City University of New York (CUNY)
CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses | Baruch College

1-1-1996

Giving-up-spirit : coping style in Japan

Chiya Ikemi
Baruch College

Follow this and additional works at: http://academicworks.cuny.edu/bb_etds

Recommended Citation
Ikemi, Chiya, "Giving-up-spirit : coping style in Japan" (1996). *CUNY Academic Works.*
http://academicworks.cuny.edu/bb_etds/25

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Baruch College at CUNY Academic Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Theses by an authorized administrator of CUNY Academic Works. For more information, please contact AcademicWorks@cuny.edu.

GIVING--UP--SPIRIT: COPING STYLE IN JAPAN

by
Chiya Ikemi©

Submitted to the Committee on Undergraduate Honors of Baruch College of The City University of New York in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Liberal Arts in Psychology with Honors.

April 29, 1996

Acknowledgement

1. Abstract
2. "Giving-Up-Spirit"
3. Religious and Historical Roots of "Giving-Up-Spirit"
4. Cultural Differences between Japan and the United States
5. When Two Cultures Meet
6. Locus of Control: A Psychological Framework for Understanding of "Giving-Up-Spirit"
7. Method
    - Subjects
    - Measures
    - Procedure
8. Results
9. Discussion

Endnotes
References
Tables
Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my mentor, Dr. Susan A. Locke, for her assistance in this project. I am especially grateful for the content of her instruction and the work ethic she has instilled in me.

I would like to thank Professor Roger Millsap for his statistical advise, and comments on my early draft.

I would also like to thank Professor Harvey Barocas for his feedback on my early draft.

Chiya

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to gain a clearer understanding of the Japanese coping style of "giving-up-spirit" (*akirame no seishin*) and the tendency of Japanese living in the United States to relinquish this style as a result of longevity in and acculturation to the United states. It was hypothesized that the longer Japanese reside in the United States, the more acculturated they become (i.e. the higher they score on the SL-ASIA Scale); the longer Japanese reside in the United States, the less they use the Japanese coping style of "giving-up-spirit" (i.e. the less externally directed they score on Rotter's Locus of Control scale); and the more acculturated Japanese become, the more internally directed they score on the Rotter's Locus of Control Scale. A positive correlation was found between longevity and acculturation level: $r = .34$, $p < .05$. A negative correlation was found between longevity and external locus of control: $r = -.21$, $p < .05$. The results confirmed two of the hypotheses: the longer Japanese have resided in the United States, the more acculturated they have become; and the longer Japanese have resided in the United States, the less externally controlled they have become. These findings are consistent with previous studies of Japanese that have concluded that increased exposure to Western culture leads to higher internality of locus of control. Future study should be concerned with visa status as well as age at time of migration when investigating changes in acculturation level and locus of control as a function of longevity in the United States.

"GIVING-UP-SPIRIT"

"Giving-up-spirit" (*akirame no seishin*), or resignation, refers to the Japanese proclivity to accept a situation without trying to change or improve it further. The Japanese find their self-identity tied in a cosmic law, fate, destiny, karma, or *innen*, imbedded in the Buddhist belief system. "Giving-Up-Spirit" has been described as related to the concept of fatalism (Lebra, 1976; Yamamoto, 1989).

According to fatalism, everything in the world is predestined to occur by an endless chain of cause and effect from the unknown past, through the present, to the future. This sequence is beyond human control. The Japanese tend to refer to fate (*un*) as an explanation for success or failure. They describe a successful person as a man of good *un*, strong *un*, or simply a man with *un*. They describe an unsuccessful man as a man with no *un*, or a man of bad *un*. Faith in bad *un* puts one in a state of *akirame* (resignation).

