

## ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIPS OF RACIAL  
IDENTITY AND GENDER-ROLE CONFLICT  
TO SELF-ESTEEM OF ASIAN AMERICAN  
UNDERGRADUATE MEN

Yen Ling Shek, M.A., 2005

Thesis Directed By: Marylu K. McEwen, Ph.D., Associate Professor,  
Counseling and Personnel Services

The purpose of this quantitative, correlational, online study was to examine the relationships of racial identity and gender-role conflict to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men ( $N = 173$ ). Instruments included the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, Gender-Role Conflict Scale, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and a demographic questionnaire. Random samples were drawn from two large public research institutions on the East and West coasts. The two samples were combined because there were no significant differences in self-esteem by location of institution. Through blocked, hierarchical multiple regression analysis, 36.8% of the variance in self-esteem ( $p < .001$ ) was explained by gender-role conflict subscales and racial identity statuses. Three subscales were found to be significant ( $p < .05$ ) predictors of self-esteem: Restrictive Emotionality, Dissonance, and Internalization. Implications were that mature racial identity development and critical analysis of traditional gender-roles were important for the development of self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men.

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF RACIAL IDENTITY AND  
GENDER-ROLE CONFLICT TO SELF-ESTEEM OF  
ASIAN AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE MEN

By

Yen Ling Shek

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts  
2005

Advisory Committee:  
Associate Professor Marylu K. McEwen, Chair  
Assistant Professor Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas  
Affiliate Assistant Professor Lisa Kiely

© Copyright by  
Yen Ling Shek  
2005

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my grandmother, Pan Kam Shek.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis is an arduous process that without the support, encouragement, and challenges from my family and friends, I would not have been able to complete. I would like to specifically acknowledge the following people:

- To Marylu McEwen, you are an incredible mentor and I can only strive to match your compassion, humility, intellect, and commitment to students. Thank you for walking with me on this journey towards becoming a scholar-practitioner.
- To Karen Inkelas, I really appreciate your unique sense of humor, research knowledge and skills, and no-nonsense attitude. Your inquiries challenge me to reconsider my assumptions and push me as a researcher.
- To Lisa Kiely, thank you for helping me map out this thesis to make it manageable. You kept me on point and realistic.
- To Gina Garcia, you constantly pushed me, made me laugh, and have been my partner-in-crime (against oppression) as well as my thesis buddy. You truly are a blessing in my life.
- To the thesis/seminar paper support group of Tiki Ayiku, Marcus Peanort, Josh Hiscock, Paul Eaton, and of course GG, we filled the beaker. Thanks for the laughs!
- To Susan Komives, thank you for your leadership and faith in everyone in the program. You introduced “scholar-practitioner” into my vocabulary.
- To Grace Chen and Alvin Alvarez, thank you for answering all of my questions, your insight, and for being such great friends and colleagues.

- To everyone who helped me with each step of the process, I could not have completed this without you: Kristen Vogt, Jeff Milem, Mitchell Chang, Susan Longerbeam, Carlos Hipolito, Will Liu, John Lynch, John Dugan, Daniello Balón, Glenna Chang, Valerie Romero, Jean Chao, Dan Symonds, Alison Orkin, and Roslyn Edson.
- To Andrea Young, Stephanie Hsu, Christina Hsu, Jeremiah Jeffries, Isti Islam, and Emily Fan for being my cheerleaders, you are incredible friends.
- To Giles Li, Bao Phi, and Neel Saxena, thank you for supporting this research on masculinity and for supporting me. You are phenomenal Asian American men and great role models for the coming generations.
- To Rob Waters and Andrea Levy, thank you for believing in me and extending yourselves to help me succeed.
- To Cordell Black for your understanding and support of me throughout my time here. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to learn from you.
- To Kimberly Arauz, Ade Adebayo, and Karen Chin, thank you for comforting me through the madness and sharing in my joy. Your friendships mean more to me than words can express.
- To my dad, mom, sisters, brother, brother-in-law, nephews, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins, thank you for supporting me even though you may not understand what I do and why I am in this profession. Thank you for caring for me, taking care of me, and for your prayers. I love you all.

- Finally to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who has given me salvation and sustained me through this journey, I give to you all the glory, honor, and praise.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION .....	1
History.....	1
Asian Americans in Higher Education .....	6
Profile.....	6
Influences on Asian American Student Experiences.....	7
Factors Related to Asian American Men’s Self-Esteem.....	9
Problem Statement.....	10
Definitions.....	11
Professional Significance.....	12
Overview of Remaining Chapters .....	14
CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	15
Racial Identity .....	15
General Racial Identity Literature .....	15
Asian American Racial Identity .....	18
Masculinity.....	27
General Literature on Masculinity.....	28
Asian American Masculinity.....	29
Gender-Role Conflict.....	34
Asian American Men and Gender-Role Conflict .....	42
Self-Esteem .....	46
Overview of Self-Esteem .....	46
Racial Identity, Racism, and Self-Esteem.....	48
Gender-Role Conflict and Self-Esteem.....	53
Summary .....	54
CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY.....	56
Purpose and Hypotheses .....	56
Research Design .....	58
Research Context.....	59
Participants.....	60
Instrumentation.....	66
People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale .....	66
Gender-Role Conflict Scale.....	67
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.....	69

Demographic Questionnaire.....	70
Procedures.....	70
Data Analysis.....	72
Delimitations.....	74
Summary of the Methodology.....	75
 CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS.....	 76
Preliminary Analyses.....	76
Analyses of Hypotheses.....	78
Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between each racial identity status and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.....	78
Hypothesis 2: A significant negative relationship exists between gender role conflict and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.....	78
Hypothesis 3: Significant positive relationships exist between the Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization racial identity statuses and gender-role conflict.....	79
Hypothesis 4: There are distinct and significant relationships between the statuses of racial identity development and the subscales of gender-role conflict with self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.....	80
Hypothesis 5a: There are no differences by ethnic region and location of institution (East coast and West coast) in racial identity development and gender-role conflict.....	83
Hypothesis 5b: There are no relationships between generational status and socioeconomic status with racial identity development and gender-role conflict.....	84
Summary.....	85
 CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION.....	 86
Summary of Findings.....	86
Hypothesis 1: Racial Identity and Self-Esteem.....	86
Hypothesis 2: Gender-Role Conflict and Self-Esteem.....	89
Hypothesis 3: Racial Identity and Gender-Role Conflict.....	90
Hypothesis 4: Racial Identity, Gender-Role Conflict, and Self-Esteem.....	94
Hypothesis 5: Demographic Variables, Racial Identity, and Gender-Role Conflict.....	96
Limitations.....	99
Implications for Practice.....	105
Recommendations for Further Research.....	110
 APPENDIX A: PEOPLE OF COLOR RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE SCALE.....	 116
 APPENDIX B: GENDER-ROLE CONFLICT SCALE.....	 120
 APPENDIX C: ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE.....	 123
 APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHICS.....	 124

APPENDIX E: CONCLUSION OF SURVEY.....	126
APPENDIX F: EAST COAST INITIAL CONTACT EMAIL .....	127
APPENDIX G: WEST COAST INITIAL CONTACT EMAIL.....	129
APPENDIX H: EAST COAST FIRST FOLLOW-UP EMAIL .....	131
APPENDIX I: WEST COAST FIRST FOLLOW-UP EMAIL.....	132
APPENDIX J: EAST COAST SECOND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL.....	133
APPENDIX K: WEST COAST SECOND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL .....	134
APPENDIX L: EAST COAST INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	135
APPENDIX M: WEST COAST INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	137
APPENDIX N: COMMENTS FROM SURVEY .....	139
APPENDIX O: ETHNICITIES OF PARTICIPANTS.....	141
APPENDIX P: CORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES .....	142
REFERENCES.....	143

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Participants' Demographic Information	63
Table 2.	Participants' Age and Generational Status with Years in the U.S.	66
Table 3.	Descriptive Statistics for Gender Role Conflict Scale, People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	77
Table 4.	Pearson Correlations of Racial Identity Statuses, Gender-Role Conflict Total Scale and Subscales	79
Table 5.	Multiple Regression Summary of Demographic Variables, Racial Identity, and Gender-Role Conflict in Relationship to Self-Esteem	82
Table 6.	MANOVA Summary of Differences in Racial Identity Development Statuses by Location of Institution and Participants' Ethnic Region	83
Table 7.	MANOVA Summary of Differences in Gender-Role Conflict Subscales by Location of Institution and Participants' Ethnic Region	84
Table 8.	Post Hoc Analysis of Ethnic Regional Differences in Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men	84
Table 9.	Means and Standard Deviations for Gender-Role Conflict Scale in Current Study and Previous Studies	92
Table 10.	Means and Standard Deviations for POCRIAS Statuses in Current Study and Previous Studies	93

## CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

The Asian American student population at institutions of higher education is a growing field of interest for student affairs professionals, as noted by the increasing presence of Asian American focused scholarship. Whereas earlier literature on Asian Americans focused on assimilation or acculturation, more recent scholarship has examined Asian American psychosocial development (Kodama, McEwen, Liang, & Lee, 2002), racial identity (Alvarez, 2002; Kohatsu, 1992), gender identity (Kim, O'Neil, & Owen, 1996; Liu, 2000), multiple social identities (Chen, 2005), student involvement (Liu & Sedlacek, 1999), use of counseling services (Chang & Yeh, 2003; Solberg, Ritsma, Davis, Tata, & Jolly, 1994), and self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Yip, 2003). One point of inquiry that needs to be inspected further is the intersection of identities within this population that may influence Asian American students' quality of life. This study explored racial identity and gender identity in Asian American undergraduate men and their relationship to self-esteem.

In order to provide a context for this study, several areas will be covered in this chapter: history of Asian Americans in the United States, Asian American student presence in higher education, and factors related to Asian American men's self-esteem. Following the overview of Asian American experiences, the next chapter will focus on existing literature on racial identity, masculinity, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem, particularly as it relates to Asian American undergraduate men.

### History

Asian American history dates as far back as the 1700s with Filipino mariners arriving in what is now known as Louisiana (Takaki, 1990). There are entire books dedicated to Asian American history that could provide more detailed chronology of

immigration waves and descriptions of communities that were built in the United States (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1990). The following will attempt to provide a perspective of history through focusing on Asian American men, in particular Chinese and Japanese American men. The focus on these two particular ethnic groups within the Asian American community is due to the long history and presence of these groups in large numbers which in turn greatly shaped the dominant perspective on Asian American men in today's society.

The first large wave of Asian immigration to the United States occurred in the mid-1800s with the arrival of Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Korean, and Indian laborers (Espiritu, 1997; Takaki, 1990). The influx of Asian laborers consisted of primarily men who came for the California gold rush, worked on Hawai`ian plantations, and worked in the South following the abolition of slavery (Takaki).

In the late 1800s and early 1900s, Asian Indians were also being recruited to work in the United States in plantations, on railroads, in agricultural fields in California and lumber towns in Washington (Takaki, 1990). The competition for labor opportunities caused many Asian Indian men to be driven out of their communities in the U.S. by White workers in groups such as the Asiatic Exclusion League (Takaki). The White workers saw Asian Indian men not only as threats to their jobs but also to White women (Takaki).

Over the years following the first wave, the United States government passed legislation which limited and, at times, restricted the immigration of Asian women (Espiritu, 1997; Takaki, 1993). Espiritu noted that the policies, such as the Page Law in 1875, were often driven by economics such that Asian men without families would offer the least costs to employers and be more transient to meet labor needs. Takaki remarked

that the Page Law was intended to bar Chinese prostitutes but became enforced so broadly that Chinese wives were also kept out of the country. In addition, the 1917 Immigration Act prevented Asian Indian men with wives to bring them to the United States (Takaki).

With limited opportunities to create families with Asian women, politicians realized that Asian men may want to intermarry with White women, and therefore anti-miscegenation laws were created to revoke citizenship of any White woman who out married (Chua & Fujino, 1999; Espiritu, 1997; Takaki, 1990). The establishment of anti-immigration laws and anti-miscegenation laws were institutional forms of oppression faced by Asian men. Along with institutional barriers, cultural forms of oppression soon emerged.

Espiritu (1997) described all the images of Asian American men “as alternatively inferior, threatening, or praiseworthy” (p. 87). Racist images collapsed gender and sexuality where Asian American men were hypermasculine and effeminate. One example of the hypermasculine image was the Yellow Peril, a threatening and insidious force to be reckoned. The Yellow Peril image was consistent with masculinity’s aggressiveness to the point that it was too aggressive and thus hypermasculine. Particularly following the bombing in Pearl Harbor, anti-Japanese propaganda spread throughout the United States through media, martial law in Hawai`i, and internment of Japanese Americans on the mainland. This image worked in conjunction with the perpetual foreigner such that Asian Americans were seen as having questionable loyalties to the United States and the inability to assimilate completely (Espiritu). Over the years, the target group of the Yellow Peril shifted from the Japanese to the Chinese to the Vietnamese depending on

global economics and political situation (Espiritu; Takaki, 1993). The threat included possible miscegenation, military action, and foreign business competition.

In order to prevent miscegenation, the intermingling of races, from occurring, popular images of Asian men as sexually deviant, asexual, effeminate, or luring White women to their opium dens were created (J. Chan, 2001; Espiritu, 1997). The image of Asian Americans as exotic and foreign was further promoted by the growing popularity of mysticism in the early 1900s with the influx of South Asians looking to profit from offering “Eastern wisdom” to the Hollywood elite (Prashad, 2000). To further emasculate Asian men, employment opportunities were also limited in scope, consisting primarily of “feminine” work such as laundry, housekeeping, and cooking, which translated into restaurant work (Takaki, 1993).

Immigration acts banning Chinese immigration – the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1891 – and the Barred Zone Act in 1924, kept many Indians from immigrating to the United States (Joshi, n.d.; Takaki, 1990). The shared history of limited access to the U.S. by Asian ethnic groups were often in response to economic concerns and typically used inflammatory and stereotypical images to encourage support by the broader public for these anti-immigration acts.

Throughout the 1900s, stereotypical images of Asian American men were seen in cartoons, Broadway shows, film, and television shows (J. Chan, 2001; Espiritu, 1997). White actors put on “yellow face” and taped their eyes to appear Chinese or Japanese. The movie character, Dr. Fu Manchu, was an Oriental mastermind that typified the lack of heterosexuality and the Yellow Peril at the same time (Espiritu, 1997). The buck-toothed bumbling image of Asian American men could be seen in movies such as *Breakfast at Tiffany's*, while the nerdy, lustful image could be seen in *Sixteen Candles*

(Wong, 1993). In the Broadway production, *M. Butterfly*, the effeminate image of Asian American men became intertwined with issues of sexuality when the lead character was a cross-dressing Chinese male spy who falls in love with the British male spy (J. Chan, 2001). South Asian American men became equated with turbans, mystics, and quickie-marts in shows such as *The Simpsons* and the film, *The Guru* (Joshi, n.d.; Prashad, 2000). *The Joy Luck Club* became a mainstream Asian American movie that had very few, if any, redeeming Asian and Asian American men (J. W. Chan, 1998). They were portrayed as misogynists and cheap and their Asian American women love interests would turn to relationships with White men.

The second large immigration wave occurred following the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act (Hune, 2002; Takaki, 1993). The 1965 Immigration Act lowered restrictions on family reunification and encouraged the influx of professionals from Asian countries, a population very different from the low-wage laborers during the 1800s (Hune; Takaki). With the influx of Asian professionals into the United States, the 1970s saw the emergence of the model minority myth, a stereotype that applied to all Asian Americans (Suzuki, 2002). The rationale of the myth was that the Confucian work ethic of Asian Americans contributed to their success in the United States. Some Southeast Asian Americans – Vietnamese, Hmong, Laotian, and Mien – were often displaced in the broader model minority image due to a very different immigration pattern and the circumstances by which they entered into the U.S. (Takaki, 1990, 1993). The 1970s and 1980s saw an influx of refugees from Southeast Asia that was a forced migration out of their homelands following the Vietnam War. Many were suffering from nerve gases that were used in the war, as well as from post-traumatic stress syndrome (Takaki, 1990). Although the model minority did not originally include Southeast Asian Americans, they

became incorporated in the broader mindset of U.S. society under the label of Asian Americans. The perpetuation of the model minority image served to support the meritocracy myth, the notion that people were judged and rewarded solely based on merit (Chua & Fujino, 1999; Suzuki, 2002).

The impact of the model minority myth on Asian American men included lower pay compared to their White counterparts and a lack of promotion to managerial positions, what is described as a glass ceiling effect (Suzuki, 2002). A broader implication of the model minority myth is how it is often used in juxtaposition with African Americans and Latinos to pit the communities against each other and to leave the institutional barriers of racism unquestioned and unchallenged, particularly at institutions of higher education (Suzuki, 2002; Takaki, 1993).

### Asian Americans in Higher Education

#### *Profile*

The term Asian American was first created in the 1960s as a term of empowerment and activism to end discrimination (Hune, 2002). Since that period, Asian American has been used, by the community and institutions, to describe a pan-ethnic identity, incorporating Chinese, Filipino, and Sri Lankan, just to name a few.

Asian Americans constitute 4.2% of the total U.S. population consisting of over 20 different ethnic groups recognized by the United States government in the U.S. Census 2000 (Barnes & Bennett, 2002). *The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac* ("College Enrollment by Racial and Ethnic Group, Selected Years," 2004) showed that Asian Americans made up 6.4% of all students in higher education in 2001. In the span of over a decade, Asian American student presence increased by 78% from 1990 to 2001 ("College Enrollment by Racial and Ethnic Group, Selected Years," 2004). More notable

is the fact that 60% of Asian Americans ages 18- to 24- years were enrolled at institutions of higher education in 2002 compared with 36.7% of all 18- to 24- year olds in the United States. Among the college-age population, Hsia and Peng (as cited in Hall, Sue, Narang, & Lilly, 2000) found 88% of Asian Americans attending institutions of higher education. Hune (2002), however, cautioned against interpreting the data on Asian Americans in higher education at a cursory level. The heterogeneity of the population needs to be considered by region, prior educational attainment for immigrants, and within ethnic groups. Regardless, these numbers demonstrate the need for colleges and universities to take note of this diverse and distinct population of students and consequently have research available that informs their practice (Hune).

#### *Influences on Asian American Student Experiences*

With Asian Americans seen as the model minority, not only in society as a whole but particularly on college campuses (Suzuki, 2002), the factors that have influenced their quality of life were not a point of interest for scholars until recently. Suzuki noted that the model minority stereotype of Asian Americans created an image that Asian American students were highly successful and did not need assistance. The model minority myth places an unrealistic expectation on Asian Americans to succeed academically regardless of the capabilities of the individual (Solberg et al., 1994; Suzuki). Not only was the model minority image pervasive but also the perfidious foreigner image in Asian American stereotypes. Suzuki described the perfidious foreigner image as one in which Asian Americans are duplicitous, scheming, and untrustworthy. In a couple of reports about Asian Pacific Americans in higher education (Cress & Ikeda, 2003; Sue, 1994), these stereotypes were described to work together to negatively affect students. Stories of lack of language assistance, suspicions of cheating, and unrealistically high academic

expectations by family, professors, and peers combined to create a stressful environment for Asian American students (Cress & Ikeda; Sue).

Other factors that affect the experiences of Asian American students in higher education include issues of race and racism (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999). Incidences of hate crimes and racist incidences both nationally and on college campuses serve to create hostile environments in which Asian American students have to negotiate (Alvarez & Yeh). Therefore it is important to understand what factors may potentially influence students' racial identity development and how they deal with racism. Beyond the typical image of Asian American students as "model minorities," Alvarez and Yeh argued for a better understanding of how racial issues are salient in Asian American students' lives and how institutions of higher education need to attend to their racial identity development for their psychological well-being. This may be achieved through the creation of Asian American studies programs, support of co-curricular involvement in Asian American political organizations and ethnic cultural organizations, and workshops that take into consideration the various racial identity developmental statuses and differential responses to interventions.

In addition to the stresses faced by the broader Asian Pacific American population, the notion of Asian American men being among the least desirable by women and hyperdesirable by men has been shown to create anxiety among Asian American men (J. W. Chan, 1998; Chen, 2004; Kumashiro, 1999). Hyperdesirability of Asian American men by other men relayed a parallel Orientalism in the gay community which fetishized Asian American men in the same way that heterosexuality fetishized Asian American women (Kumashiro, 1999). As Chen found in her study on Asian Americans' multiple identities, Asian American men reported their sexual identity as more salient than Asian

American women, regardless of how they categorized their sexual identity. Through this overview, it becomes apparent that Asian American men's racialized and gendered identities influence their experiences.

#### Factors Related to Asian American Men's Self-Esteem

The existing scholarship on Asian Americans' psychological well-being have looked at help-seeking behaviors (Chang & Yeh, 2003), anxiety related to assertiveness (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991), and career self-efficacy (Smith & Betz, 2002); at times the research included perspectives on gender. Racial identity and gender identity have been shown to be related to students' psychological well-being (Cress & Ikeda, 2003; Kim et al., 1996), and more particularly to their self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms, 2001). This study focused on self-esteem since it was often used to operationalize psychological well-being in other studies (Parham & Helms; Sharpe & Heppner; Smith & Betz; Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Cancelli, 2000; Yip, 2003).

Racial identity is how individuals perceive themselves in relation to a specific racial group (Helms, 1993). For Asian Americans, racial identity is distinct to the United States and based on sociopolitical and geographical origins as opposed to a common cultural heritage (Chen, 2004; Helms & Cook, 1999). Racial identity development refers to the process through which individuals achieve a positive and internally defined self-concept (Helms & Cook). Within racial identity development, there are five different statuses: (a) Conformity, (b) Dissonance, (c) Immersion-Emersion, (d) Internalization, and (e) Integrative Awareness. The first three statuses have been categorized as externally defined self-concepts and the last two statuses as internally defined (Wade, 1996).

Gender identity, more specifically the notions of masculinity and gender-role conflict, relates to the societal roles and expectations of men within the United States culture (Kumashiro, 1999; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986; Pleck, 1981). The masculinity that was used in the studies was hegemonic masculinity, the dominant form of masculinity based on White cultural standards and norms of aggressiveness, competition, and limited expressiveness (J. W. Chan, 1998; Cheng, 1996; Kumashiro; Liu, 2000, 2002; O'Neil et al.; Pleck).

The negative impact of gender-role conflict on psychological well-being has been well-researched; however, Asian American men were often not studied in significant numbers to be included (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good & Wood, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Stillson, O'Neil, & Owen, 1991). In particular, global self-esteem, as a measure of psychological well-being, has also not been examined in relation to Asian American men. Therefore, it is important to explore the relationships between race, gender, and self-esteem for this particular population (Chang & Yeh, 2003; Cheng, 1996; Chua & Fujino, 1999; Kumashiro, 1999; Solberg et al., 1994; Wah, 1998).

### Problem Statement

Little research has been done on Asian American men's gender role conflict and self-esteem (Liu, 2002; Stillson et al., 1991). Although research (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good & Wood, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991) shows a general relationship between gender role conflict and self-esteem, as well as more general psychological well-being, Asian American men were either not included in the study or there was a limited sample (Sharpe & Heppner; Smith & Betz, 2002; Stillson et al.). In an effort to expand the knowledge base on the interactions between race, gender, and self-esteem, particularly among college-aged men, this study focused on the following research

question: Do racial identity and gender-role conflict relate to Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem?

The sub-research questions were as follows:

1. What is the relationship of each racial identity status and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men?
2. Is there a negative relationship between gender role conflict and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men?
3. Is there a significant positive relationship between racial identity statuses and gender role conflict for Asian American undergraduate men?
4. Are there distinct relationships between statuses of racial identity development and the subscales of gender role conflict with self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men?
5. Are there any relationships between location of school based on East coast and West coast, ethnic regions, generational status, socioeconomic status and racial identity development and gender-role conflict?

To investigate these questions, a quantitative correlational study was conducted using a random sample of Asian American undergraduate men from both a public East coast university and a public West coast university. The participants completed an online survey that combined a demographic questionnaire with instruments on racial identity development, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem. The methodology is described in greater detail in Chapter 3.

### Definitions

In order to provide a foundation for understanding the study, the following terms and accompanying definitions are provided below.

*Asian American* – people of Asian descent born and/or raised in the United States (includes Indian, Pakistani, Afghani, Bangladeshi, Sri Lankan, Nepalese, and other ethnic groups in South Asia; Filipinos, Vietnamese, Thai, Chinese, Japanese, Korean; Barnes & Bennett, 2002; Hune, 2002).

*Racial identity* – an individual’s perception of a shared group identity with a particular racial group (Helms, 1993).

*Gender-role conflict* – the psychological impact of gender roles; in particular, the consideration of traditional Western notions of what it means to be a man, otherwise known as hegemonic masculinity (O’Neil et al., 1986).

