; Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979), to measure two aspects of family functioning—family cohesion and family adaptability. The family cohesion subscale (FACES–Cohesion) measures the degree to which family members are separated from or connected to their family. The family flexibility subscale (FACES–Flexibility) measures the degree to which the family system is flexible and able to change. The FACES–Cohesion and FACES–Flexibility subscales consist of 16 and 14 items, respectively, and are rated along a 5-point scale (1 = *almost never* to 5 = *almost always*). Higher scale scores on the FACES reflect greater cohesion and flexibility in family relationships, respectively. A sample FACES–Cohesion item is "Family members feel very close to each other." A sample FACES–Flexibility item is "Family members say what they want." The scale is one of the most widely used instruments for family research and has been used on diverse samples, including Asian Americans (Gorall & Olson, 1995). In the initial validation study on over 2,000 people, the internal reliability estimates for the two scales ranged from .86–.88 for FACES–Cohesion to .78–.79 for FACES–Flexibility. Test–retest reliability over a 4- to 5-week period was .83 and .80 for the two respective scales. The mean scores for adolescents were 56.30 ($SD = 9.20$) for FACES–Cohesion and 45.40 ($SD = 7.90$) for FACES–Flexibility. For this study on late adolescent and young adult college students, the mean scores for the FACES–Cohesion and FACES–Flexibility subscales were 54.24 ($SD = 11.54$) out of a range from 16 to 80 and 42.58

($SD = 8.91$) out of a range from 14 to 70, respectively. The alpha coefficients for each subscale were .84 and .91, respectively. In addition to family cohesion and flexibility scores, the scale can be used to create four types of families (balanced, moderately balanced, midrange, and unbalanced) by summing the total scores for each scale and dividing by 2. This family type score is recommended as a complement to the continuous scores. For this study, the family typology was used as a criterion reference for the validation of the FCS–Likelihood subscale.

Parent and Adolescent Communication Scales (PAC). The 20-item PAC is a self-report measure that was developed by Barnes and Olson (1982) as a companion measure to the FACES. It is designed to measure both positive and negative aspects of communication between parents (mother and father) and adolescents. The PAC consists of two separate scales, each with 20 items, that the adolescent answers independently using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) in regards to his or her relationship with mother and father. Each scale consists of two subscales that were derived from factor analysis. The Open Family Communication subscale (PAC–Open) measures the free and satisfying exchange of information and emotion, as well as understanding, between parent and child. Higher scores on PAC–Open reflect greater openness in communication. The Problems in Family Communication subscale (PAC–Closed) measures communication between parent and child that is characterized by a hesitancy to share and caution in what is discussed. Higher scores on the PAC–Closed reflect greater difficulty in communication. The internal reliability estimates for the two subscales have consistently been .87 (PAC–Open) and .78 (PAC–Closed) on over 1,800 people. For this study, the mean total scores for mother–child communication were 35.71 ($SD = 9.27$; PAC–Open) and 30.11 ($SD = 7.36$; PAC–Closed). The mean scores for father–child communication were 32.07 ($SD = 10.01$; PAC–Open) and 29.41 ($SD = 7.39$; PAC–Closed). The alpha coefficients for mother's PAC–Open was .92 and for PAC–Closed was .78. The alpha coefficients for father's PAC–Open was .93 and for PAC–Closed was .77. It is important to note that the name of one of the subscales was changed from "problems in family communication" to "closed communication" in respect of the cultural differences in what is considered "positive" and "negative" communication.

Procedure

Students were recruited from undergraduate educational psychology and psychology courses to participate in this study on the Asian American family. Participants received course credit for being a part of the study. The administration (by graduate research assistants) occurred outside of class in groups of 10 to 20 people. Participants completed a questionnaire packet that included demographic information (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, generation status, and school year), FCS, and FACES–II (Olson et al., 1979, 1982), and PAC (Barnes & Olson, 1982).

Results

For this study, the FCS–Likelihood mean score was 27.39 ($SD = 9.44$) which is slightly lower than in Studies 1 and 2 (31.24 and 31.72, respectively). The internal reliability estimate (Cronbach's alpha) for FCS–Likelihood was .89, which is consistent with the estimates from Studies 1 and 2.