The Japanese have absorbed, whether they declared Buddhists or not, the idea of *innen* or *en*; *innen* being the combination of *in* and *en*. In Buddhist doctrine, in refers of the inner,

direct cause, and en to the outer, indirect, facilitating cause, that produces an effect (Nakamura, 1962). The average Japanese, unconcerned with formal Buddhist doctrine, seems to identify these ideas with a mysterious power underlying predestination, transmigration, and reincarnation. Particularly, *en* is associated with social relationships. *Fushigi na en*, "mysterious *en*," is a common expression for some unexpected encounter of two people in a certain situation. Two strangers become friends or spouses by an en, or they may remain strangers if there is no *en*. A marriage proposal is called *endan* ("*en* talk"), and marriage itself *engumi* ("*en match*"). A person who must give up a certain goal (such as marrying the girl of his choice) is likely to be told by an elder, "Be resigned since there was no *en*." Suffering and hardship must be accompanied with resignation, one may be consoled, because one has been loaded with such *innen* since one's previous life.

Fatalism is linked with the futility of making an effort to control what has happened, what is happening, or what is going to happen. The Japanese have a tendency to consider things irreversible once they have taken place.

Belief in fatalistic irreversibility seems to have a realistic basis in the status mobility structure of Japanese society. For example, in order to get a good job, a person must be from a good university, to get into a good university, he must study at a first-rate high school, and so on. The process is becoming so intense that children now have to get into a good kindergarten in order to secure their entrance to a good elementary school. At a certain point, the course of these events does indeed appear irreversible. This sense of irreversibility may make a person resigned (*akirameru* or give-up) to what has happened or what is happening.

According to Lebra (1976), fatalism is necessary for the Japanese culture in which achievement is seen as a moral obligation. One's status in Japanese society is defined by level of achievement. Since not everyone can be successful, and no one can always be successful, readiness for resignation (*akirame* or giving-up) must be learned as an important part of the Japanese culture. Resignation can liberate the unsuccessful person from self-blame, a sense of failure, or a sense of inadequacy.

However, "giving-up-spirit" should not be described only from the point of view of fatalism. Because Japanese are known to be achievement-oriented people that they work hard to accomplish. Their intense achievement motivation comes from different sources than those of the Western individualized self. To understand Japanese achievement motivation, it is necessary to discuss the Japanese concept of self.

Roland (1988) describes one of the significant differences between Japanese and American psychology: the concept of self. According to Roland, Japanese have a "familial self" which functions within the hierarchical intimacy relationships of a particular group, also regarded as "we-self"; whereas Americans have an "individualized self" which reflects a highly mobile society where considerable autonomy is accepted and encouraged, also regarded as "I-self." The Japanese achievement motivation is deeply tied in the Japanese familial-group self: drive to task accomplishment. One dimension of

Japanese self-esteem relates to reflecting well on the family and work group through high performance. Another dimension of Japanese self-esteem relates to internalizing and fulfilling maternal expectations through high performance. Roland analyzes Japanese self-esteem as being measured by mirroring others, because, according to Roland, Japanese do not have an inner standard. He claims that the cause of "malfunction" of self-esteem comes from Japanese mother-child relationship which he describes as grossly symbiotic. Children are taught that their values are entirely based on how others see them; and not on haw they see themselves. This eventually causes an "onion" syndrome in which people are totally out of touch with their own wishes and will, and who have very little sense of an inner self (Roland, 1988).

Thus, a major motivation of Japanese performance is to reflect positively on one's family and group by doing well, thereby enhancing their esteem. Japanese sense of self is far more involved with the particular school, college, and work group (corporation, bureaucracy, profession, or business) one is associated with; and even with the nation. For example, when a Japanese figure skater Midori Ito fell down and failed to show her "perfect performance" in the Olympic game, she apologized to the whole nation. Her performance could hurt the self-esteem of all Japanese people.

It seems that a peculiar combination of tendency to give up and achievement-oriented traits reflect a unique Japanese character. Japanese are not fated from the beginning. They work hard, but when it gets to a point where they feel they have done their best, they may resign from further effort. It is more like psychological adjustment, form of acceptance of their performance.