*Self-esteem* – a positive or negative evaluation of the self (Rosenberg, 1965).

#### Professional Significance

Research has already shown the importance of racial identity development to psychosocial tasks and general well-being (Chang & Yeh, 2003; Cress & Ikeda, 2003; Pope, 2000). With the growing numbers of Asian American students in higher education, there is an increased importance to understand this heterogeneous community. In particular, greater understanding of Asian American male students will serve to better inform student support services, programming, and curriculum development.

Sue (1994) noted that a careful analysis of studies on Asian Americans and mental health contradict the popular stereotype that Asian Americans are well-adjusted. In reporting on a study of Chinese American students’ anxiety levels at two West coast institutions, Sue stressed that “academic achievement should not be used as an indicator of emotional well-being and adjustment” (p. 269). He also suggested that methodological limitations of prior studies on mental health have led to underestimations of Asian Americans’ rate of psychological disorders. The studies that have been conducted on

psychological well-being of Asian Americans have shown relationships between racial identity, ethnic identity, and self-esteem (Alvarez, 2002; Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Chua & Fujino, 1999; Kohatsu, 1992; Yip, 2003). Depending on the saliency of ethnic identity or racial identity to the student, its effect on self-esteem will vary (Yip). Recognizing the importance of race in a university setting, particularly with Asian American students where they are often left out of the Black-White dialogue (Cress & Ikeda, 2003), serves not only to legitimize their experiences but encourages their racial identity development which has shown to relate to positive mental health (Alvarez & Yeh). The frustration exhibited by Asian American undergraduate men, detailed in the literature review, should be a cause of concern for student affairs administrators as they develop culturally appropriate developmental programs (J. W. Chan, 1998; Chang & Yeh, 2003).

Gender-role conflict and notions of masculinity have also been found to relate to psychological well-being (J. Chan, 2001; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Stillson et al., 1991). Since Asian American students underutilize counseling services on college campuses, it is therefore important to determine what factors contribute to psychological well-being in order to create culturally appropriate interventions and preventions (Chang & Yeh, 2003; Sue, 1994). For Asian American students who experience distress, Asian American men are less likely to seek assistance than Asian American women (Chang & Yeh).

Self-esteem is an important and commonly used component of psychological well-being (Good, Robertson, Fitzgerald, Stevens, & Bartels, 1996; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Yip, 2003). The psychological well-being of students is important to consider with regard to retention and reducing crisis management cases (Cress & Ikeda, 2003). The study also expands the body of knowledge surrounding self-esteem by examining a population previously not considered.

This study serves to expand the understanding of hegemonic masculinity, as well as the intersection of race and gender identities, and broaden the understanding of gender role conflict and psychological well-being as evidenced in self-esteem.

#### Overview of Remaining Chapters

The remaining chapters will include a review of the literature on racial identity development, masculinity, gender role conflict, and self-esteem, as well as methodology for the current study, results, and discussion.

## CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The growing body of literature on Asian American student development has attempted to expand the knowledge base around racial identity, masculinity, and self-esteem. In order to gain a foundational understanding for the research question, a review of the literature on Asian American racial identity development, masculinity, gender role conflict, and self-esteem was conducted. The following review attempted to stay true to the original language; some terms relating to specific ethnic or racial communities in the samples may seem outdated.

### Racial Identity

#### *General Racial Identity Literature*

Racial identity has often been confused with ethnic identity (Helms, 1996). Whereas ethnic identity refers to a shared cultural heritage, and language, racial identity refers to the intrapersonal reactions to systematic oppression (Helms). In developing a racial identity development model, Helms (1993) referred to racial identity as “a sense of group or collective identity based on one’s *perception* that he or she shares a common racial heritage with a particular racial group” (p. 3). It is a social construct where the socialization process results from differential access to resources and treatment, which is socially and governmentally defined, regulated, and reinforced (Helms & Cook, 1999; Omi, 2000). Racial identity, as conceived in the United States, was based on differential access to resources where White people were in the dominant status and People of Color in the disadvantaged status (Helms & Cook; Omi).

Conceptualizing racial identity as a distinct area of development led Helms (1993) to create both White and Black racial identity development models. The Black racial identity development model was based on Cross’ model of Nigrescence (Helms, 1993).

Helms (1995) later incorporated Atkinson, Morten, and Sue's minority identity development model and updated her Black racial identity development model to include other people of color, such as Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans.

Racial identity development for visible racial and ethnic minority groups, as noted by Helms and Cook (1999), involves overcoming internalized racism based on the existing system of racial hierarchy and systematic discrimination of communities of color in the United States. Internalized racism is the impact of negative social images of one's own racial group where the dominant group's perceptions of the group are incorporated into the person's identity. In the existing racial identity development models, the goal for individuals is to develop more complex ways of information processing and negotiating the racial dynamics, particularly as it relates to their self-concept (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Helms & Cook). Rather than maintaining an identity that is based on external perceptions of a racial group, internally defined conceptualizations of the racial identity are considered to reveal more complex modes of thinking.

The People of Color racial identity model is used to describe the ego statuses and schemata people of color use as they deal with race related issues (Helms, 1995; Helms & Cook, 1999). In her update, Helms changed the model from stages to statuses since the former were seen as static and mutually exclusive. One rationale for the change in terminology to statuses was to incorporate the idea of permeability across statuses. The other rationale was to emphasize development as a dynamic process (Helms, 1996). Not everyone moves through all the statuses nor does development occur in a singular direction with no possibility of returning to less complex statuses. Rather, while individuals may be in more complex statuses, they can still draw from attitudes and behaviors of earlier statuses. Although Helms (1996) identified six theoretically distinct

ego statuses, two (Immersion and Emersion) are combined since she was unable to distinguish them empirically (Liu, 2000).

It is important to note the use of the term statuses as opposed to stages to describe where individuals may be in their development. Although Helms' racial identity development model is often mistaken to be a linear model, the model has been described as a spiral staircase where as people progress to more mature statuses, they may always draw from and go back to earlier statuses (Wade, 1996). In addition, the five statuses may be broken down into two primary points of reference for individuals as they develop: Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion-Emersion are seen as using external reference points to develop a racial identity whereas Internalization and Internalization are seen as using internal reference points (Wade).

The People of Color racial identity development model consists of five statuses: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Internalization (Helms, 1993, 1995; Helms & Cook, 1999). Conformity describes a state of being where individuals deny, ignore, or are unaware of their racial identity and often choose to identify with White standards and norms. People in this status may be unaware of their racial group's history, culture, and sociopolitical status (Helms & Cook). As individuals become aware of their racial identity either through positive exposure to their race or through negative incidents, they move into the Dissonance status (Alvarez, 2002). In Dissonance, individuals become confused or ambivalent about identifying with a racial group, whether it is their own or another race (Helms, 1995; Helms & Cook). During this status, individuals may experience dissonance between the idealized White culture and new information they are learning about their own racial group or the awareness that they are unfamiliar with their own racial group's histories (Alvarez; Helms & Cook).

In order to deal with the new information and their confusion, individuals enter the Immersion-Emersion status where they idealize their racial group and reject White standards and norms (Alvarez, 2002; Helms, 1995; Helms & Cook, 1999). Following this dualistic way of thinking, individuals move into Internalization where they reevaluate their previous perspectives on their own racial group and the White racial group and begin to develop an internalized frame of reference for their identity development (Helms; Helms & Cook). In the final status of Integrative Awareness individuals use an internal definition of their racial identity, integrate multiple aspects of their identity, and collaborate with other oppressed groups to combat oppression (Alvarez; Helms; Helms & Cook).

Scales for measuring racial identity development have undergone various iterations ranging from the Racial Identity Attitude Scale, which primarily measured Black racial identity and was more closely linked to Cross' model of Nigrescence, to the Cultural Identity Attitudes Scale to the Visible Racial/Ethnic Identity Attitude Scale (VREIAS), which began to encompass other communities of color, to the more contemporary People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS) (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Helms & Carter, 1990; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2002; Parham & Helms, 1985; Pyant & Yanico, 1991; Solberg et al., 1994). Both the VREIAS and the PRIAS have been used as valid instruments to measure Asian American racial identity development and will be discussed further in the methodology section (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2000, 2002).

#### *Asian American Racial Identity*

With early literature focused primarily on African American racial identity development, more recent scholars have attempted to apply Helms' model to the Asian

American community (Alvarez, 2002; Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2002; Naik, 2003; Toya, 1996). The six statuses identified by Helms adequately describe the racial identity development of Asian Americans and provide insight into how students may be challenged and supported (Alvarez; Kohatsu).

Alvarez (2002) detailed a progression through Helms' model for Asian Americans and identified roles student affairs professionals may play. In the Conformity status, Alvarez noted that Asian Americans want to assimilate into the White community and do not see themselves as racialized beings, often viewing the world as color-blind. In this status, individuals do not progress until they are exposed to alternative worldviews regarding their racial identity or are personally subjected to racial discrimination.

As Asian Americans are confronted with the connections between race and differential treatment by society, they enter the Dissonance status of racial identity development (Alvarez, 2002). This status is often marked by "anxiety, confusion, and racial ambivalence" (p. 37). Asian Americans begin to reevaluate White norms and explore the Asian and Asian American communities. Individuals begin to question their inherent acceptance of White norms and their belief that all races are treated equally.

Moving into the Immersion and Emersion statuses, Asian Americans begin to adopt a dualistic worldview in which Asian American culture, values, and history are idealized and where White/Eurocentric perspectives are devalued (Alvarez, 2002). Asian Americans in Immersion and Emersion typically educate themselves through Asian American studies courses, participation in ethnic organizations, or community involvement. They begin to see the disparate racial treatment of Asian Americans and feel angry and resentful towards the White majority (Alvarez).

Asian Americans in the Internalization status begin to develop their racial identity from a personally meaningful perspective rather than in response to socially imposed definitions of being Asian American (Alvarez, 2002). Alvarez described this status as striking a delicate balance between personal and group definitions while also developing a more critical perspective of their community. Whereas everything Asian American was seen as good and positive in the previous status, negative aspects are also taken into consideration, thereby providing a more realistic assessment of the community.

The Integrative Awareness status is the most mature status where the individual's "sense of self-esteem [is] rooted in a self-affirming definition of oneself as an Asian American" (Alvarez, 2002, p. 40). In this status, Asian Americans are also able to integrate multiple identities into their self-concept, such as their gender and sexual orientation.

Alvarez (2002) saw racial identity development as key to the holistic development of Asian American students, particularly since college is often the time when race becomes a salient issue. By paying attention to the racial identity development of Asian American students, Alvarez proposed that student affairs practitioners assist student leaders in understanding and promoting the racial identity development of the entire Asian American community in addition to assisting them in tasks related to their organizations.

Kohatsu's (1992) study on the effects of racial identity and acculturation on anxiety, assertiveness, and awareness of racism among Asian American college students used one of the earlier versions of the PRIAS called the Cultural Identity Attitudes Scale (CIAS). The sample consisted of four groups of Asian American students ( $N = 267$ ) from a medium-sized West coast university. The students were undergraduates with an average

age of 20.6 years. The participants were 56% foreign born and 44% U.S. born. The generational breakdown was 49% first generation, 22% second generation, and 12% third generation. The study used convenience sampling of students from Asian American studies courses, volunteers, and students from ethnic student organizations. Kohatsu's sample included Korean American, Japanese American, Chinese American, and Vietnamese American students.

In addition to using the CIAS, Kohatsu (1992) used the State Anxiety Inventory, Rathus Assertiveness Schedule, Anglo and Asian acculturation scales, Cultural Mistrust Inventory, and a demographic data sheet. Stages in the CIAS were Conformity, Dissonance, Resistance, and Integrative Awareness. Kohatsu modified the CIAS for Asian Americans by making the statements specifically about Asian Americans. He found comparable Cronbach alpha coefficients to studies with other racial groups. The analysis consisted of hierarchical multiple regressions to measure the relationships between acculturation, assertiveness, racism, racial identity, and ascribed identity.

In his preliminary analyses, Kohatsu (1992) found that men were significantly more aware of racism than women. This finding is not surprising considering the historical and cultural oppression geared towards Asian American men. In looking at ethnic differences, Vietnamese Americans and Korean Americans had higher levels of Conformity stage attitudes than did Japanese Americans. However, Japanese Americans were more highly acculturated to White culture than Vietnamese Americans and Korean Americans. Kohatsu noted that 86% of Japanese Americans identified as second, third, or fourth generation compared to only 14% of Korean Americans who identified as second generation and 10% of Vietnamese Americans who identified as 1.5 generation, those who were born in Asia but raised predominantly in the United States (Kohatsu, 1992).

In a multiple regression using racial identity attitudes and acculturation as predictors of anxiety, racial identity accounted for 5% of the variance in anxiety where Dissonance was the significant predictor (Kohatsu, 1992). Because Dissonance is the status where individuals begin to question their previous frame of reference, one in which White values are dominant, it was reasonable that there would be a relationship with anxiety. During this inquiry status, individuals are uncertain about how they are to interact with White people. Other findings included racial identity subscales predicting 27% of the variance in awareness of interpersonal racism, after controlling for gender. Resistance was a significant predictor of interpersonal racism. Resistance is now known as the Immersion/Emersion statuses where individuals are highly critical of the dominant race and have more negative attitudes towards that race. Racial identities predicted for 24% of the variance in awareness of political racism with Dissonance, Resistance, and Integrative Awareness as significant positive predictors; the more strongly one exhibited high scores for the subscale, the more they would be aware of political racism. Kohatsu's findings supported Helms' (1995) people of color racial identity model in that Asian Americans who move on from Conformity would begin to recognize and make sense of the way racism impacts them.

The limitations in Kohatsu's (1992) study were how he acquired his sample and the make-up of the sample. The unequal sample sizes by ethnicity limited the generalizability of the results to Asian Americans who do not fit the demographic characteristics of his sample. In addition, the students who responded to the survey were somewhat homogeneous in that they all participated in Asian American activities, either in a course or in an organization. Kohatsu also noted a limitation in the lack of adjustment of statistical tests, in that he did not adjust the alpha for the number of tests,

which increased the risk of Type I error (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). Finally, the sample of Asian American men did not include South Asian American men. Due to the political situation of South Asian Americans, particularly following September 11, 2001, South Asian American racial identity development may provide a broader perspective on Asian American experiences.

With regards to ethnic differences in racial identity development, numerous studies have failed to find significant differences between ethnic groups (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Liu, 2000, 2002). This could have been due to inadequate sample sizes of ethnic groups (Liu, 2002). Another consideration would be that the sociopolitical forces that combined Asian ethnic groups under a single racial category in the United States may create an environment where the various groups develop along a similar trajectory (Helms & Cook, 1999). In addition, the impact of race and racism may be mediated by generational status and length of time in the United States.

Alvarez and Helms (2001) studied racial identity and reflected appraisals as influences on Asian Americans' racial adjustment. Racial adjustment was operationalized by collective self-esteem and awareness of anti-Asian racism. They sampled 188 Asian American university students, mostly undergraduates, at a medium-sized, private, East Coast university. The participants were volunteers with similar percentages of Chinese Americans, Indian Americans, and Korean Americans. Most of the participants were born in the United States and, those who were foreign born had lived in the U.S. for a mean of 12.9 years. Alvarez and Helms used the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS), Perceptions of Asian Americans Scale, the Cultural Mistrust Inventory, and the Collective Self-Esteem instruments.

Through multiple regression analysis, racial identity and reflected appraisals were significantly predictive of racial adjustment (Alvarez & Helms, 2001). In particular, Alvarez and Helms found a relationship between racial identity development and collective self-esteem. Collective self-esteem referred to how Asian Americans felt about their social group identity as opposed to a more individual and global aspect of self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms). The researchers found that Conformity related to lower collective self-esteem while Immersion and Integrative Awareness related to higher collective self-esteem. Preliminary analyses of group differences showed that Chinese Americans and Indian Americans thought the general public had more positive perceptions of the Asian American community than Korean Americans. A possible explanation for this difference between ethnic groups, a historical threat to the study, was that the study was conducted following the Los Angeles uprising which involved the Korean American community. Due to this finding, Alvarez and Helms controlled for ethnicity in the Public subscale of the Collective Self-Esteem scale.

An overall finding was that Asian Americans, regardless of their racial identity status, were more concerned with other Asian Americans' appraisals than with White appraisals of the Asian American community. In addition, Dissonance and Integrative Awareness related to lower awareness of interpersonal racism.

Some limitations in the study included the sample characteristics. As Alvarez and Helms (2001) noted, 75% of the sample identified as part of the middle class or higher, which would affect the generalizability of the findings to the broader Asian American population. In addition, the nature of the sample, drawing on those who were already involved in Asian American activities, could have inflated the relationship between their racial identity development and the collective self-esteem.

A more recent study of Asian American college students attempted to reveal any ethnic variation in racial identity development. Naik (2003) conducted a non-experimental study at a large, public, research institution in the mid-Atlantic with 137 Asian American undergraduate students (South Asians,  $n = 26$ ; Southeast Asians,  $n = 51$ ; East Asians,  $n = 59$ ). The sample consisted of students from Asian American student organizations and Asian American studies courses. The breakdown by sex was 42.3% men and 57.7% women. The age range was 18 to 31 years old with a mean age of 19.9. With regards to generational status, 73% of the students identified as first-generation meaning they were born in the U.S. and at least one parent was not. Naik's classification of first-generation would be equivalent to other studies that use second-generation to denote those who were born in the United States (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Chua & Fujino, 1999; Kim et al., 1996; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2000). Although Naik sought to explore differences by sex, ethnicity, and generational status, the limited sample sizes precluded her from such analyses.

Naik's (2003) results regarding racial identity development and using the PRIAS matched other studies as it related to the Asian American student population in that she found no ethnic differences. Through multivariate analysis of variance testing, no ethnic variations were discovered in racial identity development; thus the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Whereas Naik had suspected regional ethnic differences within the Asian American student population, the study was unable to reject the null. There was no difference in racial identity development among South Asian American, Southeast Asian American, and East Asian American college students.

The limitations in the study (Naik, 2003) included the small sample size of South Asian American students compared with the size of Southeast and East Asian American

students. In addition, within the South Asian category, one ethnic group was predominant. Although ethnic groups such as Korean, Chinese, and Japanese were collapsed into the East Asian category, within the South Asian category, Asian Indian dominated the grouping with only one respondent responding as another South Asian ethnicity. An increase in the sample size of South Asians and a more diverse ethnic representation within that category may have led to different findings. Another limitation to the study was that the sample was taken from Asian American oriented activities, which would reduce its generalizability to the larger Asian American student population. South Asian American students who chose to participate in Asian American oriented activities may have similar racial identity development to East and Southeast Asian American students who participate in similar activities. The rationale for this concept is that Asian American racial identity could be reinforced and institutionalized through university programming and staff support (Naik).

Liu's (2000, 2002) study of Asian American men's racial identity, male role norms, gender-role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes included 323 participants from public, private, and community colleges from the East and West coasts. Participants' ethnic identifications were collapsed into the seven categories based on the Office of Management and Budget's Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity. Participants were Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Filipino, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and biracial and bi-ethnic; several participants did not report their ethnicity. Through a one-way multivariate analysis of variance, Liu found no significant ethnic differences on the PRIAS, Male Role Norm Inventory, and Gender-role conflict Scale, and therefore did not control for ethnicity in subsequent analyses. Further exploration of Liu's findings is presented in the review of masculinity.

In using Helms' (1995) people of color racial identity development model, it becomes apparent there were several challenges in applying it to the Asian American community. Issues such as generational status, ethnicity, cultural values, salience of other identities, class, and region were cited as possible additional influences on how Asian Americans progressed through these statuses (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Liu, 2000). For example, some Asian Americans from the West Coast may skip Conformity and Dissonance due to the environment affirming their Asian American culture and the large presence of Asian Americans in that region of the United States. For Asian Americans in Hawai'i, race may not be as salient an issue as ethnicity due to the high percentage of Asian Americans on the islands. Therefore, Asian Americans from Hawai'i may not progress through Helms' model unless they experience life on the mainland where issues of race become more salient. In addition, since the creation of a pan-Asian American identity is a concept to which not all Asian Americans subscribe, Asian American college students may progress at much slower or differentiated rates than other students of color (Chang & Yeh, 2003).

### Masculinity

In providing an overview of the literature on masculinity, one could argue that the review would be on hegemonic masculinity, which describes the dominant form of masculinity based on White norms, in both an aesthetic and behavioral sense (J.W. Chan, 1998; Cheng, 1996; Liu, 2000, 2002). It is a construct that serves to define what is desirable not only among men but, in a sexist society, what is desirable for women to emulate (Cheng, 1996). It is important to provide the context of hegemonic masculinity since it is the standard by which Asian American men may be expected to aspire.

### *General Literature on Masculinity*

Masculinity as defined in the literature uses a Western model of masculinity which includes aggressiveness, violence, limited expressiveness, and competition (O'Neil et al., 1986; Pleck, 1981). Masculinity includes a prescribed gender role, gender order, and way of behaving for men (O'Neil et al.; Pleck; Sabo & Gordon, 1995). For men in the United States, hegemonic masculinity is the standard by which men compare themselves. Sabo and Gordon asserted that gender order had two primary structural components: (a) male dominance over women and (b) inter-male dominance where a small group of males dominate the masses of other men based on social identities such as race, socioeconomic status, and sexual identity.

Two paradigms used to examine masculinity have been the Male Sex Role Identity (MSRI) paradigm and the Sex Role Strain (SRS) paradigm (Pleck, 1981). Whereas the MSRI paradigm sees sex role identity as being innate in men and psychological in nature, the SRS paradigm sees sex role identity as social and situational adaptations. Pleck argued that SRS is the more appropriate paradigm, noting that sex roles are responsible for the psychological strain people go through, particularly men. Most men have unrealistic expectations of masculinity and feel inadequate when they fail to meet those ideals, which are often contradictory in nature. For example, Pleck mentioned the conflict between the traditional male norm of being intellectually superior to women whereas a more contemporary male norm calls for men to have intellectual partnerships with women.

Sabo and Gordon (1995), in their series on men's health, detailed how feminist studies were used as a way of informing new concepts of masculinity. Whereas the Western model of masculinity is based on subordinating and dominating women and all

things deemed feminine, Sabo and Gordon suggested that feminist concepts of gender equality be used to reconstruct masculinity. The sociocultural construction of hegemonic masculinity has been shown to have deleterious effects on men's health, in particular to their psychological well-being and mortality (O'Neil et al., 1986; Sabo & Gordon, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Stillson et al., 1991).

### *Asian American Masculinity*

Asian American masculinity is a concept that has been mostly externally defined (J. Chan, 2001; J. W. Chan, 1998; Espiritu, 1997). With the locus of control largely being external, the impact of racism and a racialized gender identity on Asian American men could create negative self-evaluations due to a failure to live up to others' expectations. Within the framework of hegemonic masculinity, Asian American masculinities are then subordinated as are other forms of masculinity, such as among men of color, gay men, and bisexual men. Some of the existing literature on Asian American masculinity focused on White perspectives of Asian American men as effeminate and asexual while at the same time patriarchal and domineering (J. Chan; J. W. Chan; Cheng, 1996; Chua & Fujino, 1999). These contradictory and competing images of Asian American men serve not only to uphold the cultural and institutional racism in society but also to confuse the development of Asian American men to the point where their self-images are in reaction to those popular images as opposed to being internally defined (J.W. Chan; Espiritu; Liu, 2000, 2002).

In Cheng's (1996) studies on masculinities in organizations, college students had to select among their classmates people who would serve as leaders for group projects and what values they needed to possess. He found that all the leadership values students were looking for were based on hegemonic masculinity. What naturally followed was the

selection of mostly White men to be group leaders followed by White women who emulated masculine behaviors. Of all the racial and gender groups, Asian American men were the least likely to be chosen for leadership positions within their class. Students cited meritocracy to rationalize their decisions. However, when Cheng analyzed all the selected leaders based on merit alone, the Asian American men were more qualified than the students who were selected. He also found that Asian American men were characterized as having a mixture of masculine and feminine traits according to their peers. Cheng postulated that Asian cultural values such as humility and communalism were feminized and challenged the appropriateness of traits in hegemonic masculinity, such as confidence, individualism, and competition.