Concurrent Validity

A series of Pearson product–moment correlations were calculated between FCS–Likelihood, FACES–II, and PAC

to demonstrate concurrent validity. FCS–Likelihood was significantly correlated with each measure in the expected direction. That is, FCS–Likelihood was negatively correlated with FACES–Flexibility ($r = -.38$), FACES–Cohesion ($r = -.38$), Mother's PAC–Open ($r = -.40$), and Father's PAC–Open ($r = -.41$). FCS–Likelihood was positively correlated with Mother's PAC–Closed ($r = .42$) and Father's PAC–Closed ($r = .41$).

Criterion Validity

Using FACES–II scores, we categorized participants into one of four family types. These family types represent the degree of balance between cohesion and adaptability in the family structure. For this sample, 6 Asian American students were classified as from balanced families ($M = 16.00$, $SD = 2.97$), 22 were classified as from moderately balanced families ($M = 25.00$, $SD = 8.31$), 39 were classified as from moderately unbalanced families ($M = 26.77$, $SD = 8.49$), and 38 were classified as from unbalanced families ($M = 32.53$, $SD = 8.29$). A one-way ANOVA found significant differences among the four family types on FCS–Likelihood, $F(3, 101) = 9.43$, $p < .001$. A Bonferroni post hoc analysis revealed that, as hypothesized, Asian Americans from unbalanced families reported the highest amount of family conflict compared with the three other groups. Asian Americans from moderately unbalanced families also had significantly higher family conflicts than Asian Americans from balanced families.

Discussion

The FCS was developed specifically for Asian American adolescents and young adults and consists of 10 family situations that are rated for likelihood of conflict and seriousness of problem (i.e., FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness). The 10 family situations were intended to reflect disagreements in values and practices between U.S.-raised children and their Asian immigrant parents. Although these situations may reflect intergenerational conflicts, it was expected that the acculturation gap between Asian American children and parents compounds the existing intergenerational differences, resulting in higher Likelihood and Seriousness scores. The results from these three studies suggest that FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness are indeed reliable and stable measures of typical family conflicts. The mean scores on FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness indicate that among college samples of Asian American late adolescents and young adults family conflicts occur "sometimes" and are "moderately" serious as problems. Furthermore, FCS–Likelihood appears to capture family conflicts attributable, in part, to acculturation differences.

FCS–Likelihood demonstrated initial convergent and discriminant validity by its moderate correlation with family-based acculturative stress ($r = .53$), in comparison with its smaller correlation with society- and environment-based acculturative stress ($r = .32$). FCS–Likelihood also was related to perceived differences in acculturation between children and parents. That is, high-acculturated Asian American children who perceived their parents to be less acculturated reported more frequent conflict than high-acculturated children with high-acculturated parents. Additional criterion validity for FCS–Likelihood was evidenced by mean score differences among ethnic groups, immigrant and U.S.-born children, and families that spoke only English or their native Asian language. These findings suggest that FCS–Likelihood also is measuring acculturation in addition to intergenerational differences. For example, if FCS–Likelihood was measuring only intergenerational conflict, then there should not have been any difference between U.S.-born and immigrant children on FCS–Likelihood because both groups are from the same generation (i.e., born between 1972 and 1979). Moreover, the perceived acculturation gap, rather than generation status, explained the group differences by language usage and, to a lesser degree, ethnicity.

FCS–Seriousness also was moderately correlated with family-based acculturative stress ($r = .52$), but it failed to demonstrate adequate concurrent or criterion-related validity as a measure of family acculturation conflict. FCS–Seriousness appears to measure the seriousness of family conflicts regardless of acculturation differences. That is, although the likelihood for family conflicts may be partially attributable to acculturation differences, the seriousness of the conflicts is independent of whether they are due to acculturation differences. This explanation accounts for the high correlation between FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness ($r = .49–.74$) but the lack of group differences on FCS–Seriousness. Additional validation research on FCS–Seriousness is warranted in order to better understand its function.

Given the difference in validity findings for FCS–Likelihood and FCS–Seriousness, we decided to investigate further only FCS–Likelihood as a specific measure of Asian American family conflict. In the final validation study, Asian American adolescents and young adults from more balanced families, defined as family relationships that are cohesive yet flexible, reported fewer family conflicts than Asian Americans from unbalanced families. Interestingly, only 6 Asian Americans were classified as from very balanced families compared with 38 from extremely unbalanced families. Additionally, Asian American children from families with open, two-way communication patterns reported the least likelihood of family conflicts, whereas children from families with hierarchical communication patterns reported the greatest likelihood of family conflicts.