In Japanese society, resignation (*akirame* or giving-up) is often urged, and *shikata ga nai* ("cannot be helped") is often expressed, when things have irreversibly gone against a person's wishes. A person's capacity for resignation is often taken as a proof of maturity and wisdom. The Buddhist concept of satori, "enlightenment," is closely associated with attainment of *akirame* for Japanese.

Roth and Cohen (1986) suggested that avoidance is an effective coping strategy when individuals face uncontrollable stressful events. Avoidance seems beneficial when the use of direct coping strategies offer little appreciable benefit (Nowack, 1988). Motoaki, Noguchi, & Shigehisa (1990) reported that Japanese subjects showed a greater tendency to depend on the benevolence of others and were less self-defensive, aggressive, hostile, risk taking, or wishful thinkers (modest, accepting/adapting well to given situations) than were American subjects.

A recent study by Kawanishi (1995) showed that the Japanese are more likely than Anglo-Americans to attribute successful coping and stress to luck. Kawanishi suggested that the reason for this attribution to luck is that Japanese culture espouses fatalistic beliefs and encourages acceptance.

This tendency to accept the situation or "giving-up-spirit" was developed in Japan's long history of isolation during the *Tokugawa* period.(1) It is important to discuss this era of

Japanese history to understand the Japanese character. It is also necessary to discuss the religions that the Japanese follow in their lives, in order to understand the Japanese character.

RELIGIOUS AND HISTORICAL ROOTS OF "GIVING-UP-SPIRIT"

At the heart of the Japanese character are the teachings of Confucius and the nature based religion, Shinto. Shinto emphasizes loyalty to the Emperor. Shinto was used to drive away or banish persons thought to be harmful to the nation, and to force them to pay compensation for their misdeeds (Umehara, 1994).

Unlike Shinto, which originated in Japan, Confucianism was borrowed by Japan from China along with Buddhism, and adopted to be used as their own. Confucianism also places a high value on loyalty. For example, younger people should always be respectful of older people. The child should respect the parent. The citizen should respect the ruler. And the ruler should be protective of the citizens and faithful to their needs. Because of this linear system, rather than a general diffusion of morality, Japan is said to have developed a strong sense of patriotism, but a weak sense of citizenship.

It is unique that the Japanese have these "heterogeneous religions": Shinto, Buddhism, and Confucianism. "Indeed, a flexible combination of the three ethical systems, and not a single religion, has contributed to Japan's cultural and economic development" (Morishima, 1982, p. 19). Buddhism encourages the awareness of Japanese values and heritage. From Confucianism came the standard of social behavior that dictates respect and obedience for authority and for elders. Henkin (1985) explains how the Shinto/Buddhist/Confucian background of the Japanese culture in Japan has established a perceptual, conceptual, and behavioral ground of being that advocates inner discipline and encourages people to conceal frustrations and disappointments. Also, they are expected to submerge individual concerns, to recognize filial piety and moral obligations to others as superior to personal desires, and to persist in their tasks in the face of unhappiness despite the belief that they will fail.

These religions, with their highly developed concepts of loyalty, obedience and devotion to the Emperor were crucial to the development of Japanese characteristics. These characteristics were especially firmly formed during the *Tokugawa* period.

A hereditary caste system was established in 1591, in which the government prohibited a movement between the classes. This class division into warriors (*samurai*), farmers, artisans, and tradesmen persisted throughout the *Tokugawa* (or *Edo*) period, 1603 -1867. In 1639, the *Tokugawa* regime prohibited the entry of almost all Westerners, embarking on the so-called *sakoku* (closure or isolation) policy. During this *Tokugawa* period, there was no war for over 200 years.