J. Chan (2001) found that Asian American male students would prefer to be a part of the hegemonic masculinity rather than aligning themselves with other oppressed groups because of the patriarchal rewards set up in such a system. J. Chan explored the popular images of Chinese American men, finding that archetypal images of being effeminate yet also kung fu master were used to relegate Chinese American men to a lower social status than other groups. While highlighting the problematic nature in seeing Chinese American men as emasculated, J. Chan argued for a new construct of masculinity that was informed by a pro-feminist perspective. He challenged the patriarchy, fear of feminization, and homophobic characteristics of hegemonic masculinity and called upon Asian American men to take risks in creating alternative models of masculinity. J. Chan perceptively noted that

when White American men are used by popular culture as standard bearers of masculinity, Asian Americans are forced to accept the racial hierarchy embedded in the discourse of American manhood. In effect, Asian American men are given

a false choice: either we emulate White American notions of masculinity or accept the fact that we are not men. (p. 156)

J. Chan (2001) discussed Asian American masculinity as a reproduction of American stereotypes. The Asian American male college students in his class did not have the tools to construct a new masculinity since many of them have felt racial barriers to accessing the benefits of patriarchy. In an earlier article, J.W. Chan (1998) found that when the dominant form of masculinity was being critiqued, the Asian American men felt attacked. They saw the situation more as a “politics of inclusion to a hegemonic normative heteromascularity rather than a politics of alliance with women and gay and lesbian groups” (J. Chan, p. 165). J. Chan, however, proposed an ambi-sexual model of masculinity which was non-patriarchal, pro-feminist, promoted gender equality, and an “ambivalence towards socially determined definitions of masculinity” (p. 166).

Another study which shed light on issues of Asian American masculinity was conducted by Kumashiro (1999). Kumashiro’s qualitative study explored the experiences of three queer Asian American men. He found that supplemental forms of oppression existed for Asian American men where their masculinity and sexuality were intertwined. He contended that the queerphobia in Asian communities, privileging heteronormativity within the Asian culture and denigrating queerness with Whiteness, presented supplemental forms of oppression that did not replace mainstream racism and queerphobia. In addition to feeling oppressed within the Asian American community, queer Asian American men may also feel oppressed within the queer community with the appropriation of U.S. Orientalism that exoticizes and colonizes Asian American men into hypersexually desirable beings. Kumashiro cited the inversion of privilege and oppression within both the Asian American community and queer community as new

forms of oppression. These findings showed additional pressures on Asian American men as they construct their masculinity. As a study that focused on queer Asian American men, Kumashiro provided another perspective on Asian American masculinity.

Chua and Fujino (1999), however, studied how immigrant Asian men and U.S. born Asian men negotiated their masculinities by looking at their self-concepts and their attitudes towards women. The sample included 239 White, Chinese, and Japanese American students. Some participants volunteered through a psychology course while others were randomly contacted through the university's listings of the three ethnic and racial populations. The study was done within a broader study that looked at heterosexual dating. The generational differences among the different racial groups showed that over 80% of White students were at least third generation American, whereas 40% of Chinese Americans were at least second generation, 37% of Japanese Americans were second generation, and 44% of Japanese Americans were third generation. Chua and Fujino identified three groups for the study – White men, U.S. born Asian men, and immigrant Asian men. Chua and Fujino administered the Attitude Towards Women Scale as well as a locally designed instrument that included demographics, attitudes about self, and attitudes about others. The attitudes about self and attitudes about others instruments were created using factor analysis with varimax rotation. However, no further reliability or validity studies were conducted.

The results of Chua and Fujino's (1999) study on college age men found that U.S. born Asian men and immigrant Asian men had greater variability compared to White men in what they considered masculine. White male students were the only group who saw themselves as sexually exciting, physically attractive, outgoing, and social. U.S.-born Asian men were the only ones who would do domestic tasks, which showed an expanded

notion of masculinity. Immigrant Asian men held the least distinct characteristics of themselves thus showing a greater variation of what they perceived as masculine. Where there was a strong negative association of masculinity with feminine characteristics for White men, both U.S. born and immigrant Asian men showed no significant association between masculine and feminine characteristics (Chua & Fujino). This finding further supported the notion of hegemonic masculinity and gender-role conflict, which will be explored further in a later section.

Chua and Fujino (1999) argued that Asian American masculinity needed to be considered using social representation theory which is counter to seeing gender and masculinity as a purely internal and individual process. They also argued that “Asian American masculinity was socially constructed around ‘model minority’ maleness and not in terms of the dominant construction of masculinity” (Chua & Fujino, p. 396). Although Chua and Fujino made this case, they also recognized that there were Asian American men who choose to frame masculinity in terms of hegemonic masculinity. However, due to the contradiction in being both a privileged group by gender and a subordinated group by race, Asian American men may redefine their masculinity since racism may prevent them from fully emulating White masculinity (Chua & Fujino).

Chua and Fujino’s (1999) study was limited in its generalizability since generational status was not clearly delineated and Asian Americans included only Chinese and Japanese Americans. There was no further information on whether or not there were any 1.5 generation Asian American participants, those who were born elsewhere but raised in the United States. Information on whether or not the participants were raised primarily in the United States could provide insight into their level of acculturation. A possibility is that those who were primarily socialized in the United

States would have perspectives similar to those who were born in the States than those who were not. In addition, the sampling technique was not representative of the population since it was a mix of convenience sampling through a psychology course and random sampling. Finally, factor analyses were reported for the Attitudes About Self and Attitudes About Others scales to confirm that the instrument measured the characteristics the researchers were looking for; however, validity of the Attitudes Towards Women Scale was not provided using the Asian American sample.

The literature on Asian American masculinity has broadly touched on the variations of masculinity in the Asian American community but has been unable to produce findings that could be generalizable to the broader Asian American population. The studies have been qualitative or limited in ethnic representation of the Asian American male population.

#### *Gender-Role Conflict*

Much of the literature on masculinity identified certain characteristics that defined men; the common theme among the characteristics was that masculinity was an absence of femininity. Men who practiced masculinity as a highly gendered role could possibly experience gender-role conflict. "Gender-role conflict is a psychological state where gender roles have negative consequences or impact on a person or others" (O'Neil et al., 1986, p. 336). Gender-role conflict was seen as restricting a person's capability to actualize his potential and the restriction of another's potential through the imposition of gender roles (O'Neil et al.).

Building on Pleck's Sex Role Strain paradigm, O'Neil et al. (1986) attempted to identify constructs related to gender-role conflict. O'Neil et al. used a feminist approach to deconstructing masculinity. O'Neil (1990) noted that gender-role conflict was a

consequence of institutional sexism and operated on both conscious and unconscious levels as well as through cognitive, affective, and behavioral processes. Using the fear of femininity as a central construct, the factor analysis of the original survey (O'Neil et al., 1986) revealed four primary factors that illustrated gender-role conflict.

In O'Neil et al.'s (1986) initial study to create an instrument to measure gender-role conflict, the sample included 527 undergraduate men, mostly White, from two Midwestern universities who were in psychology classes. The mean age was 19.8 years with 95% identified as single. From their original 85 item instrument, O'Neil et al. identified 37 items which "yielded the most significant factor composition" (p. 343) thereby resulting in the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS). The four factors which emerged were: (a) Success, Power, and Competition (SPC); (b) Restrictive Emotionality (RE); (c) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM); and (d) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR). Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) revealed the importance of success, control, power, and competition within the male gender role which related to men's aggressiveness and instrumentality (O'Neil et al.). The factor of Restrictive Emotionality (RE) showed the expectations that men could not be expressive with their feelings. Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) related to the homophobia, lack of physical contact and fear of being seen as gay. Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) addressed the push-pull of being the provider and spending time at work versus being with family.

Stillson, O'Neil, and Owen (1991) examined race, class, age, unemployment, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain on gender-role conflict. Stillson et al. used a sample of 134 adult men from an urban environment with about half unemployed. The sample included White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian men with Asian men omitted

from analysis due to the limited response rate. Stillson et al. used the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), Personal Attributes Questionnaire, Personal Strain Questionnaire, Index of Social Position, and a demographic questionnaire.

In the canonical correlation analysis between predictor variables and GRCS subscores, two canonical variate pairs yielded significant findings (Stillson et al., 1991). The first pair, which accounted for 82% of the variance, included low vocational strain and high physical strain which predicted conflict in Success, Power, and Competition (SPC), Restrictive Emotionality (RE), and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR). The second canonical variate pair accounted for 6.1% of the variance in gender-role conflict. The second pair described lower class Black men who described themselves as instrumental and inexpressive and report low psychological strain predicting SPC but not RE or CBWFR.

Stillson et al. (1991) noted canonical correlation analyses tended to inflate findings and 88% of the variance accounted for may have been too liberal. In addition, the convenience sampling technique and demographics of the sample were additional limitations to the findings. The overrepresentation of unemployed men in the sample may have skewed the findings and limit the generalizability of the study. Also, there needed to be a broader sample of Asian American men in the study so this population could be included in the analyses.

In a study of male role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients, Good, Robertson, Fitzgerald, Stevens, and Bartel (1996) demonstrated the negative relationship of gender-role conflict to the psychological well-being of male college students through the use of a clinical sample. The sample included 130 male counseling center clients from a West Coast university and a Midwest

university where this was the students' first request for counseling services. The sample was evenly spread across class years, including undergraduate and graduate students. The sample was primarily White (over 84%) with a small sample of Asian Americans (8%), Hispanics (6%), and Black/African Americans (2%). The study used the Gender-Role Conflict Scale and the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R). For analyses, Good et al. (1996) conducted simultaneous multiple regressions with a stringent criterion for determining significance,  $p < .001$ .

The results of the simultaneous multiple regressions found that masculine role conflict variables were significantly related to five symptoms in the SCL-90-R: paranoia ( $R^2 = 20\%$ ), interpersonal sensitivity ( $R^2 = 20\%$ ), psychoticism ( $R^2 = 19\%$ ), depression ( $R^2 = 18\%$ ), and obsessive-compulsivity ( $R^2 = 17\%$ ) (Good et al., 1996). The following significant relationships emerged in the regressions: Restrictive Emotionality (RE) ( $p < .01$ ) and Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) ( $p < .05$ ) positively related to paranoia; RE positively related to interpersonal sensitivity ( $p < .001$ ); RE positively related to psychoticism ( $p < .01$ ); RE ( $p < .05$ ) and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) ( $p < .001$ ) positively related to depression; CBWFR positively related to obsessive-compulsivity ( $p < .001$ ); and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) was uncorrelated to measures of psychological distress under the significance level determined by the researchers.

The limitations of this study were in the analysis and instrumentation. Good et al. (1996) believed the criterion may have been too stringent, which was due to the simultaneous multiple correlations analysis. There may have been more significant relationships had the analysis been conducted differently. In addition, the correlational design of the study did not show causality, which would limit the applicability of the

findings (Good et al.). With the sample of mostly White men, more research is needed to see if similar relationships exist with men of color as well as men in other age groups and educational status.

With regard to instrumentation, Good et al. (1996) expressed concern with the CBWFR subscale in the GRCS as not having strong construct validity and its possible impact on their findings. In measuring psychological distress, Good et al. used a self-reported instrument where people who may experience more distress may choose to see themselves in a more positive light. They recommended having interviews with other parties to supplement their data from the participants. The findings may be different from conducting interviews in which professionals detected distress.

Blazina and Watkins (1996) examined the relationship of masculine gender-role conflict to college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. The study used a sample of 148 undergraduate men enrolled in psychology courses at a southwestern university. The age range was 18 to 55 years, with a mean of 23 years. The racial breakdown of the sample was 77% White, 10.8% African American, 4.1% Hispanic, 4.1% Asian, and 4.1% other. The instruments used were the GRCS, Beck Depression Inventory, State Trait Anger Expression Inventory, State Trait Anxiety Inventory, Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory, and the Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help. Through canonical correlational analysis, gender-role conflict accounted for 7.8% of the variance in psychological well-being and 15.6% of the variance in help seeking attitudes. Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Emotionality (RE) were significantly negatively correlated to help seeking.

In a study on the relationship between gender-role conflict and psychological distress, Good et al. (1995) surveyed male counseling students from a Midwestern university and a West Coast university. The total sample of 130 students, ranging in age from 17 - 39 years with a mean of 23 years, was similarly split among class years including undergraduate and graduate students. The racial breakdown of the sample was 82% White with 8% Asian American, 6% Hispanic, and 2% Black-African American. The instruments used were GRCS and Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R).

Good et al. (1995) observed regional differences between the Midwest and West coasts on Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) with men from the Midwest having significantly higher scores on the RABBM subscale. However, the mean scores for the GRCS and SCL-90-R were similar enough for the researchers to combine the two samples for subsequent analyses. In the regression, GRCS predicted 20% of the variance in psychological distress; Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) subscales were the two significant predictors. However, an earlier study had raised concerns with the CBWFR subscale as an accurate construct for gender-role conflict which prompted a second simultaneous regression without the subscale yielding similar significant results for RE. For future consideration, Good et al. mentioned that CBWFR may not be as salient an aspect of life for college students and that the construct needed to be tested further for content validity.

In another study, Good and Wood (1995) attempted to present a more complex picture of male gender-role conflict and its impact on psychological distress and help-seeking. The sample of 397 students in introductory psychology courses, from a large, public Midwestern university, consisted of 92% White, 4% African American, 3% Asian American, and 0.5% Hispanic. The instruments used in the study were the GRCS, the

Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale, and the Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Psychological Help.

Good and Wood (1995) conducted latent variable modeling analysis with the GRCS and created two latent variables: restriction-related and achievement-related. Through this analysis, restriction-related male gender-role conflict accounted for 25% of help-seeking attitudes. Restriction-related male gender-role conflict referred to RE and RABBM, things that men are not socialized to do such as expressing feelings and having close friendships with other men. With regard to depression, achievement-related male gender-role conflict accounted for 21% of the variance. The competition aspect of comparing achievement with other men was seen as part of what men were expected to do and, when they were unable to meet those goals, it was related to depression.

Wade (1996) studied racial identity, using the Racial Identity Attitudes Scale – B Short Form (RIAS-B), and gender-role conflict, using the GRCS. The sample consisted of 95 African American men from two metropolitan areas in the East Coast. One group included alumni from a Black fraternity and the other group were non-fraternity members. The men ranged in age from 23 - 80 years ( $M = 48$ ,  $SD = 12$ ). Wade found no significant differences in scores on the RIAS-B Short Form and GRCS between the fraternity and non-fraternity samples. Through a correlation matrix with  $p < .05$ , the following results were found: Encounter attitudes were significantly positively related to all four GRCS subscales; Immersion/Emersion was positively related to Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Emotionality (RE); Pre-Encounter was positively related to RE and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR); and there were no significant correlations between Internalization and the four GRCS subscales.

Wade (1996) noted the relationship between having externally defined racial identity statuses and high gender-role conflict. He proposed that African American men experienced stress from having to conform to traditional dominant masculine roles as well as having to meet cultural expectations within the African American community. Wade explained that the lack of relationship between Internalization and the GRCS may have been due to individuals who were able to create a personal racial identity that would translate into a similar approach to gender identity.

Limitations in this study may be due to the administration of the questionnaire since there were two different methods for the different samples (Wade, 1996). In addition, since questionnaires were mailed back, possible response biases of those who chose to respond as opposed to those who did not participate would affect the generalizability of the results. The demographic characteristics of the sample would also reduce the generalizability since the sample was mostly Black, middle-class, college educated fraternity men (Wade). More studies need to be conducted with a greater diversity in the sample and with more rigorous statistical analyses.

With regards to the analysis, Wade (1996) was unable to provide evidence that racial identity could explain the variance in gender-role conflict. He could have explored the strength of the relationship between racial identity and gender-role conflict by conducting multiple regressions rather than a correlation analysis.

Overall, gender-role conflict has been shown to be significantly related to psychological distress, well-being, and help-seeking as indicated through various studies. However, in the previous studies, Asian American men were either not included or included in such small numbers that separate analyses could not be conducted. In

addition, using self-esteem as a specific indicator of positive well-being was not used as often as more negative indicators such as depression and measures of psychosis.

#### *Asian American Men and Gender-Role Conflict*

Kim, O'Neil, and Owen (1996) investigated ethnic group differences and relationships between ethnicity, acculturation, and gender-role conflict among Asian American men. The sample included 125 Chinese American, Japanese American, and Korean American male college students, primarily undergraduates at a large southwestern university. The sample was overwhelmingly first generation (71%) but had representation of second generation (18%) and third generation (11%) Asian Americans. First generation in this study referred to students who were not born in the United States but immigrated. Kim et al. used the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale and the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) along with a demographic instrument.

Through multivariate analysis of variance, Kim et al. (1996) found no ethnic differences in acculturation but found a significant relationship between acculturation and gender-role conflict. Through main canonical analysis, acculturation accounted for 18% of the variance in gender-role conflict. More specifically, acculturation was related to the GRCS subscales of Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) and Restrictive Emotionality (RE). Higher levels of acculturation predicted higher conflict in SPC and lower conflict in RE. The findings support the notion of the GRCS as an instrument that measures conflicts with hegemonic masculinity, using Western values as opposed to various Asian cultural values and heritages. The Restrictive Emotionality subscale, in particular, seems to illustrate that the variance in RE is dependent on the degree that Asian Americans subscribe to Western culture. The comparison between their Asian ethnic culture and Western culture may lead to a perspective that expressing emotions is more reflective of

Western values. Therefore, the higher level of acculturation leading to lower conflict in RE demonstrates an association between expressing emotions and Western values. However, this idea contradicts the dominant Western idea of masculinity as being restrictive emotionally.

Kim et al.'s (1996) study has limited generalizability due to its sampling. The focus on East Asian Americans left out the potential ethnic differences with other Asian Americans such as South Asian Americans and Southeast Asian Americans. In addition, the sampling technique was convenience sampling where students were recruited through campus organizations. Kim et al. did not provide more detailed information as to what type of campus organizations they recruited from, particularly whether they were mainstream student organizations or Asian ethnic organizations. The type of organizations the sample participated in may be indicative of students' level of acculturation and skew the results. In addition, the criteria for the generational statuses were not clearly explained. Information on age of arrival to the United States may provide insight into the participants' level of acculturation.

Liu (2000, 2002) considered how racial identity and racism interacted with notions of masculinity in Asian American men. The variables included in the study were Asian American male college students' racial identity, prejudicial attitudes, gender-role conflict, and male role norms. The instruments used were Helms' People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS), the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), Male Role Norms Inventory (MRNI), and the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) in addition to a demographic form.

The convenience sample ( $N = 323$ ) of Asian American men came from four different institutions: a large East Coast public university, a small West Coast community

college, a medium sized public West Coast university, and a medium-sized private, West Coast university (Liu 2000, 2002). Participants were recruited from an Asian American studies course, an introductory psychology course, and an Asian American fraternity. The mean age was 21.07 years; undergraduates comprised 85% of the sample, graduate students 4.6%, college graduates 7.4%, and 2.8% who did not report their status. The breakdown by ethnicity was Chinese (33%), Korean (23%), Japanese (8%), Filipino (11%), Vietnamese (5%), Taiwanese (3%), Asian Indian (3%), Pakistani (0.9%), Laotian (0.3%), Thai (0.9%), Hmong (0.3%), and Mien (0.3%). In addition, there were 12 bi-racial students who identified as White and Asian, one bi-racial student who identified as Black and Asian, one bi-racial student who identified as Latino and Asian, 11 mixed ethnicity Asian, and 2.2% of the entire sample who did not report any ethnic information. Liu did not find any ethnic group differences on scores for gender-role conflict or male role norms, which may be due to the limited sample of various Asian ethnic groups or to the collapsing of those groups into broader regional categories (i.e., East Asian, Southeast Asian, and South Asian).

The analysis revealed that Asian American men's racial identity and prejudicial attitudes were significantly related (Liu, 2002). There was a negative relationship between the Conformity status of racial identity development and prejudicial attitudes. Lower scores on the Quick Discrimination Index indicated higher prejudicial attitudes. Students who endorsed Conformity attitudes were related to higher prejudicial attitudes. However, there was a positive relationship between Internalization status and prejudicial attitudes where students who endorsed Internalization attitudes had less prejudicial attitudes.

Through hierarchical multiple regression, Liu (2000) found that racial identity and prejudicial attitudes accounted for 14% of the variance in gender-role conflict. PRIAS subscales that were significant positive predictors of gender-role conflict were Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization. Liu postulated that as Asian American men were struggling with their racial identity, they would also begin to question their gender identity. In addition, “the more one endorsed racial identity attitudes of racial confusion, ethnocentrism, and integration, the more one was likely to experience Gender Role Conflict” (p. 144). In the regression for male role norms, racial identity and prejudicial attitudes accounted for 13% of the variance of male role norms. Immersion and Resistance (also known as Immersion/Emersion) and Internalization were significantly positively related and prejudicial attitudes were significantly negatively related to male role norms. Liu posited that ethnic and cultural values may account for the remainder of the variance for both gender-role conflict and male role norms. This coincides with Cheng’s (1999) thoughts on the influence of traditional Asian cultural values on notions of masculinity.

Liu (2000, 2002) recommended looking at ethnic identity more closely by getting larger samples within each ethnic group to analyze ethnic differences. He also recommended greater attention to Asian cultural values. However, the idea of a monolithic Asian cultural values scale is rather presumptuous considering the varied ethnic heritages represented in the political term of Asian American (Hirabayashi, 1998). Asian cultural values instruments would need to be validated on many of the newer Asian ethnic groups that have immigrated to the United States, such as Vietnamese, Laotian, Hmong, and Thai Americans. Another limitation in Liu’s study included his choice of sampling. Since the sample participated in Asian American activities that were

homogeneous either racially and possibly by gender, their experiences would not necessarily be generalizable to the broader population of Asian American men.

Overall, the literature on Asian American gender-role conflict is limited in its ability to generalize to the larger population of Asian American men. The focus on undergraduate students and limited sample sizes of non-East Asian American men give a narrow picture of the role of gender-role conflict in the lives of Asian American men. An issue that was alluded to by Liu (2000) and somewhat addressed by Kim et al. (1996) is the notion of conflicting or contradictory Asian cultural values for masculinity. However, this issue needs to be approached cautiously as to not assume a monolithic Asian cultural masculinity.

## Self-Esteem

### *Overview of Self-Esteem*

The concept of self-esteem among adolescents was explored in depth by Rosenberg (1965). He described self-esteem as a positive or negative attitude toward the self. It is a measure of self-appraisals that are influenced by reflected appraisals. He noted that societal factors serve to create standards by which individuals appraise themselves. This was particularly the case among adolescents whom Rosenberg described as being highly concerned with self-image. High self-esteem could be seen through two different lenses: (a) being superior to others or (b) just good enough. The meaning behind high self-esteem is self-respect and having a sense of self-worth while also being aware of limitations and wanting to grow. Low self-esteem “implies self-rejection, self-dissatisfaction, [and] self-contempt” (Rosenberg, 1965, p. 31). Incorporated in Rosenberg’s (1979) concept of self-esteem was having control over one’s life or being an

“active agent” (p. 31), which is reflective of the Western values of individualism and ignores the role faith and religion may play in one’s life.

In order to create an instrument to measure self-esteem, Rosenberg (1965) conducted a study to specify how social factors influence self-esteem and how self-esteem related to socially significant attitudes and behaviors. This study resulted in the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), a 10-item instrument where higher scores represent higher self-esteem with no threshold for low and high self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1989).

The sample consisted of White and Black students who were “5,024 high school juniors and seniors from ten randomly selected public high schools” in New York state (Rosenberg, 1965, p. 33). The results of Rosenberg’s study were that boys were significantly different from girls. Boys in the highest social class were more likely to have higher self-esteem than the lowest class whereas there was not a comparable difference for girls. The adolescent boys were more likely to value motor skills, physical control, interpersonal control and dominance, hardheadedness, and versatility in what they could do. The adolescent girls were more likely to value how likeable they were, being able to sympathize and care for others, having good ethics, and appreciating aesthetics. Rosenberg’s findings are consistent with more recent findings on gender roles and studies on masculinity (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Bowker, 1998; O’Neil et al., 1986; Pleck, 1981). In addition, although 39% of Black adolescents and 45% of White adolescents reported high self-esteem, Rosenberg did not test for a significant racial difference in self-esteem.

The limitation in Rosenberg’s (1965) study lies in its generalizability. He had a limited sample with only two races, White and Black, and although he noted a difference in the percent of Black students versus White students who had high self-esteem, he did

not conduct any statistical analysis to determine if there was a significant difference in self-esteem between the two samples. In addition, testing for validity on non-White populations in general was not conducted. However, later studies using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) have shown its validity for diverse populations (Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Pyant & Yanico, 1991; Utsey et al., 2000). In the analysis, Rosenberg could have conducted tests for significant differences between boys and girls, as well as Black youth and White youth.

### *Racial Identity, Racism, and Self-Esteem*

Most literature on racial identity and self-esteem has been focused on Black racial identity and racism. One study conducted by Parham and Helms (1985) examined African American students' self-esteem. The sample consisted of 166 Black college students, 65 men and 101 women, in four predominantly White institutions in the South, Midwest and West Coast. Parham and Helms used the Racial Identity Attitude Scale and the Self-Regard subscale of the Personal Orientation Inventory. Through multiple regression analysis, Parham and Helms found that racial identity accounted for 17% of the variance in self-regard. They discovered that Pre-Encounter and Immersion statuses, equivalents to Conformity (Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) and Immersion in the PRIAS, had an inverse relationship to self-esteem. Encounter was seen as positively related to self-regard, as was Internalization, although the latter status was not found to be significantly related.