In general, these validity findings on the FCS are consistent with the literature and research on Asian American families. For example, recent Asian immigrants, as a whole, tend to experience more acculturative stress than families born or raised primarily in the United States (Hurh & Kim, 1990). The acculturation gap between immigrant children and their parents is also likely to be much greater than in U.S.-born families, because acculturation occurs at a much more rapid pace for children than adults upon arrival to a new country. It therefore makes sense that immigrant families, such as Southeast Asian Americans, reported higher likelihood of family conflicts compared with U.S.-

born families, such as Japanese Americans who have lived in the United States for multiple generations (Min, 1995; Rumbaut, 1994). Numerous scholars have also noted that Asian immigrant families tend to have closed communication patterns, rigid hierarchical relationships, and limited quality time between parents and children (Drachman, Kwon-Ahn, & Paulino, 1996; Ying, 1994; Uba, 1994). Although this communication style and family structure is typical in many immigrant families, it presents a cultural dilemma for the U.S.-raised children who seek to have their autonomy (Fuligni, 1998). The inability to communicate their needs and expectations, compounded by a rigid family structure, exacerbates the changing family dynamics, resulting in more family acculturation conflicts. This was most evident in Study 3, where the majority of Asian Americans were from unbalanced families and reported the greatest likelihood of family conflicts.

For now we recommend that only FCS–Likelihood be used for research on Asian American family conflicts. However, FCS–Likelihood as an exclusive measure of family acculturation conflicts must be studied further to assess the degree of overlap between acculturation and intergenerational differences. One way to determine whether FCS–Likelihood uniquely measures acculturation conflict is to administer the scale to a diverse sample of Asian Americans and European Americans. If both samples present comparable scores on FCS–Likelihood, then the scale likely measures only intergenerational differences; otherwise, higher scores for Asian Americans suggest the scale taps into acculturation differences. Another approach would be to modify FCS–Likelihood for parents and administer it along with a measure of acculturation to parents. FCS–Likelihood ratings by both parents and children could then be compared while controlling for acculturation levels. This sort of multimethod validation approach is particularly recommended when developing any new psychometric instrument (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). In the end, however, it may be difficult to statistically tease apart acculturation and intergenerational differences because they are not mutually exclusive.

Additional research is necessary to confirm the reliability and validity of FCS–Likelihood. For example, a limited sample of only 11 college students completed the FCS–Likelihood twice over a 3-week period. It may be that self-reports of family acculturation conflicts fluctuate over time as a result of recent family contact, mood, or other life changes. Given these potential variations in conflict over time, a larger and more diverse sample over a longer period of time is necessary to establish the stability of the scale. It also is recommended that the FCS–Likelihood be validated on a younger, high school-age population because family acculturation conflicts begin at an earlier time than college (Gil et al., 1994; Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993).

Finally and contingent on additional validation studies, FCS–Likelihood may eventually be useful in assessing at-risk Asian American families that are in need of specific psychotherapeutic intervention (e.g., Szapocznik & Kurtines, 1993; Ying, 1998b). This potential clinical utility of the FCS–Likelihood is buttressed by the demographic shifts

in the United States. The Asian and Pacific Islander population has had the greatest growth rate of any racial or ethnic group in the United States over the last decade and is poised to reach over 12 million by 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996). It is thus imperative that more culturally sensitive instruments are developed for Asian Americans. The FCS–Likelihood represents the first specific measure of acculturative stress within the family developed exclusively for Asian Americans.

References

Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barnes, H., & Olson, D. H. (1982). *Parent-adolescent communication.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota at St. Paul.

Bentler, P. M. (1992). *EQS: Structural equations program manual.* Los Angeles: BMDP Statistical Software.

Berry, J. W., & Sam, D. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 291–326). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Byrne, B. M. (1994). *Structural equation modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows: Basic concepts, applications, and programming.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cervantes, R. C., Padilla, A. M., & Salgado de Snyder, N. (1990). Reliability and validity of the Hispanic Stress Inventory. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 12,* 76–82.