Because of this closed situation of not only isolation from foreign countries, but the existence of the untransferable caste system, the Japanese developed a sense of acceptance of the situation. Their place in the hierarchical caste system and relationships with neighbors in the community were their fate. They had to develop skills to interact with others in order to avoid any conflict at any cost. Connor (1994) noted that in Japan the draconian rule imposed by the *Tokugawa* contributed greatly to the Japanese emphasis on order, duty and obligation, hierarchy, and a compulsive obedience to authority that characterizes the Japanese down to the present. Van Wolferen (1994) criticizes Japanese society as an "ill-equipped" hierarchical structure in which people are forced to behave in the way the authorities (bureaucrats) want them to act. According to van Wolferen, Japanese people have been in a state of "learned-helplessness."

Japanese have also developed a philosophy of resignation (*akirame* or "giving-up") which inhibits an active attempt to solve problems further. They accepted their situation as their fate and as unchangeable. Their attribution of life experience to fate can be described as comparable to attributions to chance or luck. This perspective is known external of locus of control. This perspective is very different from those of Americans'. There are considerable cultural differences between Japan and the United States.

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

It was suggested that cultural practice and preferences affect the ways of individuals' coping behavior (Strong, 1984). Rothbaum, Weisz, and Snyder (1982) indicated two general paths to control. In "primary control," people attempt to gain control by influencing existing realities through personal acts. In "secondary control," individuals attempt to adapt themselves to existing realities through minimizing their psychological impact. Primary control has been emphasized and valued in American culture, whereas secondary control has assumed a more central role in the Japanese cultural context (Weisz, Rothbaum, & Blackburn, 1984).

People with "primary control," such as Americans, are internalizers that they feel control over the existing situations. People with "secondary externalizers that they control," such as Japanese, are feel no control over the existing situation.

The Japanese culture has distinct concepts of individuality that insist on the fundamental relatedness of individuals to each other. The emphasis is placed on attending to others, fitting in, and harmonious interdependence with them. The American culture neither assumes nor values such an overt connectedness among individuals. In contrast, individuals seek to maintain independence from others by attending to the self and by discovering and expressing their unique inner attributes. In other words, the American culture stresses the appreciation of one's difference from others and the importance of asserting the self, whereas the Japanese culture emphasizes the importance of cooperation with others and harmonious interdependence with them. Geertz (1975), Sampson (1988,

1989), and Shweder & LeVine (1984) described the Western view of the individual as an independent, self-contained, autonomous entity who comprises a unique configuration of internal attributes (e.g. traits, abilities, motives, and values) and whose behavior is primarily a consequences of these internal attributes.

In Japan, the self is not and cannot be separated from others and the surrounding social context; the self is interdependent with the surrounding social context and it is the "self-in-relation-to-other" that is focal in individual experience (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). According to Kondo (1990), the self is fundamentally interrelated with others and to understand the Japanese sense of self requires dissolving the self/other or self/society boundary that is such an obvious starting point in all Western formulations of the self. This Japanese interdependent view of self can be traced to Shinto and Buddhist philosophical traditions within which the very goal of existence is different from that assumed in the West (Lebra, 1972). According to Markus and Kitayama (1995), interdependent selves have difficulty constructing a positive identity and show excessive amounts of fatalism, dependence, and anxiety. The Japanese tendency to depend on others is also described by Doi (1971).

Japanese culture has often regarded as differing significantly from Western culture in terms of language, social orientation, and role expectancies (Caudill & DeVos, 1956; Nakane, 1972; Yamamoto & Wagatsuma, 1980). Japanese are more group-oriented, with more clearly defined social roles Centering around the family or family-like organizations, than are individuals in the United States. The Japanese social structure has often been described as "vertical," meaning that relationships are clearly defined to those above or below one's social status. In contrast, social structures in the United States have been described as more "horizontal," meaning not differentiated between social status. Therefore, difficulties may conceivably occur when Japanese immigrants need to adjust to the Western social orientation and role expectations.