The findings on Pre-Encounter attitudes are consistent with the notion that Black students in that status devalue themselves as being Black and would therefore have low self-regard (Parham & Helms, 1985). Parham and Helms provided an explanation for the Encounter relationship with self-regard as due to the “emerging, positive racial self-

concept” (p. 145). To explain Immersion’s negative relationship with self-regard, Parham and Helms thought the reactionary characteristic of that status may contribute to Black students’ guilt over their previous denial or ignorance. The positive relationship, although not significant, of Internalization with self-regard, represented the new balance and reconciliation of prior attitudes and feelings towards one’s own race.

Although Parham and Helms (1985) used the Self-regard subscale of the Personal Orientation Inventory to measure self-esteem, the construct was similar and could be reasonably translated to findings using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. A limitation in the study was the lack of information regarding sampling procedures. Parham and Helms were unclear about whether the participants were selected purposefully or randomly and where the tests were administered.

In a study on Black women, Pyant and Yanico (1991) examined the relationship between racial identity and gender role attitudes with psychological well-being. The sample consisted of 78 Black female college students from a predominantly Black university in North Carolina and 65 Black female nonstudents. The instruments used were the Racial Identity Attitude Scale – B Short Form (RIAS-B), Attitudes Toward Women Scale, Well-Being scale of California Psychological Inventory, Beck Depression Inventory, and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The only significant predictor of self-esteem was the RIAS-B Pre-Encounter subscale which accounted for 5.8% of the variance in the student sample and was negatively related. In the non-student sample, the Pre-Encounter and Encounter subscales were significant negative predictors of self-esteem with Pre-Encounter accounting for 16.4% of the variance and Encounter accounting for 4.9% of the variance.

Pyant and Yanico (1991) indicated that the negative relationship between Pre-Encounter and Encounter attitudes with self-esteem was consistent with Cross's model of Nigrescence. This finding contradicted Parham and Helms' (1985) earlier study which found a positive relationship between Encounter with self-regard. The difference may be due to the different instruments used to measure self-esteem or to the samples. The Encounter relationship was only negatively significant for the non-college age sample which Pyant and Yanico noted could have been indicative of their life situations where they were faced with more racism than the college students.

Utsey, Ponterotto, Reynolds, and Cancelli (2000) conducted a study on the coping strategies, racial discrimination, life satisfaction, and self-esteem of African American college students. The purpose was to explore if any relationships existed between the types of coping strategies used and the types of racial discrimination African Americans encountered, if there was a relationship between their encounters with racism and their overall race-related stress, and if there was a relationship between the coping strategies with life satisfaction and self-esteem. Utsey et al. used a sample of 213 African American college students from North Carolina, New York City, and Louisiana with 64% women and 36% men. The ages ranged from 17 – 60 years old ( $M = 21.35$ ,  $SD = 5.6$ ). A majority of the sample (93%) identified as single. The instruments used were the Coping Strategy Indicator (CSI), Index of Race Related Stress, Satisfaction with Life Scale, Demographic questionnaire, and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE).

The primary tools for analysis included a General Linear Model Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) to determine if gender differences existed in the types of coping strategies used in encounters with racial discrimination. Since there was a main effect found for gender, specifically in the Seeking Social Support subscale of the CSI,

separate analyses were conducted for men and women. Women were reported to have higher scores in Seeking Social Support than men. With regards to self-esteem, Utsey et al. (2000) used multiple regression analysis to determine the amount of variance in RSE accounted for by the CSI subscale scores, gender, and racism condition. They found that CSI subscales, gender, and racism condition accounted for 16% of the variance in self-esteem with the CSI Avoidance subscale having a negative relationship with the RSE.

The limitations in the study include the limited generalizability of the findings due to the sample. Since the sample was taken from Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Black Studies courses, the students may have had different levels of exposure to racism and racial discrimination thereby affecting their responses to the instruments (Utsey et al., 2000).

In another study, Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) examined racial identity and self-esteem using the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE). The sample included 46 African American undergraduate females from a predominantly White university (PWU) and 38 African American undergraduate females from a traditionally Black university (TBU) in the Southeast. The median age was 20.3 years for the PWU and 21.3 for the TBU. The study used the Racial Identity Attitude Scale Long Form, Womanist Identity Attitude Scale, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. There was a negative correlation between Pre-Encounter and self-esteem and a positive correlation between Internalization and self-esteem. However, no significant correlation was found between Encounter and Immersion and self-esteem. With regards to gender identity, a more inclusive/internalized notion of gender identity was significantly positively correlated with self-esteem.

Limitations in the study included administration of the survey as well as the locations of the studies. The race and gender of the administrator may have influenced the results. Additionally, the presence of resources geared towards African American students and particularly African American women at the institutions would reduce the generalizability of the findings since not all students have access to such institutional support. There is a possibility that the high self-esteem exhibited by the women could have been due to the large amount of programming and support to assist in their racial and gender identity development on campus (Poindexter & Cameron, 1997).

Yip (2003) focused on Chinese Americans' self-esteem. The purpose of the study was to investigate the salience of racial or ethnic identity depending on the situation and self-esteem. The sample included 67 undergraduates from two New York City universities ranging in age from 17 to 22 years old. There were 29 males and 38 females who participated in the pilot study. The study spanned seven days; participants completed a questionnaire at the end of the seven days. Half the sample were born in the U.S. while the other half were born in countries that were majority ethnically Chinese. Yip (2003) used the Global Ethnic Identity instrument, locally designed questions on presence of Chinese in the area, ethnic identity salience, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, and the anxiety and depressive symptoms subscales of the Profile of Mood States. Although Yip found that ethnic identity salience varied depending on the context, there was no relationship between self-esteem and depressive symptoms or between self-esteem and ethnic identity. However, ethnic identity salience was associated with better mental health. Yip's study showed that it was not only positive regard, operationalized by an instrument on global self-esteem, that was related to good mental health but positive regard about one's ethnic identity and salience.

Limitations in Yip's (2003) study include the validity of the Global Ethnic Identity instrument on populations that are not in metropolitan areas. The surveys were conducted in New York City where there may be distinct racial and cultural experiences not found in other Chinese American communities in the United States. Another consideration that was not taken into account was how race may have influenced the participants' self-esteem. For second or later generation Chinese Americans, race may be more salient than ethnicity due to the racialization process that occurs in the United States.

#### *Gender-Role Conflict and Self-Esteem*

Sharpe and Heppner (1991), in a study on gender role, gender-role conflict and psychological well-being, used a sample of 190 male students, predominantly White, in psychology classes at a large Midwestern university. The study used the Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ), Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory, Beck Depression Inventory, Miller Social Intimacy Scale, and Austin Contentment/Distress. Through a canonical analysis, Sharpe and Heppner found "three independent sources of covariation" with the primary two described as traditional masculine well-being and affiliative well-being. They found that the psychological well-being variables were better predictors of the male sex role variables than male sex role variables as predictors of psychological well-being.

Psychological well-being variables accounted for 25% of the variance of the male sex role variables while male sex role variables accounted for 12% of the variance in psychological well-being. Sharpe and Heppner also found that the GRCS served as a more direct measure of the negative consequences of following traditional male roles than the PAQ masculinity scores. Self-esteem was negatively correlated with gender-role

conflict, with the exception of the Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) subscale of the GRCS. However, they noted that the lack of significance of SPC could have been due to the use of a college sample in which those issues may not be particularly important at that time.

Since the RSE has been tested for construct validity with the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, future studies on gender-role conflict and self-esteem should lead to similar findings (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Silber & Tippett, 1965; Wylie, 1989). Of special interest would be the lack of relationship between SPC and self-esteem in Sharpe and Heppner's study (1991). Sharpe and Heppner proposed that Success, Power, and Competition may not be related to psychological health or that those issues did not resonate with the college age sample. In other studies on the GRCS (Good et al., 1996; Good et al., 1995), the Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) subscale was highlighted as the subscale that may not be applicable to the college-aged population instead of the SPC. The argument in those studies regarding CWFR indicated that career issues would not be as relevant to the college male population and findings on the subscale CBWFR would be difficult to generalize to the male population as a whole.

#### Summary

A review of the literature has shown a dearth of information on Asian American men, particularly as it relates to their gender-role conflict and self-esteem. Studies have shown the importance of racial identity development for Asian American college students that needs to be explored in greater depth among the various Asian ethnic groups. The growing body of literature around gender-role conflict has revealed the negative impact of conforming to hegemonic masculinity on men's well-being without much consideration for Asian Americans. Finally the literature on self-esteem, as a component

of psychological well-being, has yet to explore the interaction between race and gender as it relates to Asian American men.

For most of the studies, the primary limitations were in sampling, whether it was the technique or limited response rates, and instrumentation. The use of convenience sampling reduced the generalizability of the findings to the broader population. A more rigorous sampling method needs to be employed for future studies on Asian American men. Most of the instruments need to be validated on the Asian American population since the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and Gender-Role Conflict Scale were normed on White men.

In addition, the qualitative findings of the impact race and gender have on Asian American men have not been explored quantitatively (J. W. Chan, 1998; Chang & Yeh, 2003; Cheng, 1996; Kumashiro, 1999). With the literature noting the importance of racial identity and gender on self-esteem and the lack of empirical research that focuses specifically on Asian American men, Chapter 3 will outline the methodology for this study. More mature statuses of racial identity and low gender-role conflict have been shown to relate to higher self-esteem. In addition, more mature racial identity statuses have been shown to relate to lower gender-role conflict. By combining the widely used instruments for each variable, the study attempted to reveal the interactional nature of race, gender, and self-esteem as it pertains to Asian American undergraduate men.

## CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methods the researcher used in conducting this quantitative, correlational research project. It provides details on sample, instrumentation, procedures, and data analyses.

### Purpose and Hypotheses

The study examined the following research question: Do racial identity and gender-role conflict relate to Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem?

The specific hypotheses for the research questions were:

*Hypothesis 1:* There is no relationship between each racial identity status and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.

Based on the literature in Chapter 2, there are conflicting findings with regards to the relationships between the racial identity statuses and self-esteem. Alvarez and Helms (2001) found that Immersion and Integrative Awareness in the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS) were positively significantly related to collective self-esteem whereas in the study conducted by Parham and Helms (1985), Pre-Encounter (equivalent to Conformity) and Immersion were inversely related to global self-esteem and Encounter (equivalent to Dissonance) was significantly positively related to self-esteem. Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) did not find significant relationships between the Encounter and Immersion statuses with self-esteem, only a negative relationship between Pre-Encounter with self-esteem and a positive relationship between Internalization and self-esteem. The point of agreement on the studies was the positive relationship between the more complex racial identity status of Internalization with self-esteem. However, with such conflicting findings regarding the various racial identity statuses and self-esteem, the null hypothesis was used in this study.

*Hypothesis 2:* A significant negative relationship exists between gender role conflict and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.

The previous literature indicated that gender role conflict was negatively related to self-esteem and other measures of positive psychological well-being (Good et al., 1996; Good & Wood, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Although Asian American men were not included in those studies, similar findings were expected in this study.

*Hypothesis 3:* Significant positive relationships exist between Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization racial identity statuses and gender-role conflict.

The prior studies were somewhat consistent with regard to the relationship between racial identity and gender role conflict. According to Wade (1996), the statuses indicative of psychological strain (Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion) were related to gender role conflict. However, in his study of Asian American men, Liu (2000) found that Dissonance, Immersion and Resistance (also known as Immersion-Emersion) and Internalization were significantly positively related to gender-role conflict. With the population in this study having similar demographics to Liu's participants, the hypothesis was based on his findings.

*Hypothesis 4:* There are distinct and significant relationships between the statuses of racial identity development and the subscales of gender-role conflict with self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.

Prior studies have shown a moderate relationship between racial identity and gender-role conflict (Liu, 2000, 2002; Wade, 1996). There were not strong enough relationships to indicate multicollinearity (Liu, 2000; Wade). Therefore, the hypothesis would follow that racial identity and gender-role conflict would not be significantly

related to each other and would have distinct relationships with self-esteem. The prior studies on racial identity with self-esteem (Parham & Helms, 1985) and gender-role conflict with self-esteem (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991) indicate that racial identity and gender-role conflict would both be significantly related to self-esteem as well as predictive.

*Hypothesis 5a:* There are no differences by ethnic region and location of institution (East coast and West coast) in racial identity development and gender-role conflict.

*Hypothesis 5b:* There are no relationships between generational status and socioeconomic status with racial identity development and gender-role conflict.

The literature has not addressed differences based on location of institution or regions based on the experiences of Asian Americans in the East Coast and the West Coast. Additionally, generational statuses that have been taken into consideration in past studies did not account for 1.5 generation Asian Americans, those who immigrated to the United States at a young age. Socioeconomic status also has not been included in the research around Asian American men so therefore a null hypothesis was proposed.

### Research Design

The study conducted was a non-experimental, correlational, quantitative study on Asian American undergraduate men's racial identity, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem. In a non-experimental design, there is no manipulation of conditions as a method of examining relationships between variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). One method used in non-experimental designs is correlational research. Correlational research measures the degree of the relationship between phenomena and thus cannot determine

causality. The independent variables in this study were racial identity and gender-role conflict whereas the dependent variable was self-esteem.

The sampling procedure used was a simple random selection among Asian American undergraduate men from two large, public, research institutions in the East Coast and West Coast. Random sampling ensures an unbiased sample in which each member of the population has an equal probability of being selected to participate in the study (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). By reducing bias, McMillan and Schumacher asserted that there is a high probability for various population characteristics to be represented.

#### Research Context

One institution was on the East Coast in the Mid-Atlantic with a 14% Asian American undergraduate population of which 51.5% were men. The Mid-Atlantic institution had an Asian American Studies Certificate Program, over 20 recognized Asian American student organizations, and professional staff to work with the Asian American population. The second institution, on the West Coast, had 34.9% Asian Americans in the undergraduate population of which 44.4% were men. The West Coast institution had over 60 recognized Asian American student organizations and a center for Asian American Studies with full-time staff.

With both institutions having similar structural support for Asian American students, the samples were assumed to have similar characteristics. However, a preliminary analysis was conducted to determine whether the responses from participants at the two institutions were significantly different from one another.

## Participants

For the purposes of this study, the participants were self-identified Asian American undergraduate men ( $N = 173$ ), a population distinct from the institutions' Asian international student population. Based on an anticipated response rate of 39.6% from web-based surveys (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000) and a recommended 30 participants per variable, a random sample of 500 Asian American undergraduate men, not to include international students, was requested from the Registrar's Office at each of the institutions for a total of 1000 Asian American men sampled.

Of the 500 students sampled from the East Coast institution, 115 students completed the survey resulting in a response rate of 23%. One student survey was discarded because he did not meet the minimum age requirement of 18 years old. Participants were given the option to identify their ethnic and racial backgrounds. Participants were given the choice to identify as Asian American ( $n = 109$ ) or Bi-/Multi-racial ( $n = 7$ ) along with an open text box to submit any additional information. In addition, ethnic data were gathered in which the researcher provided a list of options. However, the ethnic data were collapsed into ethnic regional groups: (a) East Asian ( $n = 55$ ), (b) South Asian ( $n = 25$ ), (c) Southeast Asian ( $n = 13$ ), (d) Multi-ethnic Asian ( $n = 16$ ), and (e) Multi-racial ( $n = 7$ ).

Participants from the West Coast institution ( $n = 58$ ) completed the survey resulting in a response rate of 11.6%. The regional ethnic backgrounds of students were grouped into: (a) East Asian ( $n = 29$ ), (b) South Asian ( $n = 5$ ), (c) Southeast Asian ( $n = 13$ ), (d) Multi-ethnic Asian ( $n = 8$ ), and (e) Multi-racial ( $n = 3$ ).

Due to the small sample size from the West Coast and lack of significant difference through Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the two samples were collapsed into

a single data set. For the total sample, 163 participants identified as Asian American and 10 identified as Multiracial, including one Asian adoptee (Table 1). The mean age of participants ( $n = 167$ ) was 20.99 years ( $SD = 2.89$ ), with a range of 18 – 44 years (Table 2). The participants were overwhelmingly East Asian American (48.6%) with South Asian Americans (17.3%) being the next largest group, followed by Southeast Asian Americans (14.5%), Multi-ethnic Asian Americans (13.9%), and Multiracial students (5.8%) (Table 1).

Over half of the participants identified as second generation Asian American, being born in the United States with parents who immigrated to the U.S. The breakdown by generation was as follows: (a) 1<sup>st</sup> generation (16.2%) - foreign born and immigrated to the United States (U.S.); (b) 1.5 generation (23.7%) - foreign born but raised primarily in the U.S. (immigrated at age 12 or younger); (c) 2<sup>nd</sup> generation (54.9%) - born in the U.S.; parents immigrated to the U.S.; (d) 3<sup>rd</sup> generation (0.6%) - born in the U.S.; parents born in the U.S.; (e) 4<sup>th</sup> generation or higher (2.9%) - born in the U.S.; parents, grandparents (or more) born in the U.S. (Table 1). Participants who listed “other” indicated various generational statuses depending on the parent or identified as fifth generation. Of the students who identified as 1<sup>st</sup> generation, the number of years spent in the U.S. were  $M = 11.09$ ,  $SD = 6.67$  (Table 2). For statistical analyses of hypotheses including generational status, generational statuses of 2<sup>nd</sup> and higher were collapsed for comparisons with 1<sup>st</sup> and 1.5 generational statuses due to the limited cell sizes of 3<sup>rd</sup> generation and higher. Generational status was treated as continuous variable in all analyses.

Socioeconomic status was classified from lower class to upper class with participants self-identifying. The largest group was middle class (43.4%), then upper-

middle class (34.7%), lower-middle class (13.9%), lower class (5.8%), and upper class (1.7%). Socioeconomic status was also treated as a continuous variable in all analyses.

Table 1

*Participants' Demographic Information*

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Institution		
East Coast	115	66.5
West Coast	58	33.5
Race		
Asian American	163	94.2
Bi-/Multi-Racial	10	5.8
Regional Ethnic Background		
East Asian	84	48.6
South Asian	30	17.3
Southeast Asian	25	14.5
Multi-Ethnic Asian	24	13.9
Multi-Racial	10	5.8
Generational Status		
First	28	16.2
1.5	41	23.7
Second	95	54.9
Third	1	0.6
Fourth or higher	5	2.9
Other	3	1.7
Mother's Education		
High school or less	47	27.2
Some college	28	16.2
Associate's Degree	6	3.5
Bachelor's Degree	59	34.1
Master's, Doctorate, or Professional Degree	32	18.5
Missing	1	0.6
Father's Education		
High school or less	31	17.9
Some college	21	12.1
Associate's Degree	4	2.3
Bachelor's Degree	49	28.3
Master's, Doctorate, or Professional Degree	66	38.2
Missing	2	1.2

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
<b>Mother's Occupation</b>		
Unemployed/Not working	36	20.9
Manual laborer	11	6.4
Service Worker	42	24.3
Skilled Worker	38	22.0
Professional or top administrator	45	26.0
Missing	1	0.6
<b>Father's Occupation</b>		
Unemployed/Not working	10	5.8
Manual laborer	18	10.4
Service Worker	23	13.3
Skilled Worker	33	19.1
Professional or top administrator	87	50.3
Missing	2	1.2
<b>Socioeconomic Status</b>		
Lower class	10	5.8
Lower-middle class	24	13.9
Middle class	75	43.4
Upper-middle class	60	34.7
Upper class	3	1.7
Missing	1	0.6
<b>Class Year</b>		
1 <sup>st</sup>	24	13.9
2 <sup>nd</sup>	35	20.2
3 <sup>rd</sup>	44	25.4
4 <sup>th</sup>	51	29.5
5 <sup>th</sup> +	18	10.4
Missing	1	0.6
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>		
Heterosexual	154 <sup>a</sup>	90.2
Gay	9	5.2
Bi-sexual	6	3.5
Missing	2	1.1
<b>Relationship Status</b>		
Single	130	75.1
Partnered	36	20.8
Married	4	2.3
Widowed	1	0.6
Missing	2	1.2

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Religious Affiliation	166	96.0
Agnostic	10	5.8
Atheist	8	4.6
Buddhist	14	8.1
Catholic	28	16.2
Christian <sup>b</sup>	57	32.9
Daoist	1	0.6
G.o.D.	1	0.6
Hindu	18	10.4
Humanism	1	0.6
Jain	1	0.6
Multiple <sup>c</sup>	3	1.7
Muslim	2	1.2
None <sup>d</sup>	19	11.0
Sikh	1	0.6
Taoism	1	0.6
Zoroastrian	1	0.6
Student Status		
Full-time	167	96.5
Part-time	6	3.5
Employment Status		
Full-time	4	2.3
Part-time	39	22.5

<sup>a</sup>2 participants responded “straight” in the “other” category. Researcher placed them in the heterosexual category. <sup>b</sup>Christian – collapsed identifications in denominations (Baptist, Presbyterian, Evangelical, Episcopalian, Protestant, United Methodist). <sup>c</sup>Participants who identified with more than one religion were placed in the multiple category. <sup>d</sup>None includes responses such as “N/A,” “No religion.”

Table 2

*Participants' Age and Years in the U.S. for 1st Generation Students*

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Age of respondents	167	20.99	2.89	18-44
Years in the U.S. 1 <sup>st</sup> Generation	27	11.09	6.67	2.5-30

## Instrumentation

*People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale*

The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS; Appendix A) is a 50-item instrument with a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree) (Appendix A). The instrument measures four statuses in Helms's (1995) People of Color racial identity theory: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. Integrative Awareness, the most mature status in the model, is combined with Internalization in the instrument. Scores for each subscale were determined by summing the scores in the corresponding items. The sums were then transformed to T scores ( $M = 50$ ,  $SD = 10$ ) for comparison across subscales. Although Helms (personal communication, December 14, 2004) recommended using the T scores in plot profiles to interpret scores, for the purposes of the research questions, plot profiles were not necessary. However, scores from each status were compiled and used for analyses.

The degree to which an individual identified and drew from a certain status was exhibited by how high the score was; therefore, if the Immersion-Emersion status received a higher score than Dissonance, then the respondent was more likely to manifest characteristics found in the Immersion-Emersion status as opposed to the Dissonance status.

The following range of Cronbach alphas for each subscale were taken from prior studies on Asian Americans measuring internal consistency: Conformity .71 - .78; Dissonance .72 - .78; Immersion-Emersion .74 - .83; and Integrative Awareness .61 - .86 (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2002; Naik, 2003). McMillan and Schumacher (2001) noted that an acceptable range of reliability for instruments was .70 to .90. Although the Internalization subscale's range is moderate to acceptable, it has been used frequently in studies on racial identity development (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2000; Naik, 2003; Parham & Helms, 1985). Validity for the PRIAS can be found in its consistency across studies, indicated earlier, to measure racial identity development. "Test validity is the extent to which inferences and uses made on the basis of scores from an instrument are reasonable and appropriate" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001, p. 181). For the Asian American population, the PRIAS has been shown to be a reliable instrument. The small range in Cronbach alphas across studies revealed a consistency in what was measured, with the exception of the Internalization subscale.

In the current study, the PRIAS had the following Cronbach alphas: (a) Conformity = .85; (b) Dissonance = .83; (c) Immersion/Emersion = .85; and (d) Internalization = .80. The results for reliability were higher than what was previously found in other studies (Liu, 2000; Naik, 2003). The higher reliabilities may be due to the random sampling method used in the current study as compared to the convenience sampling in both Liu's and Naik's studies which involved students primarily from Asian American student organizations and Asian American studies courses.

#### *Gender-Role Conflict Scale*

The Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; Appendix B), which measures the internal conflict with gender-roles, is a 37-item instrument with a 6-point Likert scale (1

= *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*) and four subscales: (a) Success, Power, and Competition (SPC); (b) Restrictive Emotionality (RE); (c) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM); and (d) Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) (O'Neil et al., 1986). To calculate subscale scores, the corresponding statements to each subscale were summed then divided by the number of statements in that subscale. The total GRCS score was calculated by summing the scores on all the items then divided by 37, which was the total number of items. Higher gender-role conflict corresponded with higher total scores.

The GRCS has been utilized in numerous studies to determine the existence of conflict in men with the prescribed gender role norms (Good et al., 1995; Good & Wood, 1995; Stillson et al., 1991). The GRCS has been determined to have convergent validity with the Brannon Masculinity Scale and the Fear of Intimacy Scale (Good et al., 1995). The instrument was also tested for social desirability and was not associated with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Good et al.). The construct validity of GRCS has shown a significant positive correlation with other measures on psychological distress (Good et al.; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). With regard to internal consistency, across studies of 10 diverse samples, O'Neil (2004) reported the average GRCS Cronbach alpha as .88. Across 20 diverse samples, the average GRCS subscale Cronbach alphas were .83 for SPC, .82 for RE, .83 for RABBM, and .78 for CBWFR. O'Neil et al. (1986) found, for a sample of 14 participants in a four-week interval, test-retest reliabilities ranging from .72 to .86. In relation to Asian American men, Liu (2002) reported Cronbach alphas of .90 for the GRCS and for each of the subscales: .84 for SPC, .82 for RE, .81 for RABBW, and .77 for CBWFR.