Cervantes, R. C., Padilla, A. M., & Salgado de Snyder, N. (1991). The Hispanic Stress Inventory: A culturally relevant approach to psychosocial assessment. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 3,* 438–447.

Chambon, A. (1989). Refugee families' experiences: Three family themes—family disruption, violent trauma, and acculturation. *Journal of Strategic and Systemic Therapies, 8,* 3–13.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child Development, 65,* 1111–1119.

Chen, C., Greenberger, E., Lester, J., Dong, Q., & Guo, M.-S. (1998). A cross-cultural study of family and peer correlates of adolescent misconduct. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 770–781.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Conner, J. W. (1974). Acculturation and family continuities in three generations of Japanese Americans. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 36,* 159–165.

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans–II: A revision of the original ARSMA Scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17,* 275–304.

Cuellar, I., Nyberg, B., Maldonado, R. E., & Roberts, R. E. (1997). Ethnic identity and acculturation in a young adult Mexican-origin population. *Journal of Community Psychology, 25,* 535–549.

Dana, R. H. (1998). Cultural identity assessment of culturally diverse groups: 1997. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 70,* 1–16.

Dinh, K. T., Sarason, B. R., & Sarason, I. G. (1994). Parent–child relationships in Vietnamese immigrant families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 8,* 471–488.

Dinh, K. T., Sarason, B. R., & Sarason, I. G. (1996, August). *Parent–child relationships and acculturation conflict in Asian*

American families. Paper presented at the 104th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Drachman, D., Kwon-Ahn, Y. H., & Paulino, A. (1996, December). Migration and resettlement experiences of Dominican and Korean families. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 626–638.

Fuertes, J. N., & Westbrook, F. D. (1996). Using the Social, Attitudinal, Familial, and Environmental (S.A.F.E.) Acculturation Stress Scale to assess the adjustment needs of Hispanic college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 29*, 67–76.

Fuligni, A. J. (1998). Authority, autonomy, and parent–adolescent conflict and cohesion: A study of adolescents from Mexican, Chinese, Filipino, and European backgrounds. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 782–792.

Gil, A. G., Vega, W. A., & Dimas, J. M. (1994). Acculturative stress and personal adjustment among Hispanic adolescent boys. *Journal of Community Psychology, 22*, 43–53.

Gorall, D. M., & Olson, D. H. (1995). Circumplex model of family systems: Integrating ethnic diversity and other social systems. In R. H. Mikesell, D. D. Lusterman, & S. H. McDanial (Eds.), *Integrating family therapy: Handbook of family psychology and systems theory*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gorman, J. C. (1998). Parenting attitudes and practices of immigrant Chinese mothers of adolescents. *Family Relations, 47*, 73–80.

Hurh, W. M., & Kim, K. C. (1990). Adaptation stages and mental health of Korean male immigrants in the United States. *International Migration Review, 24*, 456–479.

Kurtines, W. M., & Miranda, L. (1980). Differences in self and family role perception among acculturating Cuban-American college students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 4*, 167–184.

Landau, J. (1982). Therapy with families in cultural transition. In M. McGoldrick, J. K. Pearce, & J. Giordano (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 552–572). New York: Guilford Press.

Lee, E. (Ed.). (1997). *Working with Asian Americans: A guide for clinicians*. New York: Guilford Press.

Lerner, R. M., Karson, M., Meisels, M., & Knapp, J. (1975). Actual and perceived attitudes of late adolescents and their parents: The phenomenon of the generation gap. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 126*, 195–207.

Mack, D. E., Tucker, T. W., Archuleta, R., DeGroot, G., Hernandez, A. A., & Oh Cha, S. (1997). Interethnic relations on campus: Can't we all get along? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25*, 256–268.

McGoldrick, M., Giordano, J., & Pearce, J. K. (1996). *Ethnicity and family therapy*. New York: Guilford Press.

Mead, M. (1970). *Culture and commitment: A study of the generation gap*. London: Bodley Head.

Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M., & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 207–225.

Min, P. G. (Ed.). (1995). *Asian Americans: Contemporary trends and issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nah, K.-H. (1993). Perceived problems and service delivery for Korean immigrants. *Social Work, 38*, 289–296.

Nguyen, N. A., & Williams, H. L. (1989). Transition from East to West: Vietnamese adolescents and their parents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 28*, 505–515.