The tendency to avoid revealing problems to others reportedly predicts how individuals cope with stressful events, such as moving to a new culture (McCrae and Costa, 1986). Nakano (1992) found that extroverted individuals not only sought more social support but also avoided stressful situations more than did introverted individuals in Japan. This finding is partially inconsistent with the results of a previous study (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985) that extroverted individual engaged in more social interaction and were less likely to avoid stressful situations than introverted individuals. Nakano's finding implies that personal characteristics of the extraverted individuals are influenced by the Japanese cultural context.

The cultural differences between Japan and the United States can also be explained from the perspective of individualistic versus collectivistic country dimension.

Individualistic cultures view individual goals as more important than group goals, while collectivistic cultures stress that group goals have precedence over individual goals. Japanese culture has been described as collectivistic, emphasizing conformity,

belongingness, empathy and dependence (Benedict, 1946; Lebra, 1976; Nakane, 1972). American culture has been known as individualistic (Triandis, 1988).

Elements of individualism and collectivism have become correlated with other constructs, such as cooperation, competition, hedonism, self-reliance, family integrity, emotional detachment from in-groups, in differing degrees (Triandis et al., 1993). Correlates of individualism include emotional detachment from in-groups, behavior regulated by attitudes and cost/benefit computations, the perception of the in-group as more heterogeneous than out-groups, and willingness to confront in-group members with whom one disagrees; whereas correlates of collectivism include a strong emotional attachment to the in-group, the definition of the self as an aspect or a "representative" of the in-group, behavior regulated by in-group norms, emphasis on in-group harmony, acceptance of in-group authorities, and the perception of the in-group as relatively homogeneous (Triandis et al., 1993). According to Triandis (1995), the more homogeneous the culture, the more collectivistic it can be. The more heterogeneous the culture, the more individuals need to decide for themselves which norms to follow; thus, the more individualistic the culture.

The socialization patterns that are found in individualistic cultures emphasize independence, self-reliance, creativity, and acceptance of disobedience if the child is especially competent. In individualistic cultures, people are very good at entering and leaving groups, but do not develop deep and lasting relationships with others with the same frequencies as collectivists.

In contrast, the socialization patterns that are found in collectivistic cultures emphasize obedience, duty, sacrifice for the group, cooperation, favoritism toward the in-group, acceptance authorities, nurturing, and interdependence. In collectivistic cultures, people are shy or less able to enter new groups, but tend to establish more close, and long-lasting relationships than do individualists.

Considering such distinct differences between Japanese culture and American culture, one might imagine that it would be very difficult to adjust or acculturate when Japanese move into an individualistic country, like the United States.

WHEN TWO CULTURES MEET

When people move to a new culture, they are confronted with a separation from accustomed social, cultural, and environmental support systems. The impact varies from the need to adapt to a new culture for a temporary stay with an intention to go home to the desolating consequences of the total loss of family, friends, home, and country. Psychological responses they may experience such as frustration, anxiety, uncertainty, anger, extreme homesickness, depression are popularly referred to a *culture shock* or *cross-cultural adjustment*.

Immigrants experience a process of *cultural adjustment* that at times is stressful and difficult to handle (Bennett, 1986; Grove & Torbiorn, 1986). According to Grove and Torbiorn (1986), the adjustment process is especially difficult for adults who are accustomed to functioning effectively in their own cultures. Padilla, Alvarez, & Lindholm (1983 as cited in Padilla, Wagatsuma, & Lindholm, 1984) found that immigrants who are made to adjust to a new country at a relatively advanced age perceived themselves more externally controlled when compared to those who immigrated early in life. Social system is different from their own country, and it may become stressed to a point where adaptive changes become difficult or impossible (Spradley & Phillips, 1972).

Several suggestions can be made concerning a great stress experienced by immigrant-status Japanese. Difficulties in adjusting to a new culture may cause psychological discomfort as well as affecting one's self-concept. Living in an unfamiliar environment, immigrants are faced with a sense of helplessness, diminished confidence, and feeling of loss (Trobiorn, 1982). Moreover, acculturative stress is greater when there are more cultural and behavioral differences between the host culture and the ethnic culture (e.g. American and Japanese cultures) (Berry & Annis, 1974).