The current study had Cronbach alphas of .92 for the total scale, .84 for Success, Power, and Competition, .88 for Restrictive Emotionality, .87 for Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, and .85 for Conflict Between Work and Family Relations. The results were consistent with previous findings and showed higher internal consistency in CBWFR than previously. Similar to the PRIAS, the random sampling technique may have contributed to the higher reliabilities.

#### *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale*

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Appendix C) is a 10-item instrument used to measure global self-regard (Rosenberg, 1965). The instrument uses a 4-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly agree* to 4 = *strongly disagree*). Half of the items in the scale are reverse scored (Items 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7). Scores are summed for all the items so that the range is 10 – 40 with 40 representing the highest score possible and high self-esteem. There is no cut-off that delineates high and low self-esteem in the RSE.

The RSE has demonstrated adequate validity and reliability and is the most widely-used instrument for global self-esteem (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Byrne, 1983; Silber & Tippett, 1965; Wylie, 1989). In a review of the RSE, the alpha coefficients in studies ranged from .77 to .88 (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). The test-retest correlation was .85 for 28 participants for a two-week interval (Silber & Tippett, 1965). The RSE has also shown convergent validity with other self-esteem scales, such as the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, and a negative relationship with tests on low self-regard (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). The internal consistency rating in one study of race, coping, life satisfaction, and self-esteem had a Cronbach alpha of .83 (Utsey et al., 2000). Discriminant validity has also been shown for the RSE in previous correlations of RSE with grade point averages, locus of control, gender, or work experience (Blascovich

& Tomaka, 1991). For a sample of Asian Americans ( $N = 264$ ), Chen (2005) found a Cronbach alpha of .87 for the RSE. The internal consistency for the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale in this study was .86.

#### *Demographic Questionnaire*

Demographic questions (Appendix D) were created to provide a richer description of the participants and for additional analyses. Included in the questionnaire were questions on race, ethnicity, age, generational status, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, year in school, parents' education, parents' occupation, and religious affiliation.

#### *Comments Section*

At the end of the survey, a section for comments was included to allow for feedback from survey respondents. The area was a text box in the online survey and was an optional component to completion of the survey.

#### *Conclusion of Survey*

Participants were given the option to enter a drawing for the raffle and receive results of the study (Appendix E).

### Procedures

The universities' registrar's offices were contacted to generate a random list of 500 Asian American undergraduate male students per institution. The East coast institution provided an email list to the researcher whereas the West coast institution sent correspondence on behalf of the researcher. Only the East coast sample was given codes to correspond with their email addresses for follow-ups. Email invitations were sent on March 17, 2005 to the East coast institution (Appendix F) and March 22, 2005 to the West coast institution (Appendix G) with a brief introduction to the study, link to the web

survey, notice of the selectivity of the survey, deadline for responses, contact information for further questions, and notice of drawing for prizes. A two-week window was given for students to complete the survey. Follow-up emails were sent a week after initial contact to the remaining participants (Appendices H & I), with a final follow-up email three days before the deadline (Appendices J & K). Within a week following the completion of data collection, the winners of the drawing were notified and the gift cards mailed out. Porter and Whitcomb (2003) found that inclusion of a deadline for the web survey as well as a notice that the participants were a select group would increase response rates by 7.6%.

However, the response rate for the East coast sample was 23% and for the West coast sample was 11.9%. Possible reasons for the low response rates include: (a) the timing of the surveys since invitations were sent out around institutional breaks due to mitigating circumstances; (b) certain populations possibly being sent multiple surveys from other studies at the same time; (c) lack of personal relationship with researcher, particularly for the institution that the researcher was not affiliated with; and (d) possible technical difficulties where invitations may have been filtered out as junk mail in the student accounts.

Surveys were created through a reputable on-line survey instrument, SurveyMonkey.com, with data collected on a secure encrypted server. Survey responses were backed up hourly internally and nightly on the backup server. Once students clicked onto the web survey, the first item was the consent form. The consent form (Appendices L and M) included a list of expectations and contact information of the researcher and faculty advisor. Separate consent forms had to be created since the West Coast institution requested that the institution's faculty sponsor be included. At the end of the survey,

participants were given instructions on how to be entered into the raffle. Students could submit their email address at the conclusion of the survey (Appendix E) to be entered into the drawing for one of two \$50 American Express Gift Cards or one of two \$25 American Express Gift Cards.

The order of the instruments in the survey was as follows: (a) Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), (b) Gender-Role Conflict Scale (GRCS), (c) People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS), and the demographic questionnaire. To reduce test bias, the RSE was placed first. The researcher did not want to prime the participants by providing cues on racial and gender identity and thereby influencing their responses on self-esteem. The purpose of this method of controlling bias was to create a more accurate evaluation of racial identity and gender-role conflict on self-esteem.

The GRCS was placed before the PRIAS so as to not prime the participants to think about racial implications on gender roles. Finally, the demographic questionnaire was placed at the end since participants would be able to answer with relative ease.

#### Data Analysis

All data were collected through a web-based survey instrument, allowing for data to be imported into SPSS. Descriptive and frequency statistics were conducted in order to determine characteristics of the sample population. Preliminary analyses were conducted to see if the two institutional samples could be combined.

For the PRIAS, GRCS, and RSE, Cronbach alphas were computed to assess internal consistency of scales on the instruments. Computing Cronbach alphas follows a precedent set by other researchers who have modified the PRIAS scale for the Asian American student population (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Kohatsu, 1992; Naik, 2003). The PRIAS was modified by replacing “race” with “Asian American.” Cronbach alphas were

calculated for all GRCS subscales and for the total scale. Pearson correlations were then computed to identify relationships between demographic variables and instruments.

Blocked hierarchical multiple regression was used to determine the amount of variance accounted for in self-esteem by racial identity and gender role conflict. For multiple regression analyses to be conducted, assumptions related to multicollinearity must be met (Lomax, 2000). In the multiple regression, collinearity diagnostics were run which produced an intercorrelation matrix and variance inflation factor (VIF). As recommended by K. Inkelas (Personal communication, February 4, 2005), the intercorrelation matrix was examined for  $r > .60$ , a more conservative criterion than what was outlined by Lomax. Following the identification of one correlation, Restrictive Emotionality and Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men ( $r = .628$ ), the researcher consulted the VIF numbers that were computed through the collinearity diagnostics in the regression analysis. The VIF numbers for each block did not reach 10 or higher, which would have indicated high collinearity between items and violated assumptions needed for multiple regression (Groß, 2003).

In order to control for demographic characteristics, the first block entered included generational status, socioeconomic status, ethnic region, and coast (East and West coasts based on the initial institutional samples). Based on prior literature related to racial identity, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem, the second block entered included the gender role conflict subscales and the third block included the racial identity subscales (Liu, 2000; Parham & Helms, 1985; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Since Liu (2002) found that racial identity accounted for 14% of the variance in gender-role conflict, the researcher decided to measure the impact racial identity had on self-esteem beyond gender-role conflict. The dependent variable in the analysis was self-esteem.

Finally, Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) tests were conducted to determine any differences in the PRIAS and GRCS scores by ethnic region and coast. The results would be used to supplement existing research on racial identity and gender-role conflict as it relates to these demographic variables. Coast, referring to the institutional samples from the East Coast and West Coast, was included in the analyses following findings that there were significant differences in the experiences with racism of Asian Americans depending on the region they were located (A.N. Alvarez, personal communication, March 29, 2005). Independent MANOVAs were conducted with each individual demographic variable since the cell sizes were too small for testing interaction effects.

Finally, Pearson correlations were conducted to identify any relationships between generational status, socioeconomic status, racial identity development, and gender-role conflict.

#### Delimitations

Although the study attempted to have greater generalizability of the results through a random sampling technique, there were several limitations of the study. Regional differences between the East and West coast were not significant which may be due to the small sample size. In addition, since the sample was randomly selected, there was no guarantee of adequate sample sizes of different ethnic regional groups (South Asian, Southeast Asian, East Asian). The expectation for using randomization was that the method would produce representative numbers of ethnic regional groups in the two universities or in the national population. Another limitation may be that South Asian American students may not identify themselves as Asian American and not be represented in the findings.

Another concern with the random sampling technique was its effectiveness in reaching the Asian American community. Difficulties arising from the process led to possible historical effects on the low response rates.

There were also limitations through the use of established instruments. The use of instruments that were normed on White men may have created additional limitations although both the Gender Role Conflict Scale and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale have been used with diverse populations (O'Neil, 2004; O'Neil et al., 1986; Rosenberg, 1965; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Smith & Betz, 2002; Yip, 2003). With the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, generational differences within the Asian American population may not have been reflected. In addition, the phrasing of some statements was confusing to some respondents. However, the internal consistency reliabilities were all high.

#### Summary of the Methodology

Asian American men from the East and West coasts were randomly selected to complete an online survey, which included instruments that measured racial identity development, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem, as well as a demographic questionnaire.

This chapter has summarized the methods used in this study. The remaining chapters present analyses and findings of the study, discussion of the results, limitations, and implications.

## CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS

The purpose of the study was to answer the following research question: Do racial identity and gender-role conflict relate to Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem? The chapter provides results of the preliminary analyses and results of the analyses to test the five hypotheses.

### Preliminary Analyses

The research was conducted using samples from two different institutions. An analysis by institution was conducted to determine if the sample could be combined for future analyses. One institution was a large public Mid-Atlantic university, the other a large public West coast university. A significance level of  $p < .05$  was used in the Analysis of Variance test with the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale as the dependent variable and coast of the institution as the independent variable. The findings were not significant,  $F(1, 172) = 1.295, p > .05$ . Thus, the data were combined into a single data set.

Descriptive statistics, i.e., means and standard deviations, were calculated for all independent and dependent variables and are presented in Table 3. Scores for the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS) were transformed into T-scores to standardize scores for each status, as recommended by Helms (personal communication, December 14, 2004).

For purposes of comparison with previous studies, the Gender-Role Conflict Scale was the only instrument in which scoring procedures were comparable. As mentioned earlier, PRIAS in this study used T-scores in the analyses. However, in comparing the scores with earlier studies, means were calculated for each status. For the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), Chen (2005) used a 5-point Likert scale and used

the overall means as opposed to the 4-point Likert scale used in this study and summing the scores for each person then arriving at the mean score. Chen's findings on Asian American men ( $n = 70$ ) revealed a mean score of 4.06 ( $SD = 0.63$ ). The mean age of Chen's sample on Asian American men was 28.55 years ( $SD = 8.84$ ). The current study found a mean of 30.05 based on a 4-point scale ( $SD = 4.95$ ) (Table 3).

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Gender Role Conflict Scale, People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (N = 173)*

Instrument	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range of Scores
<b>Gender Role Conflict Scale</b>			
Success, Power, and Competition	4.22	0.72	1.75 – 6.00
Restrictive Emotionality	3.41	0.92	1.00 – 6.00
Restrictive Affectionate Behavior	3.46	0.99	1.00 – 6.00
Between Men			
Conflict Between Work and Family Relations	4.07	0.99	1.33 – 6.00
Total Score	3.79	0.67	1.80 – 6.00
<b>People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale</b>			
Conformity	49.98	10.02	27.52 – 87.53
Dissonance	49.99	10.02	25.77 – 88.53
Immersion	50.71	9.99	27.65 – 91.43
Internalization	49.93	9.99	16.29 – 65.91
<b>Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale</b>	<b>30.03</b>	<b>4.95</b>	<b>15.00 – 40.00</b>

## Analyses of Hypotheses

*Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between each racial identity status and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.*

The relationships between each racial identity status and self-esteem were determined through a correlation analysis. The correlation table revealed significant relationships between each racial identity status and self-esteem. The Pearson correlations for each subscale were: Conformity ( $r = -.32, p < .001$ ), Dissonance ( $r = -.42, p < .001$ ), Immersion ( $r = -.23, p < .001$ ), and Internalization ( $r = .30, p < .001$ ). The results indicated that Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion were all significantly negatively related to self-esteem and that Internalization was positively related to self-esteem. The null hypothesis was rejected in the correlation analysis.

*Hypothesis 2: A significant negative relationship exists between gender role conflict and self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.*

The hypothesis was partially supported by the correlation analysis. Three of the four gender-role conflict subscales had significant negative relationships with self-esteem: Restrictive Emotionality ( $r = -.36, p < .001$ ), Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men ( $r = -.18, p < .01$ ), and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations ( $r = -.24, p < .001$ ). The Success, Power, and Competition subscale was not significantly related to self-esteem ( $r = -.12, p > .05$ ).

A Pearson correlation was also computed to determine the relationship between total gender-role conflict scores and self-esteem scores. The correlation was  $-.31$  ( $p < .001$ ). Thus, higher gender-role conflict was significantly negatively related to self-esteem.

*Hypothesis 3: Significant positive relationships exist between the Dissonance, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization racial identity statuses and gender-role conflict.*

In order to test for relationships between the racial identity statuses and gender-role conflict, Pearson correlations were calculated between each racial identity status and gender-role conflict subscales and gender-role conflict total score. Significant positive relationships (Table 4) existed between three of the racial identity statuses (Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion) with Gender-role Conflict total score, Success, Power, and Competition, Restrictive Emotionality, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men, and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations. The only significant relationship with Internalization was with Conflict Between Work and Family Relations ( $r = .13, p < .05$ ). The hypothesis was partially supported by the findings although Internalization was not found to have significant positive relationships with all GRCS subscales.

Table 4

*Pearson Correlations of Racial Identity Statuses, Gender-Role Conflict Total Scale and Subscales (N = 173)*

Racial Identity	GRCS Total	SPC	RE	RABBM	CBWFR
Conformity	.32**	.29**	.31**	.24**	.13*
Dissonance	.42**	.31**	.45**	.23**	.28**
Immersion	.33**	.20**	.29**	.28**	.22**
Internalization	.06	.10	-.05	.00	.13*

*Note.* GRCS = Gender-Role Conflict Scale. SPC = Success, Power, and Competition. RE = Restrictive Emotionality. RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men. CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations.

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

*Hypothesis 4: There are distinct and significant relationships between the statuses of racial identity development and the subscales of gender-role conflict with self-esteem for Asian American undergraduate men.*

A blocked hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to test for significant and distinct relationships between the statuses of racial identity development and the subscales of gender-role conflict with self-esteem. Results of the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 5. Variables were entered in three blocks. The first block included demographic variables to control for selected demographic characteristics, namely, location of institution (East coast or West coast), ethnic region, generational status, and socioeconomic status. Ethnic region was inputted as dummy variables using the designations of East Asian, South Asian, Southeast Asian, and Multi-ethnic Asian. Multiracial Asian Americans were not entered due to the limited sample size ( $n = 10$ ) and were used as the referent group for the regression. The first block explained 9.5% ( $p < .05$ ) of the variance in self-esteem. Within the block, identifying as East Asian American ( $\beta = -.379, p < .05$ ) in reference to Multiracial Asian Americans was significantly negatively related to self-esteem.

The second block entered included the gender-role conflict subscales: Success, Power, and Competition; Restrictive Emotionality; Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations. The first and second blocks together explained 23.0% ( $p < .001$ ) of the total variance in self-esteem, with the second block accounting for  $\Delta R^2 = .135, p < .001$ . Therefore, gender-role conflict subscales explained 13.5% of the variance ( $p < .001$ ) in self-esteem above and beyond the demographic variables. Two items were significant predictors in the regression which

included the first and second blocks: socioeconomic status ( $\beta = .141, p < .05$ ) and Restrictive Emotionality ( $\beta = -.360, p < .001$ ).

The third block entered included the four racial identity subscales: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization. The combination of the three blocks explained 36.8% ( $p < .001$ ) of the total variance in self-esteem. The racial identity scales collectively explained 13.8% of the variance ( $p < .001$ ) in self-esteem above and beyond the demographic variables and gender-role conflict subscales. Three variables were significant predictors of self-esteem in the overall regression equation: Restrictive Emotionality ( $\beta = -.197, p < .05$ ), Dissonance ( $\beta = -.291, p < .01$ ), and Internalization ( $\beta = .219, p < .01$ ). It should be noted that, although East Asian American in reference to Multiracial Asian Americans was a significant predictor in the first block, when gender-role conflict subscales and racial identity subscales were entered, East Asian American was not significant. Similarly, socioeconomic status was significant with the addition of the second block of gender-role conflict subscales, but not with the addition of the racial identity scales.

The overall regression equation, using all three blocks, was significant in predicting variance in self-esteem with  $F(15, 172) = 6.085, p < .001$ . Thus, the hypothesis was supported by the regression analysis.

Table 5

*Multiple Regression Summary of Demographic Variables, Racial Identity, and Gender-Role Conflict in Relationship to Self-Esteem (N = 173)*

Blocks	$\beta$	$R^2$	Adj. $R^2$	$\Delta R^2$
Regression with Block 1		.095*	.057	.095*
Coast	.058			
East Asian	-.379*			
South Asian	-.086			
Southeast Asian	-.173			
Multi-ethnic Asian	-.125			
Generational Status	.020			
Socioeconomic Status	.147			
Regression with Blocks 1 and 2		.230***	.178	.135***
Coast	.016			
East Asian	-.290			
South Asian	-.033			
Southeast Asian	-.084			
Multi-ethnic Asian	-.026			
Generational Status	.010			
Socioeconomic Status	.141*			
SPC	.084			
RE	-.360***			
RABBM	.000			
CBWFR	-.110			
Regression with Blocks 1, 2, and 3		.368***	.307	.138***
Coast	.005			
East Asian	-.208			
South Asian	.037			
Southeast Asian	-.056			
Multi-ethnic Asian	.013			
Generational Status	.009			
Socioeconomic Status	.108			
SPC	.093			
RE	-.197*			
RABBM	-.045			
CBWFR	-.120			
Conformity	-.045			
Dissonance	-.291**			
Immersion/Emersion	.066			
Internalization	.219**			

*Note.* Multiracial Asian Americans were used as a referent category for ethnic regions. SPC = Success, Power, and Competition. RE = Restrictive Emotionality. RABBM = Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men. CBWFR = Conflict Between Work and Family Relations.

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

*Hypothesis 5a: There are no differences by ethnic region and location of institution (East coast and West coast) in racial identity development and gender-role conflict.*

The null hypothesis was partially supported through MANOVAs, ANOVA, and correlation analyses. Multiple Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) analyses were conducted to explore possible differences in racial identity development and gender-role conflict by location of institution (East Coast and West Coast) and ethnic region. Independent MANOVAs were conducted using location or ethnic region as the independent variable and the subscales for each instrument as the dependent variables. Interaction effects between the demographic variables were not accounted for due to limited cell sizes.

Results of the MANOVAs (Table 6) for the four racial identity subscales showed no significant differences for location of institution (East coast and West coast), Wilks'  $\Lambda = .968, p > .05$ , or participants' ethnic region, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .935, p > .05$ .

Table 6

*MANOVA Summary of Differences in Racial Identity Development Statuses by Location of Institution and Participants' Ethnic Region (N = 173)*

Effect	Value	F	Hyp. Df	Error df
Location				
Wilks' Lambda	.968	1.367	4.000	168.000
Ethnic Region				
Wilks' Lambda	.935	.704	16.000	504.721

For the MANOVAs using the GRCS subscales (Table 7), there was a significant difference between the coast of the institutional samples and gender-role conflict subscales, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .93, p < .05$ ; however, in follow-up ANOVAs there were no significant differences by subscale. In addition, there were significant differences in gender-role conflict subscales by ethnic region, Wilks'  $\Lambda = .85, p < .05$ . In follow-up

ANOVAs, the only subscale which demonstrated a significant difference was Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men,  $F(4, 172) = 2.694, p < .05$ . Through a Tukey post hoc test (Table 8), there was a significant difference between East Asian Americans and Multi-Ethnic Asian Americans ( $p < .05$ ), with East Asian Americans scoring lower in Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men than Multiethnic Asian Americans.

Table 7

*MANOVA Summary of Differences in Gender-Role Conflict Subscales by Location of Institution and Participants' Ethnic Region (N = 173)*

Effect	Value	F	Hyp. df	Error df
Location				
Wilks' Lambda	.933	3.034*	4.000	168.000
Ethnic Region				
Wilks' Lambda	.849	1.732*	16.000	504.721

\*  $p < .05$

Table 8

*Post Hoc Analysis of Ethnic Regional Differences in Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (N = 173)*

Regional Ethnicity	n	M
East Asian	84	3.34*
South Asian	30	3.51
Southeast Asian	25	3.48
Multi-ethnic Asian	24	3.98*
Multi-racial Asian	10	2.98

\*  $p < .05$  using Tukey's HSD

*Hypothesis 5b: There are no relationships between generational status and socioeconomic status with racial identity development and gender-role conflict.*

The null hypothesis was supported by the findings. Pearson correlations were conducted for generational status and socioeconomic status with the gender-role conflict subscales and racial identity scales (Appendix P). Generational statuses for 2<sup>nd</sup> and higher

were combined due to the limited cell sizes of higher generational statuses. Both generational status and socioeconomic status were treated as continuous variables. None of the relationships was significant ( $p > .05$ ).

#### Summary

In this chapter, the results of analyses relating to demographic variables, racial identity statuses, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men were presented. The following chapter will relate the findings to the literature, outline limitations to the study, explore implications for practice, and identify areas for further research.

## CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION

This chapter provides an overview of the findings, relates them to the literature, outlines limitations, explores implications for professional practice, and identifies areas for further research.

### Summary of Findings

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationships of racial identity and gender-role conflict to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men. The study included 173 Asian American undergraduate men from a large mid-Atlantic public, research university and a large West coast public, research university. Participants in the study responded to the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), Gender-Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil et al., 1986), and People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990) through an online survey. The three instruments used demonstrated high reliabilities, slightly higher than previous studies. The higher Cronbach alphas may be due to the random sampling technique used in this study as opposed to the less rigorous sampling techniques used in other studies.

#### *Hypothesis 1: Racial Identity and Self-Esteem*

The hypothesis of no relationship between each racial identity status and self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men was rejected. There were significant correlations between all statuses of racial identity and self-esteem. Previous studies (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Parham & Helms, 1985; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Pyant & Yanico, 1991) presented conflicting results with regard to racial identity statuses and self-esteem in undergraduate students. This study found that Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion/Emersion were significantly negatively related to self-esteem. Most studies (Parham & Helms, 1985; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997;

Pyant & Yanico, 1991) agree with the idea that Conformity, or Pre-Encounter, is negatively related to self-esteem because the reference group is the majority group and there is a general unawareness of one's own racial identity in this status.

The results of the study found a significant relationship between Dissonance and self-esteem. Although Parham and Helms' (1985) study on African American women indicated a significant positive relationship between Encounter and self-esteem, other studies (Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Pyant & Yanico, 1991) found significant negative relationships to self-esteem. The Encounter status in Black racial identity development is equivalent to the Dissonance status in the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale. Whereas Dissonance is the status where confusion is heightened and persons begin to question the dominant paradigm, self-doubt may enter into their minds and relate to lower self-esteem.

Immersion/Emersion status was significantly negatively related to self-esteem in this study, which is different from Alvarez and Helms' (2001) study. In a study of Asian American college students, Alvarez and Helms found that Immersion/Emersion was related to higher collective self-esteem. Since Alvarez and Helms measured collective identity rather than personal global self-esteem, the differing relationship with Immersion/Emersion is reasonable and not contradictory to this study. The positive relationship with collective self-esteem is consistent with the notion of a heightened awareness of group identity and affiliation; however, the negative relationship with global self-esteem may be indicative of an increased awareness of the racial minority status in being Asian American and a heightened sensitivity to racism. Although Immersion and Emersion schemata typically involve a greater showing of pride in anything Asian American (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999), the psychological influence in doing so

may negatively affect a personal sense of self-worth within the broader dominant and oppressive environment. Another perspective is presented in Parham and Helms' (1985) study on African American women, where Immersion was also inversely related to self-esteem. Parham and Helms suggested that the immersion into African American women's racial identity may be explained by the reactionary nature of this status. Now that the students have explored their racial identity, they may feel guilt over their previous ignorance or denial, which may result in lower self-esteem (Parham & Helms).