Olson, D. H., Portner, J., & Bell, R. Q. (1982). *FACES II: Family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota at St. Paul.

Olson, D. H., Sprenkle, D. H., & Russell, C. S. (1979). Circumplex model of marital and family systems: I. Cohesion and adaptability dimensions, family types, and clinical applications. *Family Process, 18*, 3–28.

Padilla, A., Wagatsuma, Y., & Lindholm, K. (1985). Acculturation and personality as predictors of stress in Japanese and Japanese Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology, 125*, 295–305.

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

Rumbaut, R. G. (1994). The crucible within: Ethnic identity, self-esteem, and segmented assimilation among children of immigrants. *International Migration Review, 28*, 748–794.

Shon, S. P., & Ja, D. Y. (1982). Asian families. In M. McGoldrick, J. K. Pearce, & J. Giordano (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 208–228). New York: Guilford Press.

Sluzki, C. (1979). Migration and family conflict. *Family Process, 18*, 379–390.

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

Sung, B. L. (1985). Bicultural conflicts in Chinese immigrant children. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 26*, 255–269.

Szapocznik, J., & Kurtines, W. M. (1993). Family psychology and cultural diversity: Opportunities for theory, research, and applications. *American Psychologist, 48*, 400–407.

Szapocznik, J., Santisteban, D., Kurtines, W., Perez-Vidal, A., & Hervis, O. (1984). Bicultural effectiveness treatment for enhancing intercultural adjustment in Cuban American families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 6*, 317–344.

Uba, L. (1994). *Asian Americans: Personality patterns, identity, and mental health*. New York: Guilford Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1996). *Statistical abstract of the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vega, W. A., Khoury, E. L., Zimmerman, R. S., Gil, A. G., & Warheit, G. J. (1995). Cultural conflicts and problem behaviors of Latino adolescents in home and school environments. *Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 167–179.

Yee, B. W. K., & Hennessy, S. T. (1982). Pacific/Asian American families and mental health. In F. U. Munoz & R. Endo (Eds.), *Perspectives on minority group mental health*. (pp. 53–70). Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Ying, Y.-W. (1994). Chinese American adults' relationship with their parents. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 40*, 53–70.

Ying, Y.-W. (1998a). Educational program for families on intergenerational conflict. In E. Kramer, S. Ivey, & Y. Ying (Eds.), *Immigrant women's health: Problems and solutions*. (pp. 282–294). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ying, Y.-W. (1998b). Strengthening intergenerational/intercultural ties in migrant families: A new intervention for parents. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 89–96.

Ying, Y.-W., & Chao, C. C. (1996). Intergenerational relationship in Iu Mien American families. *Amerasia Journal, 22*, 47–64.

Appendix

Asian American Family Conflicts Scale

The following statements are parent–child situations that may occur in families. Consider how likely each situation occurs in your *present* relationship with your parents and how serious these conflicts are. Read each situation and answer the following questions using the following rating scales:

How likely is this type of situation to occur in your family?

1	2	3	4	5
almost never	once in a while	sometimes	often or frequently	almost always

How serious a problem is this situation in your family?

1	2	3	4	5
not at all	slightly	moderately	very much	extremely

Family Situations	Likelihood	Seriousness
1. Your parents tell you what to do with your life, but you want to make your own decisions.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
2. Your parents tell you that a social life is not important at this age, but you think that it is.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
3. You have done well in school, but your parents' academic expectations always exceed your performance.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
4. Your parents want you to sacrifice personal interests for the sake of the family, but you feel this is unfair.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
5. Your parents always compare you to others, but you want them to accept you for being yourself.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
6. Your parents argue that they show you love by housing, feeding, and educating you, but you wish they would show more physical and verbal signs of affection.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
7. Your parents don't want you to bring shame upon the family, but you feel that your parents are too concerned with saving face.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
8. Your parents expect you to behave like a proper Asian male or female, but you feel your parents are being too traditional.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
9. You want to state your opinion, but your parents consider it to be disrespectful to talk back.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5
10. Your parents demand that you always show respect for elders, but you believe in showing respect only if they deserve it.	1....2....3....4....5	1....2....3....4....5

Note. Permission to use the Asian American Family Conflicts Scale must be obtained from Richard M. Lee.