Immigrants are often subjected to conflicting values. They face pressure to conform to the values, norms, and patterns of behavior in the new culture. Many want to participate in and learn as much as possible about the host culture, but at the same time, they do not want to lose their sense of cultural identity. Sue and Sue (1971) have described three different categories with which Asian immigrants may identify in order to deal with the conflicting demands of two culture (pp. 36-49):

1. *Traditionalist*: individuals who remain "loyal" to their own ethnic group by retaining traditional values and living up to expectations of the family;

2. *Marginal person*: individuals who attempt to become over-Westernized by rejecting traditional Asian values;

3. *Yellow power person*: individuals who is rebelling against parental authority as he or she attempts to develop a new identity that will enable a reconciliation of viable aspects of his or her heritage with the present situation.

A pattern of adjustment reaction can be described as following a U-curve over the course of time. Lesser and Peter (1957) have described the process. When persons first arrive (at a first phase), they are happily engage in an exciting adventure and enjoying new experiences. Then, at a second phase, they become involved, might face many problems, and suffer disillusionment and sometimes even depression. At a third phase, persons learn to solve their problems, and the curve of satisfaction rises as they succeed in the process of *cultural adjustment* or acculturation.

Thus, as persons stay longer in the host culture and become familiar with a new cultural norms and systems (i.e. the more they acculturate to a new culture), the less they would

have problems adjusting. Acculturation has become an important issue for cross-cultural psychology.

The first major anthropological studies of acculturation were completed in the 1930s (Berry, 1990). Two classic definitions of acculturation are contained in related publications:

Acculturation comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patters of either or both groups ...(Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936, pp. 149-152)

... culture change that is initiated by the conjunction of two or more autonomous cultural systems. Acculturative change may be the consequence of direct cultural transmission; ... with internal adjustments following upon the acceptance of alien traits or patterns ... (Social Science Research Council, 1954, p.974)

The process of acculturation is involved when two or more cultures interact with each other. Changes are induced within both cultures as a result of the diffusion of cultural elements in both directions. In principal, each culture influences the other equally; but in practice, the flow of culture is generally stronger in one direction than the other (i.e. one tends to dominate the other). According to Herskovits (1938), this imbalance often leads to the view that acculturation is really the process of one culture dominating another. Despite this observed imbalance, the concept refers to a two-way flow of influence.

The psychological concept of acculturation involves behavioral and cognitive changes that are the consequences of change in one's sociocultural environment. The case of an immigrant moving to set up a new life in another country would be an example of acculturation, because contact with external culture is involved. After receiving considerable attention in the psychological literature (Berry, 1980), the description of acculturation includes such concepts as *Westernization, modernization, industrialization, Americanization,* and so on. Sometimes, acculturation can be interpreted as movement from traditionalism to modernism (Segall, 1979), but in the case of Japanese immigrants, it is more like Americanization because Japan is one of the most modernized countries in the world.

Immigrants to any given society generally experience greater psychological stress than do native habitants of that society (Dyal & Dyal, 1981). Immigrants must adjust to a new social system. Interpersonal relationships may be organized differently than they are in their culture of origin. In the new environment, language, social norms, and role expectations may be unfamiliar. As new-comers, immigrants must cognitively, attitudinally, and behaviorally adapt to the new cultural system (Kim, 1978). Individual differences in the responses to the acculturation processes varies. Some may turn their backs, others may embrace, and yet others may selectively engage the new culture, while others may selectively merge it to the old culture.