The positive relationship between Internalization and self-esteem was consistent with other studies (Alvarez & Helms, 2001; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). The newfound balance and reconciliation of racial self-attitudes in the Internalization and Integrative Awareness statuses are related to an increased self-esteem. This demonstrates the importance of achieving more mature racial identity statuses in Asian American undergraduate students (Alvarez, 1999, 2001, 2002; Kohatsu, 1992; Liu, 2000). By achieving a more positive self-concept, Asian American students are then able to understand and appreciate the complexities not only within their own racial group but in other racial groups. The increased comfort and security in identity may lead to greater participation in the university community (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 1999). Hurtado et al. recommended that institutions of higher education create and support diverse learning environments not only structurally, through enrollment numbers, but by creating a campus climate that encourages diversity. The support of cultural and racial student organizations and ethnic studies programs further promotes mature racial identity statuses by providing increased opportunities for students to explore issues of race.

The significant relationships between racial identity development and self-esteem make evident the salience of racial identity in undergraduate Asian American men's lives. Implications for institutions of higher education will be explored further in this chapter.

### *Hypothesis 2: Gender-Role Conflict and Self-Esteem*

The hypothesis that gender-role conflict was significantly negatively related to self-esteem was partially supported by this study. Three of the gender-role conflict subscales and the overall score were significantly negatively related to self-esteem which supports O'Neil et al.'s (1986) and Sharpe and Heppner's (1991) assertions that gender roles have a negative influence on men leading to internal conflict. As noted in previous studies (Good et al., 1996; Good & Wood, 1995), the Conflict Between Work and Family Relations subscale, which was negatively related to self-esteem but not significant, may illustrate the lack of applicability to the college-aged, undergraduate population. However, the primary disagreement around the significance of CBWFR with this particular sample and not with others demonstrates a heightened awareness of possible conflicts between work and family, which relates to their self-esteem. Over 75% of the sample identified as single, and 96.5% were full-time students with only 24.8% working part-time or full-time. Contrary to other studies (Good et al.; Good & Wood) the concept of having to choose between a work life and family obligations seems to be a salient issue for this particular sample of undergraduate Asian American men.

No significance between Success, Power, and Competition (SPC) and self-esteem was a surprising finding considering the model minority stereotype (Suzuki, 2002) and pressures placed on Asian Americans (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999; Cress & Ikeda, 2003). A

possible rationale for the non-significant finding may be that SPC was seen as outside of their personal self-concept and therefore did not relate to their personal self-esteem.

### *Hypothesis 3: Racial Identity and Gender-Role Conflict*

The hypothesis of significant positive relationships between racial identity statuses and gender-role conflict was partially supported by the study. There were significant positive relationships between Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion/Emersion with all gender-role conflict subscales and the total score. However, Internalization was significantly positively related only to the Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) subscale. Although Liu (2000) in his study of Asian American men found positive relationships between Dissonance, Immersion, and Internalization with gender-role conflict total score, in this study Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion were positively related to gender-role conflict total score. The difference in the findings included the lack of significance of Conformity in Liu's study and the lack of significance of Internalization in the current study with total gender-role conflict score.

With regards to subscales, Liu (2000) discovered significant positive relationships between Conformity and Restrictive Emotionality (RE); Dissonance and RE, Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM), and Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR); Immersion/Resistance and RE, RABBM, and CBWFR; and Internalization and Success, Power, and Competition, and CBWFR. The current study revealed a greater number of significant positive relationships, as stated earlier and in Table 4, between racial identity statuses and gender-role conflict subscales. A possible rationale for the positive relationship between the less mature racial identity statuses and the GRCS subscales and total scale may be that, while Asian American undergraduate

men are struggling with understanding who they are racially, they are still finding conflicts with the gender-roles they are expected to play, especially if they are getting conflicting messages about what Asian American men are supposed to be.

Earlier studies on gender role expectations of Asian American men by Chan (1998) and Cheng (1996) detailed how hegemonic masculinity, the dominant form of masculinity, has structured how Asian American men, particularly students, respond. For queer Asian American men, the racist expectations of being effeminate and subordinate also influence the quality of interactions they have (Kumashiro, 1999). There is an increased awareness of multiple social identities by Asian American men and a salience in which gender and race play related roles (Chen, 2005; Kumashiro, 1999).

The mean scores for the subscales and total scores (Table 9) are similar to other studies using the GRCS, although the means were slightly higher in the current study than the one conducted by Liu (2000) on a similar Asian American undergraduate male population. The similarities may show that Asian American undergraduate men, regardless of their racial identity status, experience gender-role conflict, thereby indicating the pressures Asian American men undergo in constructing racial and gender identities.

In comparing mean scores for each status (Table 10) of racial identity with other studies, the current sample had similar scores with earlier research on racial identity (Naik, 2003; Toya, 1996; Yeh, 1997). The Conformity subscale scores were slightly higher in this study than the other studies; however, as indicated earlier, the preferred method for analyzing racial identity statuses is to plot profiles of T-scores (J.E. Helms, personal communication, December 14, 2004).

Table 9  
*Means and Standard Deviations for Gender-Role Conflict Scale in Current Study and Previous Studies*

Variable	Current	Liu (2000)	Kim et al. (1996)			Wade (1996)
			<u>CA</u>	<u>JA</u>	<u>KA</u>	<u>African Americans</u>
<i>N</i>	173	323	42	41	42	95
SPC						
Mean	4.22	3.85	4.24	3.66	4.02	3.61
SD	0.72	0.82	0.93	0.94	0.88	0.88
RE						
Mean	3.41	3.21	3.16	2.99	3.23	2.92
SD	0.92	0.84	1.04	0.84	0.98	0.93
RABBM						
Mean	3.46	3.37	3.79	3.35	3.51	3.18
SD	0.99	0.95	1.17	1.02	1.01	1.00
CBWFR						
Mean	4.07	3.60	3.76	3.96	3.47	3.39
SD	0.99	0.98	1.02	0.92	0.88	1.09
Total Score						
Mean	3.79	3.53	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.28
SD	0.67	0.65				0.34

*Note.* CA = Chinese American. JA = Japanese American. KA = Korean American.

Table 10

*Means and Standard Deviations for POCRIAS Statuses in Current Study and Previous Studies*

Variable	Current	Naik (2003)	Toya (1996)	Yeh (1997)
<i>N</i>	173	137	125	116
Conformity				
Mean	2.50	1.87	1.79	1.84
SD	0.67	0.51	0.49	0.52
Dissonance				
Mean	2.72	2.75	2.60	2.60
SD	0.59	0.51	0.49	0.52
Immersion/Emersion				
Mean	2.59	2.69	2.70	2.71
SD	0.58	0.59	0.53	0.52
Internalization				
Mean	4.16	4.45	4.37	4.37
SD	0.52	0.39	0.48	0.49

*Note.* For purposes of comparison, means for each subscale in the current study were calculated although the recommended scoring method is to transform scores into standardized T-scores.

#### *Hypothesis 4: Racial Identity, Gender-Role Conflict, and Self-Esteem*

The hypothesis of distinct and significant relationships between the statuses of racial identity and gender-role conflict with self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men was supported by the study. Prior studies have shown moderate correlations between racial identity and gender-role conflict (Liu, 2000, 2002; Wade, 1996) so correlation diagnostics were conducted to ensure assumptions for multiple regression were met. Through the correlation analysis between gender-role conflict subscales and racial identity statuses and analysis of VIF score, assumptions of multicollinearity were not violated.

The hierarchical multiple regression included three blocks. The first block entered included demographic variables and contributed significantly to the variance in self-esteem. The gender-role conflict subscales were entered into the second block and contributed significantly to the variance in self-esteem. The third block included racial identity statuses and also contributed significantly to the variance in self-esteem.

In this study, three scales were significant predictors of self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men. Restrictive Emotionality and Dissonance were negative predictors of self-esteem, and Internalization was a positive predictor of self-esteem. In an earlier study by Pyant and Yanico (1991), Pre-Encounter and Encounter were significant predictors of self-esteem in Black female students and non-students. For Black female college students, only Pre-Encounter was a significant negative predictor of self-esteem. The PRIAS equivalent of Pre-Encounter, Conformity, was not a significant predictor in the current study. The difference in findings may be a result of the different reference groups.

The significance in racial identity as a predictor for self-esteem support both Pyant and Yanico's (1991) study as well as Utsey et al.'s (2000) findings that racism and gender account for some variance in self-esteem. Although racial identity and racism are two different concepts, the saliency of race in the experiences of individuals may be accounted for in both studies.

Gender-role conflict as a significant predictor for self-esteem supported other studies done on male students and adult men, gender-role conflict, and psychological well-being (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good & Wood, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Sharpe and Heppner found that gender-role conflict accounted for some variance in psychological well-being, where well-being included self-esteem. The negative relationships between gender-role conflict subscales and self-esteem were supported in this study and further illustrate the detrimental influence of traditional gender-roles on Asian American undergraduate men.

This study combined two important social identity elements, racial identity and gender-role conflict, to examine the unique experiences of Asian American men as a racialized gender group and how both variables related to their self-esteem. The combination of demographic variables, gender-role conflict subscales, and racial identity statuses accounted for 36.8% of the variance in self-esteem. Over one-third of the variance in self-esteem scores was accounted for by the variables in this study. Although interaction effects between variables were not accounted for in the regression due to limited sample size, the findings still indicated significant predictors of the variance in self-esteem.

The three significant predictors of self-esteem were Restrictive Emotionality (RE), a subscale of the Gender-Role Conflict Scale, and two racial identity statuses,

Dissonance and Internalization. RE was negatively related to self-esteem indicating that Asian American undergraduate men who have difficulty expressing their emotions reported lower self-esteem. For Asian Americans, RE is a difficult concept to deconstruct since there may be various contextual cues such as ethnic cultural norms as well as hegemonic masculinity. However, the negative predictive relationship supports O'Neil et al.'s (1986) gender-role conflict construct regarding the harmful nature of traditional gender-roles.

Dissonance was a significant negative predictor of self-esteem, which is consistent with Helms' (1995) theory that the status is marked by confusion and conflicting feelings. The positive predictive relationship of Internalization to self-esteem is consistent with Helms & Cook's (1999) belief that more mature racial identity statuses promote a better self-concept and self-esteem.

*Hypothesis 5: Demographic Variables, Racial Identity, and Gender-Role Conflict*

The hypothesis of no relationships between demographic variables, racial identity statuses, and gender-role conflict was partially supported by the findings. Significant differences in Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men (RABBM) by ethnic region were found, with the significant difference between East Asian American undergraduate men and Multi-ethnic Asian American undergraduate men. East Asian American undergraduate men had lower RABBM scores than Multi-ethnic Asian American undergraduate men. The applicability of the findings on ethnic regional groups and self-esteem are limited in generalizability. The formation of ethnic regions, as a form of classification, was based on governmental categories rather than on self-identifications by Asian Americans (Liu, 2000). The rationale for forming ethnic regional groups was to

collapse data into broader categories for analyses, similar to Liu's methodology in his study on Asian American masculinity.

A possible rationale for the lower RABBM scores in East Asian American undergraduate men may be that there is stronger gender role socialization reflective of East Asian Americans. The presence of East Asian Americans in the United States has heavily influenced the way Asian Americans are viewed overall. Therefore, it is logical that the reflection of the Fu Manchu and Long Duck Dong stereotypes, described in Chapter 1, may serve as stronger influences on how East Asian American undergraduate men view behavior between men than on other ethnic regional groups (J. Chan, 2001; J. W. Chan, 1998). In addition, the groups represented under the Multi-ethnic Asian category are so varied that there may be limited socialization influences on this group which includes undergraduate men who identify as both Chinese and Samoan, and others who identify as Indian and Iranian.

Another demographic variable included coastal representation in the sample of Asian American undergraduate men. Samples were acquired from both an East Coast institution and a West Coast institution to serve as proxies for experiences and socialization by coasts. The larger presence of Asian Americans on the West Coast as opposed to the East Coast (Hune, 2002) may lend itself to a different socialization process that affects the racial identity, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men. For the purposes of the current study, samples from both coasts are referred to as West coast and East coast.

According to a study on how Asian American students experience racism, there were significant differences in how East Coast Asian American college students and West Coast Asian Americans college students experience racism (A.N. Alvarez, personal

communication, March 29, 2005). East Coast Asian American college students reported fewer perceptions of racism and lower levels of stress than students on the West Coast. (A.N. Alvarez, personal communication, May 7, 2005). Alvarez explained the differences in experiences in the larger presence of Asian Americans on the West Coast, which leads to greater sensitivity to racism and greater exposure to stereotypes such as the Yellow Peril.

Although the current study did not show significant differences by coast in racial identity development statuses, the ANOVA analyzing GRCS by coast did indicate significant differences. The results did not indicate where the significant differences were. The inability to identify the significant differences by coast in gender-role conflict scales may be due to the limited sample size from the West coast. However, the overall differences by coast in gender-role conflict may illustrate an overall variation in experiences with masculinity by coast. This presupposition of Asian American undergraduate men experiencing masculinity differently on the East coast compared to the West coast would be comparable to the findings by Alvarez and Liang's study on Asian American college student experiences with racism where variation was discovered (A.N. Alvarez, personal communication, March 29, 2005). Further study on how Asian American undergraduate men view masculinity, depending on their location and socializing influences, may provide insight into not only reactions to racism but what may shape their self-concept.

With regard to the insignificant relationship between socioeconomic status (SES) of Asian American undergraduate men and gender-role conflict, interactions between SES and other demographic variables were not accounted for in the study. Stillson et al. (1991) examined the effects of class on gender-role conflict and found significant

relationships in low socioeconomic status of Black men with certain subscales in GRCS. Stillson et al. noted that there may be relationships between race and class that produce greater gender-role conflict. Since Asian American men are in similar situations as African American men in being racial minorities and stereotyped, although in very different ways, studying the relationships of race, class, and gender-role conflict may be another area for further exploration. Although SES was not found to be significant in this analysis, interactions between SES and other demographic variables such as generational status, coast, or ethnic region may reveal additional predictive relationships on self-esteem.

#### Limitations

The limitations in the current study range from sampling strategies, correspondence with Asian American undergraduate students, historical effects, instrumentation, and methodology. Since the current study attempted to be highly rigorous in its sampling technique, equal numbers were sampled from the East Coast institution and the West Coast institution. The response rate for Asian American undergraduate men on the East Coast was 23% whereas for those on the West Coast, the response rate was 11.6%. The low response rate from the West Coast sample may have resulted from the lack of an explicit institutional relationship with the researcher. Perhaps a direct endorsement from a faculty member or administrator could have encouraged more students to respond. Although a faculty member at UCLA sponsored the research, students who received email invitations to participate would not have readily known the institutional connection. Additionally larger monetary incentives, greater than \$50 American Express Gift Cards, may have increased the number of responses overall; however, due to financial constraints larger incentives were not possible.

The sensitivity of the topics became evident through the institutional review board process. Racial identity and gender-role conflict were interpreted as particularly sensitive, which led to the delay in sending the survey to participants and historical effects which were particularly relevant to the West coast sample. Students were bombarded with survey requests (J. Richlin-Klonsky, personal communication, March 9, 2005), which may have distracted students' attention from the current study. In addition, invitations and reminders were sent during breaks in the academic calendar, which could have contributed to the low response rate. Unfortunately, the timing of the correspondence was dependent on other factors such as the institutional review board process.

Additional sampling limitations include the self-selective nature of the participants. Students who self-identified as Asian Americans may have been more likely to complete the survey than those who did not identify with the racial term of Asian American. If participants ascribed to the racialization concept, this may help to explain the high Cronbach alphas for the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale. For individuals who may find their ethnic identity to be more salient and those who do not follow the racial identity development outlined by Helms (1995), their experiences may be not represented in the study.

One method to improve sampling would be to increase the numbers of Asian American undergraduate men sampled. The increase may capture additional Asian American undergraduate men, particularly from the West Coast, as well as from later generational statuses, to provide a richer description of the experiences of Asian American undergraduate men.

Differences between the two institutions may not have been significant due to the small sample sizes. Other possible areas of difference may have been by ethnic region or

ethnicity. However, there was no guarantee of representation by certain ethnic regions or ethnicities because of the random sampling technique. As indicated earlier, student identification with the term Asian American, particularly by South Asian Americans, may also limit the generalizability of the study. Asian American undergraduate men, who do not identify racially and are in less mature statuses of their racial identity development, may not be represented in the study.

One of the challenges in conducting an online survey is technical difficulty. The surveys were inaccessible for one day during the two-week interval, resulting in students being unable to complete the survey. Another technical limitation may be the junk mail filters available in various email programs. If the correspondence was sent in bulk or from an unknown email address, there was a possibility that it was filtered into a separate junk mail folder.

Methodologically, there were several limitations in how items were measured. Socioeconomic status and generational status were potentially limiting. Socioeconomic status in particular was self-reported with most people identifying as middle-class. Although students were asked about their parents' educational and occupational statuses, the data were not entered into the regression. The overall sample size of 173 Asian American undergraduate men created a limitation in the number of variables that may be entered in a regression for the study to be methodologically sound.

The instruments used in this study provide additional potential limitations although the Cronbach alphas for the current study were higher than in the studies reviewed. The Gender-Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil et al., 1986) and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) had been initially normed on White men, thereby reflecting White cultural norms such as hegemonic masculinity and valuing an individual,

global self-esteem over a collective self-esteem and self-concept. The instruments therefore may not capture the complexity of cultural variations and the interactions of power and oppression, particularly related to race and gender roles. However, both instruments have been used with diverse populations and demonstrated adequate internal consistencies (O'Neil, 2004; O'Neil et al., 1986; Rosenberg, 1965; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Smith & Betz, 2002; Yip, 2003). The People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990) may not provide accurate profiles for Asian Americans who identify as first or 1.5 generation. Additionally, Helms (1995) People of Color racial identity development model may not provide adequate descriptions of racial identity development for Asian Americans who have transnational identities, where the United States is only one of multiple national cultures they experience.

Survey questions for certain instruments were also phrased in somewhat confusing ways. Comments from respondents at the end of the survey brought up concerns with the phrasing of the PRIAS and GRCS. Some of the concerns expressed by the Asian American undergraduate men may have been reflective of their racial identity development status and gender-role conflict rather than the phrasing. For example, one student commented, "This survey had a lot of questions related to homosexuality and White Asians (Wasians). Horrible!" (Appendix N). The subscale which measured homophobia, RABBM, seemed to agitate this student as he was filling out the survey. The comment on White Asians is unclear; although, this may be in reaction to the PRIAS, which used Whites as the dominant and reference group in some of the questions. However, this further supports the PRIAS in what it is attempting to measure, how individuals respond to broader systems of racialization and oppression. Considering both

the GRCS and PRIAS are well-established instruments, the validity of the statements are widely accepted.

In the analysis, interactions between the demographic variables were not accounted for in the regression or the MANOVAs. The limited sample size restricted the number of variables accounted for in the analyses. By not including the interactions between variables such as ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and generational status, the analyses provided an incomplete picture of the population. Larger sample sizes would assist in allowing for more complex analyses, especially considering the diversity within the Asian American population (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999). More complex analyses, such as analysis of covariance, could have been conducted to test for main and interaction effects (K. Inkelas, personal communication, May 18, 2005).

As with any study targeting the Asian American population, the cultural appropriateness of the instruments may be questioned. For Asian American undergraduate men, all instruments have been used with this population and had adequate reliabilities (Chen, 2005; Kim et al., 1996; Liu, 2000; Naik, 2003; Yip, 2003). However, the diversity within the Asian American undergraduate male population may not have been adequately reflected in those studies as well as in the current study to truly test the appropriateness of the GRCS, PRIAS, and RSE.

The research done on Asian American undergraduate men were typically conducted on students attending large public or private institutions (Chen; Kim et al.; Naik; Yip) with the exception of one study which included community college students (Liu, 2000). The level of access to the large public and private institutions may draw Asian American undergraduate men who may be at different racial identity statuses and

gender-role conflict levels from those at smaller public institutions, community colleges, for-profit institutions, or private liberal arts colleges.

Another limitation in the study is the lack of attention given to Asian ethnic values. In attempting to understand what may explain variance in gender-role conflict, Liu (2000) proposed a greater attention on Asian cultural values. Although the researcher questions the idea of the categorization of Asian cultural values as an umbrella concept, there may be specific ethnic, as well as religious, heritages that relate to how Asian American men define masculinity. The idea of a monolithic Asian cultural values scale is misrepresentative of the varied ethnic heritages represented in the political term of Asian American (Hirabayashi, 1998). A more appropriate term to get at the spirit of what Liu may have intended would be ethnic cultural values to make the distinction between Asian ethnic groups and their values, which may or may not overlap (Helms, 1996). The differences in Asian ethnic values may also help explain variance in self-esteem; however, it was not included in this study because the focus was on racialization and systems of oppression and privilege (Helms, 1995, 1996).

A final limitation may be the assumptions implicit in using racial identity as a measure to predict self-esteem. There is an assumption that Asian American undergraduate men, regardless of generational status, coast, ethnic region, or class, will go through a process of racialization which places them at a subordinate status compared with Whites. The racialization also includes a perceived pan-Asian identity by Asian American undergraduate men (Alvarez, 2002; Chen, 2005) and an assumption that there is a distinction between ethnic and racial identity (Helms, 1996). Although the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale may not capture all the nuances in Asian American

experiences with racial identity development, it is the most widely used and tested instrument to measure the racial identity developmental process.

### Implications for Practice

The results of this study have implications for the Asian American community, student affairs professionals, and higher education. Asian American is a socially constructed term that stemmed out of political movements and governmental regulations (Hune, 2002). Although there is a rich Asian American history (S. Chan, 1991; Takaki, 1990), the stories that have been told and are predominant have focused on East Asian Americans. As studies continue to examine the various communities within the broader Asian American community, Alvarez and Yeh (1999) stressed the importance of institutions recognizing this complexity despite broader society's desire to create a singular Asian American experience. Naik (2003) attempted to identify any differentiation in racial identity development between South Asian American, East Asian American, and Southeast Asian American undergraduate students. Although Naik was unable to find any significant differences, greater research needs to be conducted with broader samples to either support or contradict her findings. The current study was able to demonstrate the salience of racial identity in Asian American undergraduate men's lives across ethnic regions and other demographics such as socioeconomic status, coast, and generational status, thereby challenging popular model minority myths on college campuses today.

Beyond exploring racial identity as an isolated variable, the connections between racial identity, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem in this study illustrate a greater need for institutions to attend to Asian American undergraduate men holistically.

Approximately 27% of the variance in Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem

was accounted for by racial identity and gender-role conflict. When attempting to understand what may affect Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem, undergraduate Asian American men cannot be seen as one-dimensional beings – either solely by race or by gender – but as complex individuals negotiating multiple social identities in an environment that is constantly challenging their self-concepts (Chen, 2005; Lagdameo et al., 2002). Although being male is a dominant identity in society, what it means to be male and masculine needs to be given greater attention so that gender-role conflicts may be exposed and critically examined, especially as gender-role conflict interacts with race.

Additionally, there is an importance in promoting mature racial identity development in Asian American undergraduate men that not only needs to be communicated to student affairs practitioners but also to faculty and students. The significant positive relationship between Internalization, the more mature racial identity status in the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (PRIAS), and self-esteem demonstrates the benefit of attending to racial identity development in Asian American undergraduate men. The predictive relationship between racial identity development and self-esteem, with 13.5% of the variance in self-esteem explained by PRIAS statuses, is another facet of looking at holistic education and student development. Although prior studies on Asian Americans have shown relationships between racial identity and collective self-esteem (Alvarez & Helms, 2001), this is one of the first studies to show the relationship with global self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men.

In understanding the salience of racial identity to personal well-being, it is therefore the responsibility of institutions of higher education to incorporate mechanisms that promote mature racial identity development in Asian American undergraduate

students (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999). The significant predictive relationships of Dissonance and Internalization statuses to self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men outline two critical points in racial identity development that institutions need to attend to.

Dissonance is the status where Asian American undergraduate men experience confusion and begin to question their previous naiveté around issues of race (Alvarez, 2002). The Dissonance status was negatively related to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men and because of its level of significance, initiatives that focus on encouraging students to move past the Dissonance status into more mature racial identity statuses would be beneficial to their development.

Internalization is one of the more mature statuses where Asian American undergraduate men begin to internalize a more balanced view of being Asian American by developing a personally meaningful definition rather than using external criteria and dualistic characteristics (Alvarez, 2002). The significant and positive predictive relationship between Internalization and self-esteem demonstrate the value of assisting students in more complex ways of thinking of race. The status not significant in the regression, Immersion/Emersion, still needs to be considered since it is a transitional status for Asian American undergraduate men as they achieve more mature racial identity statuses and its subsequent positive predictive relationship to self-esteem.

In order to encourage mature racial identity development, institutions may seek to integrate Asian American history, culture, and society throughout the curriculum and student affairs programs (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999). More importantly, the ability to view Asian American studies curriculum through a gender lens may allow room for critical insights into the experiences of Asian American undergraduate men. As indicated in prior studies on Asian American undergraduate men (J. W. Chan, 1998; Chang & Yeh, 2003;

Chua & Fujino, 1999), there needs to be a space to openly discuss their experiences. Institutions, through orientation programs, residence halls, faculty, and student affairs professionals can demystify the counseling process for Asian American undergraduate men. The institutions can also create more programs geared towards Asian American men, such as leadership programs, discussion groups, or speakers.