The negative side of acculturation would be the fact that previous, familiar patterns of authority, of civility no longer operate at the group level, while at the individual level, uncertainty, identity confusion, and depression may set in (Berry, 1990). The concept of "*acculturative stress*" refers to the kind of stress in which the stressors are identified as having their source in the process of acculturation (Berry & Annis, 1974). The term of "*acculturative stress*" was employed by Berry (1971) to refer to those individual behaviors that are mildly pathological and disruptive, including those problems of mental health and psychosomatic symptoms often observed during social change. In the United States, migrant groups have higher rates of admissions to mental hospitals than the local-born population *(Murphy, 1974 as cited in Berry, 1980).*

The level of acculturation has an important role, especially, in ethnic minority issues. Padilla et al. (1984) used level of acculturation and personality attributes as predictors of stress among Japanese and Japanese-American students. Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (1966) was used to assess locus of control. Padilla et al. found that first-generation students, who experienced the most stress, were lower in self-esteem and were more externally oriented than third/later generation students. This external locus of control has the same perspective as does "giving-up-spirit."

LOCUS OF CONTROL: A PSYCHOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING OF "GIVING-UP-SPIRIT"

Internal versus external control of behavioral outcomes are often referred to as locus of control. Internal versus external control refers to the degree to which individuals expect that the outcome of their behavior is contingent on their own behavior or personal characteristics versus the degree to which persons expect that the outcome is a function of chance, luck, or fate, is under the control of powerful others, or is simply unpredictable.

Achievement motivation theory has the same concept as internal versus external locus of control. Weiner et al. (1971) organized Heider's attribution theory (1958) into a 2 X 2 factorial design. According to Weiner et al., Internal/Stable people attribute their outcomes to "Ability"; Internal/Unstable people attribute their outcomes to "Effort"; External/Stable people attribute their outcomes to "Task Difficulty"; and External/Unstable people attribute their outcomes as "Luck."

Note that Japanese achievement motivation is different from those of Americans. Japanese are motivated by outer situations to accomplish a task (e.g. pressure for high performance to fulfill maternal expectation or obligation), whereas Americans are motivated by inner desire to accomplish a task. For example, once Japanese get into a desired college after their hard working, they no longer feel motivated to study hard. Because their external/outer pressure is no longer exists, and they are not internally motivated to learn or gain knowledge. Until the time to prepare getting a good job,

Japanese college students simply relax. Thus, Americans are said to be internalizers, and Japanese, externalizers.

Researchers have obtained numerous behavioral and attitudinal differences between internalizers and externalizers. Internalizers have demonstrated a preference for personal control over the situation and externalizers exhibit a greater willingness to abdicate control over the situation (Crowne & Liverant, 1963; Julian & Katz, 1968; Julian, Lichtman, & Ryckman, 1968). Internalizers have been found to respond more negatively than externalizers to attempts by others to influence their attitudes or behaviors (Biondo & MacDonald, 1971; Crowne & Liverant, 1963; Doctor, 1971). Externalizers were found to be readily responsive to prestigious sources of influence (Getter, 1966; Lefcourt, 1976; Ritchie & Phares, 1969). Externalizers appeared to be less effective than internalizers in the use of skills involved in self-control behavior (Barling & Fincham, 1978; Bellack, 1975; Heaton & Duerfeld, 1973).

Other evidence shows that internalizers are more active, alert, or directive in attempting to control and manipulate their environments than are externalizers. Internalizers seems to be eager to seek out cues and to be better able to achieve when they try to accomplish the task (Phares, 1976).

Even though the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) was originally designed for purposes unrelated to the study of cultural differences, a number of studies have reported national differences in locus of control scores (see Lefcourt, 1984 for a review; Padilla et al., 1984; Smith, Trompenaars, & Dugan, 1995). One might predict the outcome of such studies is that Western respondents would score more internally than those from non-Western countries, on account of their individualistic values. In fact several researchers have supported that contention. Compared to students in the United States, Hong Kong Chinese students were more externally controlled (Hsu, 1953); Taiwan Chinese females were more external than American females (Lao, 1978); and Thai workers were more external than American workers (Reitz & Groff, 1974).