One of the significant predictors in Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem was Restrictive Emotionality. Whether the forums are online groups (Chang & Yeh, 2003) or in Asian American studies courses (J. W. Chan, 1998), Asian American undergraduate men need avenues to be more expressive with their emotions to improve their personal self-esteem. The internalization of racist ideologies and stereotypes of Asian American men may be connected with the Restrictive Emotionality (RE) and Dissonance statuses that are significant predictors of self-esteem. Cultural expectations from specific ethnic groups may also contribute to the restraint in emotionality exhibited in Asian American undergraduate men. However, it should be noted that the mean score for RE in this sample was 3.41 on a 6-point scale, which indicates slightly lower than the mid-point in gender-role conflict.

Positive role modeling, from an increased presence of Asian American men, may serve as another avenue for promoting active exploration of students' racial identity (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999; Hurtado et al., 1999; Laker, 2005). For student affairs, an increase in the number of men in the profession would be one avenue to support undergraduate men (Laker, 2005). By moving away from stereotypical images and messages, institutions can promote more complex understandings of the Asian American community, which is indicative of the more mature racial identity statuses outlined by Helms (1995) and related to higher self-esteem as indicated in the current study.

Institutions can encourage participation in student leadership by Asian American men and include the Asian American community in university-wide “mainstream” programs. By purposefully incorporating Asian American culture and issues, Asian American undergraduate men will be exposed to positive reflections of their communities while non-Asian American students become accustomed to Asian American issues as part of a broader community context.

Overall, this study served to expand the available research on Asian American students and Asian American men. With Gender Studies now moving to explore masculinity and experiences of men (Kellum, 2005), this contributes to the broader body of information. Previous studies on men have had limited samples of Asian Americans to the point where they were not included in the analysis (O'Neil et al., 1986; Stillson et al., 1991). This study supports the validity of the gender-role conflict scale for the undergraduate Asian American men, similar to Liu (2000) and Kim et al. (1996).

Additionally, this study provided a psychological well-being perspective around race and gender for Asian American undergraduate men, which is helpful considering the increased attention to the quality of life on college campuses for Asian American students (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999; Cress & Ikeda, 2003). One variable in operationalizing psychological well-being is self-esteem (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Cress & Ikeda, 2003; Pyant & Yanico, 1991; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Yip, 2003). By focusing on self-esteem as a measure of psychological well-being, the current study attempts to expand the discourse on Asian American undergraduate students beyond the model minority paradigm (Suzuki, 2002).

For institutions that have resources designed specifically for Asian American students, the relationships between racial identity, gender-role conflict, and self-esteem

provide possible areas for emphasis. The significant relationships found in the correlation analyses and hierarchical multiple regression of this study present new focal points for services. In the presence of programs geared towards Asian American women, Asian American men may need similarly focused programs. For the institutions that do not provide services specifically for Asian Americans, this study may help reveal the need for specialized, or more informed and comprehensive, services to support the development of this population (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999).

#### Recommendations for Further Research

This research examined the relationships of racial identity and gender-role conflict to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men. The assumptions of Asian American undergraduate men as racialized gendered beings responding to broader forces of socialization framed the study and research questions. The findings seemed to support the framework although the limitations addressed earlier may affect the generalizability to Asian American undergraduate men nationally.

The experiences of Asian American undergraduate men in the East coast and West coast were not shown to be significantly different in this study. However, the idea that different socialization processes may occur depending on the region in the United States students are currently in may be an area for further study. A. Alvarez (personal communication, May 7, 2005) has already empirically demonstrated the differences in East coast and West coast Asian American undergraduate students' experiences with racism. Taking into consideration the varying findings related to experiences by East coast and West coast Asian American undergraduate students, future examinations can focus on how coasts may relate to different measures of race, racial identity, and racism. The difference between the study by Alvarez and the current study is the focus of the

research question. The research question in the current study involved racial identity development, which is different from experiences with racism and the level of stress associated with racism. A future study may incorporate racial identity, experience with racism, and level of stress associated with racism to identify any potential differences in experiences by coast. Results from those studies may provide insight into what could be learned from different regions in how to approach issues of race and Asian Americans in particular. For institutions of higher education, interventions that are tailored to the experiences of Asian American undergraduates may take into consideration their culture based on coast to create more appropriate outreach and support mechanisms (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999).

The current study focused on large, public research institutions. Future research to focus on the experiences of Asian American men in community college settings as well as other institution types such as comprehensive universities, private institutions, and liberal arts colleges is recommended. In addition, institutions may consider collecting ethnic data as supplementary information to racial data gathered during admissions. An important note is that racial identifications are optional so there would not be any guarantee of the accuracy of such reported information.

Another way to expand the research on Asian American undergraduate men would be to purposefully sample students from different regions in the U.S. (Midwest, South, etc.), ethnic groups, socioeconomic statuses, and institution types. The current study was narrowly focused on East Coast and West Coast large, public, research universities. Experiences of Asian American undergraduate men who may have to juggle additional responsibilities such as work and family may provide greater validity to the Conflict Between Work and Family Relations (CBWFR) subscale in the Gender-Role

Conflict Scale. Rather than assuming that CBWFR is not as applicable to the college population, perhaps the type of institution may be related to the weaker relationships with college students in earlier studies (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good et al., 1995). The current study had a higher reliability (Cronbach alpha = .85) than other studies with college students so further research needs to be conducted to test the reliability of the CBWFR subscale with the college population.

Another factor that may be explored further is socioeconomic status (SES) and its relationship to Asian American undergraduate men's self-esteem. When the first block of demographic variables, which included SES, was combined with the second block of gender-role conflict subscales, SES was a significant predictor of self-esteem. When combined with the third block of racial identity statuses, SES was no longer significant in predicting self-esteem. The findings indicate that further examination of SES and possible interactions need to be conducted with regards to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men. Could additional variance in self-esteem be explained by the interaction of demographic variables, gender-role conflict, and racial identity? Stillson et al. (1991) has already identified intersections of race and class with gender-role conflict in African American adult men. Would there be similar findings with Asian American undergraduate men? How would this relate to the experiences of working Asian American men who may or may not be traditionally aged college students?

The scope of the Asian American undergraduate male population may also be expanded in future research to include greater numbers of gay, bisexual, and transgender-identified individuals. The current study was over 90% heterosexual men, 5.2% gay men, and 3.5% bisexual men. There were no students who identified as transgender. The lack of diversity within this sample identifies an area for further study on racial identity,

gender-role conflict, and self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men. How representative and applicable are the current findings to Asian American gay and bisexual men? One gay male student commented, “My answers for showing affection to males is of course going to be skewed because I am gay so I completely disagreed many times.” A lesbian and gay identity development model could be an additional component to studies on self-esteem, racial identity, and gender-role conflict to understand how they may relate to each other. The Inclusive Model of Lesbian/Gay Identity Formation developed by Fassinger (1998) identifies two areas for development, an individual sexual identity and group membership identity. Although Chen (2005) attempted to measure multiple social identities in her mixed methods study, one challenge she encountered was lack of an instrument to measure multiple social identities adequately. Chen’s findings included Asian American undergraduate men who felt the need to explain their sexual identity regardless of their sexual orientation. For Asian American undergraduate men, this intersection of race, gender, and sexual orientation could be examined further to understand how the different identities relate to each other, as well as other social identities mentioned previously (SES and religious orientation).

Although this study focused on global self-esteem, other indicators of psychological well-being may be another area for future research (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Cress & Ikeda, 2003; Pyant & Yanico, 1991; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Yip, 2003). Studies on depression, satisfaction of life, and self-efficacy may be other indicators to examine with racial identity and gender-role conflict. How strong of a predictor is racial identity with depression, satisfaction of life, and self-efficacy? Cress and Ikeda (2003) noted the importance of a supportive campus climate for Asian Americans as a way to address issues of depression in Asian American college students. For Asian American

undergraduate men, what contributes to feelings of depression? Do issues of race and gender-role conflict play heavily in the likelihood of Asian American undergraduate men who experience depression?

With regards to self-esteem, although the study accounted for 36.8% of the variance, what contributes to the rest of the variance? Possible factors may include Asian ethnic values, religious orientation, sexual orientation, and self-efficacy. Asian ethnic values may be an area for further study with self-esteem because of the variability within the Asian American community (Alvarez & Yeh, 1999; Hune, 2002; Liu, 2000). Religious orientation was considered in Chen's (2005) study on multiple social identities and self-esteem and would be interesting to study using developed instrumentation on religious identity combined with racial identity, and gender-role conflict with self-esteem.

Sexual orientation, similar to gender-role conflict, may also relate to self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men. If more mature racial identity statuses are significant predictors of more positive self-esteem, it would seem to follow that another social identity status that is oppressed in society would have similar relationships with self-esteem. The current study indicated a positive predictive relationship between Internalization and self-esteem as well as negative predictive relationships between Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion/Emersion with self-esteem. Parallel statuses in lesbian and gay identity development may lead to similar findings.

Self-efficacy as a variable to study with self-esteem was identified due to the perception that Asian American students are goal-oriented (Suzuki, 2002), which may influence their global self-esteem. Future studies that seek to identify the other factors predictive of self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men may seek to use the recommended social identities and self-efficacy as a starting point.

By broadening the focus even further, how do institutional programs and policies relate to the gender-role conflict, racial identity, and self-esteem in Asian American undergraduate men? Liu (2000) examined how multicultural education may be related to gender-role conflict and racial identity development. Hurtado et al. (1999) identified benefits of diverse learning environments for students but how all of those factors relate to the psychological well-being of Asian American undergraduate men and Asian American undergraduate students could be areas for further research. What are the areas of personal development that are influenced by such policies, curriculum, and programs?

Finally, what became evident through the research process was a need for qualitative or mixed-method approaches to exploring the experiences of Asian American undergraduate men. The survey allowed for comments and suggestions from respondents (Appendix N), which spanned the range of racial identity development and gender-role conflict that was measured. However, through all the comments, it was clear that Asian American undergraduate men had stories to share and did not necessarily feel like their experiences, thoughts, and opinions could be limited by the confines of the instruments used. Therefore, individual interviews and focus groups may elicit a more revealing and insightful picture into the lives of Asian American undergraduate men.

In conclusion, the results of this study indicate a need for greater research on Asian American undergraduate men and how institutions may be responsive to this population of students.

APPENDIX A: PEOPLE OF COLOR RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE SCALE

(Helms & Carter, 1990)

Modified by Liu (2000)

**Instructions:** This questionnaire is designed to measure people’s social and political attitudes concerning race and ethnicity. Since different people have different opinions, there are no right or wrong answers. Use the scale below to respond to each statement according to the way you see things. Be as honest as you can. Beside each item number, mark the number that best describes how you feel.

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

---

Mark here

- |           |     |  |
|-----------|-----|--|
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 1.  | In general, I believe that Anglo-Americans (Whites) are superior to other racial groups.   |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 2.  | I feel more comfortable being around Anglo-American (Whites) than I do being around Asian Americans.   |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 3.  | In general, Asian Americans have not contributed very much to American society.  |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 4.  | Sometimes, I am embarrassed to be Asian American.  |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 5.  | I would have accomplished more in life if I had been born an Anglo-American (White).   |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 6.  | Anglo-Americans (Whites) are more attractive than Asian Americans.   |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 7.  | Asian Americans should learn to think and act like Anglo-Americans (Whites).   |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 8.  | I limit myself to White activities.  |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 9.  | I think Asian Americans blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) too much for their problems.  |
| 5 4 3 2 1 | 10. | I feel unable to involve myself in Anglo-Americans’ (Whites) experiences, and am increasing my involvement in experiences involving Asian Americans. |

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
5 4 3 2 1	11.	When I think about how Anglo-Americans (Whites) have treated Asian Americans, I feel an overwhelming anger.			
5 4 3 2 1	12.	I want to know more about my culture.			
5 4 3 2 1	13.	I limit myself to activities involving Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	14.	Most Anglo-Americans (Whites) are untrustworthy.			
5 4 3 2 1	15.	American society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	16.	I am determined to find my cultural identity.			
5 4 3 2 1	17.	Most Anglo-Americans (Whites) are insensitive.			
5 4 3 2 1	18.	I reject all Anglo-American (White) values.			
5 4 3 2 1	19.	My most important goal in life is to fight the oppression of Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	20.	I believe that being Asian American has caused me to have many strengths.			
5 4 3 2 1	21.	I am comfortable wherever I am.			
5 4 3 2 1	22.	People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.			
5 4 3 2 1	23.	I think Asian and White cultures differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior.			
5 4 3 2 1	24.	My Asian cultural background is a source of pride to me.			
5 4 3 2 1	25.	People of Asian culture and White culture have much to learn from each other.			
5 4 3 2 1	26.	Anglo-Americans (Whites) have some customs that I enjoy.			
5 4 3 2 1	27.	I enjoy being around people regardless of their race.			
5 4 3 2 1	28.	Every racial group has some good people and some bad people.			

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
5 4 3 2 1	29.	Asian Americans should not blame Anglo-Americans (Whites) for all of their social problems.			
5 4 3 2 1	30.	I do not understand why Anglo-Americans (Whites) treat Asian Americans as they do.			
5 4 3 2 1	31.	I am embarrassed about some of the things I feel about Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	32.	I'm not sure where I really belong.			
5 4 3 2 1	33.	I have begun to question my beliefs.			
5 4 3 2 1	34.	Maybe I can learn something from Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	35.	Anglo-American (White) people can teach me more about surviving in this world than Asian Americans can, but Asian Americans can teach me more about being human.			
5 4 3 2 1	36.	I don't know whether being Asian American is an asset or a deficit.			
5 4 3 2 1	37.	Sometimes I think Anglo-Americans (Whites) are superior and sometimes I think they're inferior to Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	38.	Sometimes I am proud to be Asian American and sometimes I am ashamed of it.			
5 4 3 2 1	39.	Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time.			
5 4 3 2 1	40.	I'm not sure how I feel about myself.			
5 4 3 2 1	41.	White people are difficult to understand.			
5 4 3 2 1	42.	I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who are Asian American.			
5 4 3 2 1	43.	I feel anxious about some of the things I feel about Asian Americans.			

	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
5 4 3 2 1	44.	When an Asian American does something embarrassing in public, I feel embarrassed.			
5 4 3 2 1	45.	When both White people and Asian Americans are present in a social situation, I prefer to be with Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	46.	My values and beliefs match those of Anglos (Whites) more than they do Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	47.	The way Anglos (Whites) treat Asian Americans makes me angry.			
5 4 3 2 1	48.	I only follow the traditions and customs of Asian Americans.			
5 4 3 2 1	49.	When Asian Americans act like Anglos (Whites) I feel angry.			
5 4 3 2 1	50.	I am comfortable being Asian American.			

APPENDIX B: GENDER-ROLE CONFLICT SCALE

(O'Neil et al., 1986)

Instructions: In the space to the left of each sentence below, write the number which most closely represents the degree that you Agree or Disagree with the statement. There is no right or wrong answer to each statement; your own reaction is what is asked for. Please note the change in scaling for this survey.

Strongly Agree						Strongly Disagree
6	5	4	3	2		1

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Moving up the career ladder is important to me.
2. \_\_\_\_\_ I have difficulty telling others I care about them.
3. \_\_\_\_\_ Verbally expressing my love to another man is difficult for me.
4. \_\_\_\_\_ I feel torn between my hectic work schedule and caring for my health.
5. \_\_\_\_\_ Making money is part of my idea of being a successful man.
6. \_\_\_\_\_ Strong emotions are difficult for me to understand.
7. \_\_\_\_\_ Affection with other men make me tense.
8. \_\_\_\_\_ I sometimes define my personal value by my career success.
9. \_\_\_\_\_ Expressing feelings makes me feel open to attack by other people.
10. \_\_\_\_\_ Expressing my emotions to other men is risky.
11. \_\_\_\_\_ My career, job, or school affects the quality of my leisure or family life.
12. \_\_\_\_\_ I evaluate other people's value by their level of achievement and success.
13. \_\_\_\_\_ Talking (about my feelings) during sexual relations is difficult for me.
14. \_\_\_\_\_ I worry about failing and how it affects my doing well as a man.
15. \_\_\_\_\_ I have difficulty expressing my emotional needs to my partner.
16. \_\_\_\_\_ Men who touch other men make me uncomfortable.

Strongly Agree 6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

17. \_\_\_\_\_ Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
18. \_\_\_\_\_ Doing well all the time is important to me.
19. \_\_\_\_\_ I have difficulty expressing my tender feelings.
20. \_\_\_\_\_ Hugging other men is difficult for me.
21. \_\_\_\_\_ I often feel that I need to be in charge of those around me.
22. \_\_\_\_\_ Telling others of my strong feelings is not part of my sexual behavior.
23. \_\_\_\_\_ Competing with others is the best way to succeed.
24. \_\_\_\_\_ Winning is a measure of my value and personal worth.
25. \_\_\_\_\_ I often have trouble finding words that describe how I am feeling.
26. \_\_\_\_\_ I am sometimes hesitant to show my affection to men because of how others might perceive me.
27. \_\_\_\_\_ My needs to work or study keep me from my family or leisure more than I would like.
28. \_\_\_\_\_ I strive to be more successful than others.
29. \_\_\_\_\_ I do not like to show my emotions to other people.
30. \_\_\_\_\_ Telling my partner my feelings about him/her during sex is difficult for me.
31. \_\_\_\_\_ My work or school often disrupts other parts of my life (home, family, health, leisure).

Strongly Agree 6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree 1
------------------------	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

32. \_\_\_\_\_ I am often concerned about how others evaluate my performance at work or school.
33. \_\_\_\_\_ Being very personal with other men makes me feel uncomfortable.
34. \_\_\_\_\_ Being smarter or physically stronger than other men is important to me.
35. \_\_\_\_\_ Men who are overly friendly to me, make me wonder about their sexual preference (men or women).
36. \_\_\_\_\_ Overwork and stress, caused by a need to achieve on the job or in school, affects/hurts my life.
37. \_\_\_\_\_ I like to feel superior to other people.

APPENDIX C: ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

(Rosenberg, 1965)

Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please mark the circle corresponding with how you feel about the statement.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I feel that I'm a person of worth at least on an equal plane with others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. I certainly feel useless at times.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. At times I think I am no good at all.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

APPENDIX D: DEMOGRAPHICS

I attend school on the:

- East Coast                       West Coast

I am:

- Asian American                       Bi-/Multi-racial (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

My ethnic background includes: (please check all that apply)

- |                                      |                                     |                                       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bangladeshi | <input type="checkbox"/> Indian     | <input type="checkbox"/> Pakistani    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Burmese     | <input type="checkbox"/> Indonesian | <input type="checkbox"/> Taiwanese    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cambodian   | <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese   | <input type="checkbox"/> Thai         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese     | <input type="checkbox"/> Korean     | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Filipina/o  | <input type="checkbox"/> Laotian    | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hmong       | <input type="checkbox"/> Malaysian  |                                       |

Gender:             Male                       Female                       Transgender

Generational Status:

- 1<sup>st</sup> generation – foreign born and immigrated to the United States (U.S.)  
Please note how many years you have lived in the U.S. \_\_\_\_\_
- 1.5 generation – foreign born but raised primarily in the U.S. (immigrated at age 12 or younger)  
Please note how many years you have lived in the U.S. \_\_\_\_\_
- 2<sup>nd</sup> generation – born in the U.S.; parents immigrated to the U.S.  
\_\_\_ one parent immigrated to the U.S. \_\_\_ both parents immigrated to the U.S.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> generation – born in the U.S.; parents born in the U.S.
- 4<sup>th</sup> generation or higher – born in the U.S.; parents, grandparents (or more) born in the U.S.

Which of the following best describes your mother’s highest educational attainment?

- High school or less
- Some college
- Associate’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s, Doctorate or professional degree (JD, MD, PhD)

Which of the following best describes your father’s highest educational attainment?

- High school or less
- Some college
- Associate’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s, Doctorate or professional degree (JD, MD, PhD)

Which of the following best describes your mother's current occupational status?

- Unemployed/not working
- Manual laborer
- Service worker
- Skilled worker
- Professional or top administrator

Which of the following best describes your father's current occupational status?

- Unemployed/not working
- Manual laborer
- Service worker
- Skilled worker
- Professional or top administrator

I would consider the home I grew up in:

- Lower class
- Lower-middle class
- Middle class
- Upper-middle class
- Upper class

Current Status:  Full-time Student  Part-time Student  
(check all that apply)  Full-time Employed  Part-Time Employed

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Class Year:  1<sup>st</sup>  2<sup>nd</sup>  3<sup>rd</sup>  4<sup>th</sup>  5<sup>th</sup>+  Graduate

Major: \_\_\_\_\_

Religious Orientation (e.g. Buddhist, Catholic, Hindu, Muslim, etc.):

Sexual Orientation:  Heterosexual  Gay  Bisexual  Asexual  Other:

\_\_\_\_\_

Relationship Status:  Single  Partnered  Married  Divorced  Widowed

Please feel free to make comments or suggestions in this space:

## APPENDIX E: CONCLUSION OF SURVEY

### **Thank you for your responses to this survey!**

In appreciation of completing the survey, you are eligible to enter a prize drawing for gift certificates!

- Yes, please enter me in the prize drawing. Enter your e-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_
- No, I do not wish to enter the prize drawing.

Winners will be notified by the e-mail address entered above after Friday, March 25, the last day of the survey.

Would you like a summary of this study's results when they become available?

- Yes, please send me a summary of the study's results to my e-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_
- No, I do not want a summary of the study's results.

“Continue” [to next screen of survey]

Your responses have been successfully submitted. If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, we would like to hear from you. Please feel free to contact us:

Yen Ling Shek  
Graduate Student  
University of Maryland  
[ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu)  
(240) 461-4092

Faculty Advisor  
Dr. Marylu McEwen  
Counseling and Personnel Services  
3214 Benjamin, University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742  
[mmcewen@umd.edu](mailto:mmcewen@umd.edu)  
(301) 405-2871

**Remember to close or exit your Internet browser.**

**Thank you!**

## APPENDIX F: EAST COAST INITIAL CONTACT EMAIL

Subject: Your thoughts are needed

---

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?\[Custom ID\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?[Custom ID])

Dear [Name of Participant],

You have been contacted as part of a select group of students to participate in a study on the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men as part of research for the College Student Personnel Program.

The survey will take 20 minutes to complete. You will be entered into a drawing to win a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card. The deadline for survey completion is March 31, 2005. Winners will be notified by April 30, 2005.

I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study as it would expand the scholarship on Asian American undergraduate men. The link to the website is below:  
[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?\[Custom ID\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?[Custom ID])

If you have difficulties connecting to the website, please copy and paste the link onto your browser. Once you are on the website you will see an informed consent form which will provide you with further information on the survey.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu) or (240) 461-4092. Information for the faculty sponsor is also included below. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Yen Ling Shek  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Student Personnel  
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2005  
(240) 461-4092  
[ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu)

Faculty Sponsor  
Marylu McEwen, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
3214 Benjamin Building  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-2871  
[mmcewen@umd.edu](mailto:mmcewen@umd.edu)

Please note: Two follow-up emails will be sent within the next two weeks as a friendly reminder for those who have not completed the survey. If you do not wish to receive further emails, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from the list.

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/r.asp?\[Custom ID\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r.asp?[Custom ID])

APPENDIX G: WEST COAST INITIAL CONTACT EMAIL

Date for Release: March 22, 2005

Subject: Your thoughts are needed

---

**<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=51772940062>**

You are invited to participate in a study on the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men for my master's thesis.

The survey will take **20** minutes to complete. You will be entered into a drawing to win a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card. Winners will be notified a week following the conclusion of the survey. The deadline for survey completion is **April 5, 2005**.

I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study as it would expand the scholarship on Asian American undergraduate men. The link to the website is below:

**<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=51772940062>**

If you have difficulties connecting to the website, please copy and paste the link onto your browser. Once you are on the website you will see an informed consent form which will provide you with further information on the survey.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at [ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu) or (240) 461-4092. Information for the faculty sponsors are also included below. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
Yen Ling Shek  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Student Personnel  
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2005  
(240) 461-4092  
[ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu)

UMD Faculty Sponsor  
Marylu McEwen, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
University of Maryland  
3214 Benjamin Building  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-2871  
[mmcewen@umd.edu](mailto:mmcewen@umd.edu)

UCLA Faculty Sponsor  
Mitchell Chang, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
UCLA Graduate School of Education &  
Information Studies  
Box 951521, 3038 MH  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521  
(310) 825-0504  
[mjchang@gseis.ucla.edu](mailto:mjchang@gseis.ucla.edu)

Please note: Two follow-up emails will be sent within the next two weeks as a friendly reminder for those who have not completed the survey.

APPENDIX H: EAST COAST FIRST FOLLOW-UP EMAIL

(One week prior to deadline)

Subject: Reminder: Your thoughts are needed

---

Dear [Name of Participant],

Last week, you received an email message about participating in the College Student Personnel survey on social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men. You are part of a select group contacted for this important research. There is one more week until the deadline for the survey, March 31<sup>st</sup> and your help would be greatly appreciated.

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. You can access the survey through the following website:

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?\[Custom ID\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?[Custom ID])

If you have any difficulties accessing or completing the survey, please feel free to contact me. As a reminder, you could be the recipient of a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,  
Yen Ling Shek  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Student Personnel  
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2005  
(240) 461-4092  
ylshek@umd.edu

Faculty Sponsor  
Marylu McEwen, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
3214 Benjamin Building  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-2871  
mmcewen@umd.edu

Please note: There will be one last friendly reminder sent three days before the deadline for survey completion. If you do not wish to receive further emails, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from the list.  
[https://www.surveymonkey.com/r.asp?\[Custom ID\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r.asp?[Custom ID])

APPENDIX I: WEST COAST FIRST FOLLOW-UP EMAIL  
(One week prior to deadline)

Date for Release: March 29, 2005

Subject: Reminder: Your thoughts are needed

---

*If you have already completed the survey, please disregard this email.*

Last week, you received an email message about participating in my survey on social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men. There is one more week until the deadline for the survey, April 5<sup>th</sup>, and I would greatly appreciate your help with my thesis research.

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. You can access the survey through the following website:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=51772940062>

If you have any difficulties accessing or completing the survey, please feel free to contact me. As a reminder, you could be the recipient of a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,  
Yen Ling Shek  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Student Personnel  
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2005  
(240) 461-4092  
ylshek@umd.edu

UMD Faculty Sponsor  
Marylu McEwen, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
University of Maryland  
3214 Benjamin Building  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-2871  
mmcewen@umd.edu

UCLA Faculty Sponsor  
Mitchell Chang, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
UCLA Graduate School of Education &  
Information Studies  
Box 951521, 3038 MH  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521  
(310) 825-0504  
mjchang@gseis.ucla.edu

Please note: There will be one last friendly reminder sent three days before the deadline for survey completion.

APPENDIX J: EAST COAST SECOND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL

(Three days prior to deadline)

Subject: Last Reminder: Your thoughts are needed

---

Dear [Name of Participant],

The deadline to contribute to new research on the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men is in three days. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. You can access the survey through the following website:

[https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?\[Custom ID\]](https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?[Custom ID])

If you have any difficulties accessing or completing the survey, please contact me. As a reminder, you could be the recipient of a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,  
Yen Ling Shek  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Student Personnel  
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2005  
(240) 461-4092  
ylshek@umd.edu

Faculty Sponsor  
Marylu McEwen, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
3214 Benjamin Building  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-2871  
mmcewen@umd.edu

APPENDIX K: WEST COAST SECOND FOLLOW-UP EMAIL  
(Three days prior to deadline)

Date for Release: April 2, 2005

Subject: Last Reminder: Your thoughts are needed

---

*If you have already completed the survey, please disregard this email.*

The deadline to contribute to new research on the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men is in three days, April 5<sup>th</sup>. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. You can access the survey through the following website:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=51772940062>

If you have any difficulties accessing or completing the survey, please contact me. As a reminder, you could be the recipient of a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,  
Yen Ling Shek  
University of Maryland, College Park  
College Student Personnel  
Candidate for Master of Arts, 2005  
(240) 461-4092  
ylshek@umd.edu

Faculty Sponsor  
Marylu McEwen, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
College of Education  
University of Maryland  
3214 Benjamin Building  
College Park, MD 20742  
(301) 405-2871  
mmcewen@umd.edu

UCLA Faculty Sponsor  
Mitchell Chang, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
UCLA Graduate School of Education &  
Information Studies  
Box 951521, 3038 MH  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521  
(310) 825-0504  
mjchang@gseis.ucla.edu

## APPENDIX L: EAST COAST INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Welcome to the survey on your social and personal attitudes as an Asian American undergraduate man.

Before you begin, please review this page. It contains information on your rights as a participant.

- By clicking the “Begin Survey” link below, you state that you are over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Yen Ling Shek under the faculty advisement of Dr. Marylu McEwen in the Department of Counseling and Personnel Services at the University of Maryland, College Park.
- The purpose of this research study is to study the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men.
- If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a survey about your social and personal attitudes. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.
- All information collected in this study is confidential. The information you provide will be grouped with information other people provide for reporting and presentation, and your name will not be used. Data will be stored on a private computer owned by the student researcher and will be password protected.
- Due to the public nature of the Internet, the possibility of someone intercepting your data is possible, but highly unlikely. If you do not exit or close your Internet browser when you have completed your survey, it is possible that another person using your computer at a later time could view your responses. It is therefore important that you exit your browser after you have submitted your survey.
- *I understand that the questions may ask for me to reflect on my personal experiences and opinions and may be sensitive in nature which may result in some discomfort.*
- *I understand that my participation is voluntary.*
- *I also understand that I do not have to answer any question I feel uncomfortable with and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.*
- The following are sample questions from the survey:
  - I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
  - Moving up the career ladder is important to me.
  - Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
  - I am comfortable wherever I am.
- The research is not designed to help you personally, but the benefits to participation include contributing to research on an important, understudied topic. This research may help us understand the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men.
- Following completion of the survey, you may follow instructions to be entered into a drawing for a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card.
- If you have any questions about participating in this project, please contact me (Yen Ling Shek at [ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu) or 240-461-4092) or my faculty advisor, Dr. Marylu McEwen ([mmcewen@umd.edu](mailto:mmcewen@umd.edu), 301-405-2871, or 3214 Benjamin).

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact: Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742; (e-mail) [irb@deans.umd.edu](mailto:irb@deans.umd.edu); (telephone) 301-405-4212

- I wish to participate in this research study. “Begin Survey”
- I do not wish to participate in this research study. “Log Out”

## APPENDIX M: WEST COAST INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Welcome to the survey on your social and personal attitudes as an Asian American undergraduate man.

Before you begin, please review this page. It contains information on your rights as a participant.

- By clicking the “Begin Survey” link below, you state that you are over 18 years of age and wish to participate in a program of research being conducted by Yen Ling Shek under the faculty advisement of Dr. Marylu McEwen in the Department of Counseling and Personnel Services at the University of Maryland, College Park.
- The purpose of this research study is to study the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men.
- If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a survey about your social and personal attitudes. It will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.
- All information collected in this study is confidential. The information you provide will be grouped with information other people provide for reporting and presentation, and your name will not be used. Data will be stored on a private computer owned by the student researcher and will be password protected.
- Due to the public nature of the Internet, the possibility of someone intercepting your data is possible, but highly unlikely. If you do not exit or close your Internet browser when you have completed your survey, it is possible that another person using your computer at a later time could view your responses. It is therefore important that you exit your browser after you have submitted your survey.
- *I understand that the questions may ask for me to reflect on my personal experiences and opinions and may be sensitive in nature which may result in some discomfort.*
- *I understand that my participation is voluntary.*
- *I also understand that I do not have to answer any question I feel uncomfortable with and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.*
- The following are sample questions from the survey:
  - I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
  - Moving up the career ladder is important to me.
  - Finding time to relax is difficult for me.
  - I am comfortable wherever I am.
- The research is not designed to help you personally, but the benefits to participation include contributing to research on an important, understudied topic. This research may help us understand the social and personal attitudes of Asian American undergraduate men.
- Following completion of the survey, you may follow instructions to be entered into a drawing for a \$50 or \$25 American Express Gift Card.
- If you have any questions about participating in this project, please contact me (Yen Ling Shek at [ylshek@umd.edu](mailto:ylshek@umd.edu) or 240-461-4092), my UMD faculty advisor, Dr. Marylu McEwen ([mmcewen@umd.edu](mailto:mmcewen@umd.edu), 301-405-2871, or 3214 Benjamin), or UCLA

faculty advisor, Dr. Mitchell Chang (mjchang@gseis.ucla.edu, 310-825-0504, 3038 MH).

If you have questions about your rights as a research subject or wish to report a research-related injury, please contact: Institutional Review Board Office, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, 20742; irb@deans.umd.edu; 301-405-4212 or the UCLA Office for the Protection of Research Subjects, 1401 Ueberroth Building, UCLA, Box 951694, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694, 310-825-8714.

- I wish to participate in this research study. “Begin Survey”
- I do not wish to participate in this research study. “Log Out”

## APPENDIX N: COMMENTS FROM SURVEY

The following are comments from Asian American undergraduate men who participated in the study on the relationships of racial identity and gender-role conflict to self-esteem of Asian American undergraduate men. Comments below are in their original format and spelling. [] - Indicates an omission to protect respondent's confidentiality.

1. I hope this survey will make more people confident about themselves.
2. The one question I was taken back by is the 'white activities.' What exact would constitute a white activity? Eating at applebees instead of a pho restaurant? Be more specific. My answers for showing affection to males is of course going to be skewed because I am gay so I completely disagreed many times. Good Luck on this design! Would like to know how your Master's turns out and when/where it will be published if possible.
3. I think most of the statements in the survey are accurately stereotypical of an average Asian American male that I know due to the fact that I attended high school with a good number of Asian Americans.
4. could not answer race questions due to my opinions on race are very 'fluid'.
5. I liked this survey, it was well written, and i like the large number of options available for areas like sexual orientation, and gender. thank you
6. For the question 'People, regardless of their race, have strengths and limitations.' i said disagree because i don't completely believe in setting limitations.
7. I would like to know more about your findings from this study. Can you please let me know a bit more about your research? Can you please provide me with a copy of your research proposal? my email address is [] Thanks!
8. Some questions could be improved by reformulating.
9. The quality of the questions are superficial and the scope of the survey was poorly defined, limiting to self esteem, homophobia, and anglo/asian relations issues only in a fairly shallow way. Example of ways to improve such as replacing the whether anglo are attractive to whether you find other race more/less attractive and whether you think of yourself are more/less attractive to own/other race and etc.
10. I definitely feel in the world, there are prejudices and hidden barriers that make it more difficult for asian americans to succeed. Nevertheless, I believe these prejudices come not only because of racism from whites but from a sort of internalized self-deprecation by fellow asian americans. Moreover, I feel for asian americans in general, there is a an awkward need to justify or prove oneself as a credible source of information or knowledge that is a complex combination of social injustices and a problem to articulate thoughts in a collected, confident, and persuasive manner. Hope this helps a little. sorry it took me so long. []
11. in the part two, you have to put an option as 'i don't know', because when the questions talk about sexual relations and feelings i'm single i don't know.
12. I hadn't realized that Anglo-Americans and Asian Americans had so many issues. I have never experienced any tension between the two cultures and I think that the racials issues are minimal.

13. thank you very much for the survey. it made me think about my personal thoughts and feelings about being an asian american. hopefully, i can reflect on this later in life and use it for the betterment of my life. thanks =)
14. This survey had a lot of questions related to homosexuality and White Asians (Wasians). Horrible!
15. growing up in predominantly black schools and being the only asian often made me the source of childrens cruelty , i began to develop a shame for my asian heritage and sometimes wouldnt even acknowledge other asians. as i grew older and more confident that shame quickly turned into pride and now i feel there is nothing better than being half white and half asian. i do however feel angry when i see asians mistreated by other races.
16. answer choices were too extreme in a few instances, didn't give option for middle ground response.
17. There were some questions that seemed loaded. There were other questions also, that weren't true for me, but when I say strongly disagree, it doesn't make the statment correct for me either.
18. This survey was really dumb
19. Asian Americans have the hardest time to create their identity in the United States because a majority of them adapt to Anglo-American ways faster than the other groups. So, sometimes we are considered 'white' in a sense, and we lose identity quickly. The problem then comes when other whites don't see that we are assimilating into American culture for our own benefit of survival and career movement, and the loss comes when many of Asian Americans forget their cultural background and their rich heritage. The prejudice against us can be very tough because no one sees that we are the fastest to adapt and be successful, yet the stereotype remains in the minds of other races, even among Asians.
20. I think that this survey was very indescrpt. I'm not necessarily sure what the aims of this survey were trying to accomplish, but the questions seemed very vague and too general to actually accumulate a scientific response or formula. Many of them were repetative and could seemed be interpreted in a number of ways.
21. Keep preaching it brotha.
22. the questions should be able to be unchecked in the case a person answers a question and then chooses not to answer a question
23. I feel this survey is very limited in that it gives you words that you have to use to look at a certain situation, and you can only pick the degree that you agree with it. I feel that there is a bias and that if some of the words were not so blunt or opiniated 'I feel i'm a failure' i may have answered differetnly. I feel there is a need for more specific language in this situation b/c no one will feel 'I'm a failure'. Feelings are more complicated than that and the simplicity and opiniated nature of the word choice most likely affect my answers. All in all, thank you for asking me to fill in this quesionaire. Take care.
24. I believe this survey in itself was very bias in itself and made the person taking the survey pick between anglo americans and asian americans based on how the questions were worded, I do not think that this survey will convey any sort of reality based on how the questions were asked. I was tempted several times to not complete the survey I believed it was that rediculous.

APPENDIX O: ETHNICITIES OF PARTICIPANTS

Table O1

*Ethnicities of Participants (N = 173)*

Ethnicity	<i>n</i>
Bangladeshi	3
Burmese	2
Cambodian	4
Chinese	56
Filipina/o	15
Hmong	0
Indian	32
Indonesian	1
Japanese	4
Korean	40
Laotian	1
Malaysian	2
Pakistani	1
Taiwanese	25
Thai	2
Vietnamese	11
Other	7
Anglo/European/White	3
Canadian	1
Iranian	1
Nepalese	1
Samoan	1

*Note.* Participants were given the option to indicate as many ethnic group identifications as applicable, therefore, the numbers will not total  $N = 173$ .

APPENDIX P: CORRELATIONAL MATRIX OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES  
AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Table P1

*Correlations of Demographic Variables, Gender-Role Conflict Scale, and People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale*

Variable	Generational Status	Socioeconomic Status
Success, Power, and Competition	.015	.000
Restrictive Emotionality	- .023	- .005
Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men	- .094	.043
Conflict Between Work and Family Relations	.033	- .111
GRCS Total Score	- .026	- .026
Conformity	- .011	- .057
Dissonance	.029	- .093
Immersion	- .030	- .010
Internalization	.069	.005

*Note.* No correlations were significant at  $p < .05$

## REFERENCES

- Alvarez, A. N. (2002). Racial identity and Asian Americans: Supports and challenges. In M. K. McEwen, C. M. Kodama, A. N. Alvarez, S. Lee & C. T. H. Liang (Eds.), *Working with Asian American college students* (New Directions for Students Services no. 97, pp. 33-43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Alvarez, A. N., & Helms, J. E. (2001). Racial identity and reflected appraisals as influences on Asian Americans' racial adjustment. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 7*, 217-231.
- Alvarez, A. N., & Yeh, L. Y. (1999). Asian Americans in college: A racial identity perspective. In D. Sandhu (Ed.), *Asian and Pacific Islander Americans: Issues and concerns in counseling and psychotherapy* (pp. 105-119). Comstock, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Barnes, J. S., & Bennett, C. E. (2002). *Census 2000 Brief* (No. C2KBR/01-16).
- Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 115-160). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, C. E. (1996). Masculine gender role conflict: Effects on college men's psychological well-being, chemical substance usage, and attitudes toward help-seeking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 461-465.
- Bowker, L. H. (Ed.). (1998). *Masculinities and violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Byrne, B. M. (1983). Investigating measures of self-concept. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 16*, 115-126.

- Chan, J. (2001). *Chinese American masculinities: From Fu Manchu to Bruce Lee*. New York: Routledge.
- Chan, J. W. (1998). Contemporary Asian American men's issues. In L. R. Hirabayashi (Ed.), *Teaching Asian America: Diversity and the problem of community* (pp. 93-102). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Chan, S. (1991). *Asian Americans: An interpretive history*. New York: Twayne.
- Chang, T., & Yeh, C. J. (2003). Using online groups to provide support to Asian American men: Racial, cultural, gender, and treatment issues. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 34, 634-643.
- Chen, G. A. (2004, December). *The complexity of "Asian American Identity": The intersection of multiple social identities*. Paper presented at the Counseling Center Research and Development Presentation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Chen, G. A. (2005). *The complexity of "Asian American identity": The intersection of multiple social identities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, TX.
- Cheng, C. (1996). "We choose not to compete": The "merit" discourse in the selection process, and Asian and Asian American men and their masculinity. In C. Cheng (Ed.), *Masculinities in organizations* (pp. 177-200). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chua, P., & Fujino, D. C. (1999). Negotiating new Asian-American masculinities: Attitudes and gender expectations. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 7, 391-413.
- College enrollment by racial and ethnic group, selected years*. (2004). Retrieved November 30, 2004, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/almanac/2004/nation/0101603.htm>

- Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thompson, R. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web- or internet-based surveys. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 60*, 821-836.
- Cress, C. M., & Ikeda, E. K. (2003). Distress under duress: The relationship between campus climate and depression in Asian American college students. *NASPA Journal, 40*, 74-97.
- Espiritu, Y. L. (1997). *Asian American women and men: Labor, laws, and love*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fassinger, R. E. (1998). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual identity and student development theory. In R. L. Sanlo (Ed.), *Working with lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender college students: A handbook for faculty and administrators* (pp. 13-22). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., & Bartels, K. M. (1996). The relation between masculine role conflict and psychological distress in male university counseling center clients. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*, 44-49.
- Good, G. E., Robertson, J. M., O'Neil, J. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Stevens, M., DeBord, K. A., et al. (1995). Male gender role conflict: Psychometric issues and relations to psychological distress. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42*, 3-10.
- Good, G. E., & Wood, P. K. (1995). Male gender role conflict, depression, and help seeking: Do college men face double jeopardy? *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 70-75.
- Groß, J. (2003). *Linear regression*. Berlin: Springer.

- Helms, J. E. (1993). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casa, L. A. Suzuki & M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 143-192). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Helms, J.E., & Carter, R.T. (1990). *People of Color racial identity attitude scale*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and practice*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hirabayashi, L. R. (1998). Introduction. In L. R. Hirabayashi (Ed.), *Teaching Asian America: Diversity and the problem of community* (pp. 1-12). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hune, S. (2002). Demographics and diversity of Asian American college students. In M. K. McEwen, C. M. Kodama, A. N. Alvarez, S. Lee & C. T. H. Liang (Eds.), *Working with Asian American college students* (New Directions for Student Services no. 97, pp. 11-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hurtado, S., Milem, J., Clayton-Pederson, A., & Allen, W. (1999). *Enacting diverse learning environments: Improving the climate for racial/ethnic diversity in higher*

*education*. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Joshi, K. Y. (n.d.). *South Asian Americans and race relations*. Retrieved March 28, 2005, from <http://www.project-impact.org/iapac/guide/storyideas.pdf>

Kellum, G. (2005). *Report on the Center for Men's Leadership and Service*. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association National Convention, Nashville, TN.

Kim, E. J., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1996). Asian-American men's acculturation and gender-role conflict. *Psychological Reports, 79*, 95-104.

Kodama, C. M., McEwen, M. K., Liang, C. T. H., & Lee, S. (2002). An Asian American perspective on psychosocial student development theory. In M. K. McEwen, C. M. Kodama, A. N. Alvarez, S. Lee & C. T. H. Liang (Eds.), *Working with Asian American college students* (New Directions for Students Services no. 97, pp. 43-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kohatsu, E. (1992). *The effects of racial identity and acculturation on anxiety, assertiveness, and ascribed identity among Asian American college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Kumashiro, K. K. (1999). Supplementing normalcy and otherness: Queer Asian American men reflect on stereotypes, identity, and oppression. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*, 491-508.

Lagdameo, A., Lee, S., Nguyen, B., Liang, C. T. H., Lee, S., Kodama, C. M., et al. (2002). Voices of Asian American students. In M. K. McEwen, C. M. Kodama, A. N. Alvarez, S. Lee & C. T. H. Liang (Eds.), *Working with Asian American*

- college students* (New Directions for Student Services no. 97, pp. 5-10). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Laker, J. (2005). *Beyond "Bad Dog!": Employing gendered lenses in our work with male students*. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association National Convention, Nashville, TN.
- Liu, W. M. (2000). *Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Liu, W. M. (2002). Exploring the lives of Asian American men: Racial identity, male role norms, gender role conflict, and prejudicial attitudes. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 107-118.
- Liu, W. M., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1999). Differences in leadership and co-curricular perception among entering male and female Asian-Pacific-American college students. *Journal of the First-Year Experience*, 11, 93-114.
- Lomax, R. G. (2000). *Statistical concepts: A second course for education and the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education* (5th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Naik, D. P. (2003). *Distinguishing racial identity development among South Asian, Southeast Asian, and East Asian American college students*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Omi, M. (2000). Racial identity and the state: Contesting the federal standards for classification. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman,

- M. L. Peters & X. Zuniga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice* (pp. 73-78). New York: Routledge.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1990). Assessing men's gender role conflict. In D. Moore & F. Leafgren (Eds.), *Problem solving strategies and interventions for men in conflict* (pp. 23-38). Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.
- O'Neil, J. M. (2004). *Internal consistencies reliabilities for 20 diverse samples using the GRCS across factors and total score*. Retrieved October 25, 2004, from <http://web.uconn.edu/joneil/DiverseSamples.pdf>
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B. J., Gable, R. K., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles, 14*, 335-350.
- Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem of Black students: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*, 143-147.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Poindexter-Cameron, J. M., & Robinson, T. L. (1997). Relationships among racial identity attitudes, womanist identity attitudes, and self-esteem in African American college women. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*, 288-296.
- Pope, R. L. (2000). The relationship between psychosocial development and racial identity of college students of color. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*, 304-314.
- Porter, S. R., & Whitcomb, M. E. (2003). The impact of contact type on web survey response rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 67*, 579-588.

- Prashad, V. (2000). *The Karma of Brown Folk*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Pyant, C. T., & Yanico, B. J. (1991). Relationship of racial identity and gender role attitudes to Black women's psychological well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 315-322.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the adolescent self-image* (Rev. ed.). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Sabo, D., & Gordon, D. F. (1995). Rethinking men's health and illness: The relevance of gender studies. In D. Sabo & D. F. Gordon (Eds.), *Men's health and illness: Gender, power, and the body* (pp. 1-21). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sharpe, M. J., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). Gender role, gender-role conflict, and psychological well-being in men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 323-330.
- Silber, E., & Tippett, J. S. (1965). Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. *Psychological Reports, 16*, 1017-1071.
- Smith, H. M., & Betz, N. E. (2002). An examination of efficacy and esteem pathways to depression in young adulthood. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 438-448.
- Solberg, V. S., Ritsma, S., Davis, B. J., Tata, S. P., & Jolly, A. (1994). Asian-American students' severity of problems and willingness to seek help from university counseling centers: Role of previous counseling experience, gender, and ethnicity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 275-279.

- Stillson, R. W., O'Neil, J. M., & Owen, S. V. (1991). Predictors of adult men's gender-role conflict: Race, class, unemployment, age, instrumentality-expressiveness, and personal strain. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 458-464.
- Sue, S. (1994). Mental health. In N. Zane, D. Takeuchi & K. Young (Eds.), *Confronting critical health issues of Asian & Pacific Islander Americans* (pp. 266-288). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Suzuki, B. H. (2002). Revisiting the model minority stereotype: Implications for student affairs practice and higher education. In M. K. McEwen, C. M. Kodama, A. N. Alvarez, S. Lee & C. T. H. Liang (Eds.), *Working with Asian American college students* (New Directions for Student Services no. 97, pp. 21-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Takaki, R. (1990). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Toya, G. J. (1996). *The relationship between career aspirations and racial identity development of Asian Pacific American college students by ethnicity, generation, gender and career certainty*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Utsey, S. O., Ponterotto, J. G., Reynolds, A. L., & Cancelli, A. A. (2000). Racial discrimination, coping, life satisfaction, and self-esteem among African Americans. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 78*, 72-80.

- Wade, J. C. (1996). African American men's gender role conflict: The significance of racial identity. *Sex Roles, 34*, 17-33.
- Wah, L. M. (1998). Asian men and violence. In R. Carrillo & J. Tello (Eds.), *Family violence and men of color: Healing the wounded male spirit*. New York: Springer.
- Wong, S. (1993, November 1, 1993). Beyond Bruce Lee. *Essence, 24*, 64.
- Wylie, R. C. (1989). *Measures of self-concept*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Yeh, T. H. (1997). *Distinguishing between racial identity and ethnic identity for Asian Americans*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Yip, T. (2003). *Situational variation in ethnic identity and psychological well-being: A palm pilot study of Chinese American students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York.