One consistent and substantive research finding is that Asians, particularly Japanese, tend to score more externally than North-American Caucasians (Dyal, 1984). The most consistent findings in cross-cultural studies of locus of control have been obtained comparing Japanese with White Americans. Bond and Tornatzky (1973) found that the Japanese to be reliably more external. Mahler (1974) also found that the Japanese were more external than the Americans. McGinnies, Nordholm, Ward, & Bhanthumnavin (1974) as well found Japanese students to be more external than those from the United States, Australia, and New Zealand who did not differ from each other. Moreover, the Japanese were by far the most external of Parsons and Schneider's (1974) eight countries [Japan, United States, Canada, West Germany, Italy, France, Israel, and India]. Furthermore, the recent study of the Rotter Locus of Control Scale in forty three countries, the Japanese scored second highest on externality (12.61) among all countries, whereas the United States scored third lowest on externality (7.46) (Smith et al., 1995).

Such evidence might suggest that Japanese, with their "giving-up-spirit" or the acceptance of the situation, are likely to score high on externality of locus of control. Because this coping mechanism of resignation fits well to the Japanese collectivistic culture. But, when they move into an individualistic country, such as the United States, their need to adapt a new culture and values in order to succeed may force them to change their coping style. "Giving-Up-Spirit" may not work in the United States. One might assume that moving to the United States, Japanese might shift towards more internal than they are in Japan. Heine and Lehman (1995) reported that with increased exposure to Western culture, Japanese respondents showed higher reports of self-esteem, self-concept clarity, internal locus of control, and dispositional optimism; and lower reports of control by powerful others and control by chance. The amount of time spent in the United States might be a good predictor of Japanese coping style of "giving-up-spirit," in terms of its transformation from external to internal as they acculturate to a new culture.

The present study examined Japanese immigrants' transformation in terms of their coping style of "Giving-Up-Spirit" (as external locus of control) after they came to the United States. Because of two cultures' conflicting values, Japanese' coping style would not fit to a new culture of the United States. Japanese would have to change their coping behavior in order to adjust to a new environment. Their locus of control would shift toward being internal.

It was predicted that (1) the longer Japanese reside in the United States, the more acculturated they become; (2) the longer they reside in the United States, the less they perceive themselves as being externally controlled (i.e. more internally controlled they become); and (3) the more acculturated Japanese become, the less externally controlled they become (i.e. more internally controlled they become).

METHOD

Subjects:

Ninety six Japanese males and females participants living in the New York City participated in the study. Of those, four persons were not included in the study because these participants failed to follow the instructions. Participants were recruited from four different sources: (a) the Japanese Overseas Voters Network New York and Japan Student Network (JSN); (b) Kinokuniya Book Store, seller of Japanese books, in midtown Manhattan; (c) through personal contact in Japanese community; and (d) the International Student Office at Baruch college.

The total size of the sample is 92. Of those, there were 33 male participants (36%) and 59 female participants (64%). Male participants ranged in age from 19 to 40; female participants ranged in age from 21 to 57. The mean age of all participants was 31.

Measures:

Three questionnaires were administered.

(1) A demographic questionnaire was constructed in order to obtain demographic information: age, gender, length of residence in the United States, visa status, educational level, and desire to stay in the United States. The demographic questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.

(2) A revised version of the **Suin-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale** (SL-ASIA; Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, in press). The original SL-ASIA Scale (Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987) is a 21-item, multiple choice questionnaire that assesses four content areas: (1) language familiarity, usage, and preference; (2) ethnic identity; (3) cultural behaviors; and (4) ethnic interactions. Participants are asked to choose the one response that best describes themselves. An acculturation score is obtained by dividing the respondent's total score on 21 items by the number of items on the scale. Acculturation scores can range from 1 to 5. Suinn et al. (1987) indicated that participants with scores close to 1 are considered Asian-identified, or low in level of acculturation, persons with scores around 3 are considered bicultural, and participants with scores around 5 are considered Western-identified, or high in level of acculturation. Suinn et al. (1987) reported an alpha coefficient of .88 for the 21 items. In more recent studies, a reliability coefficient of .91 has been reported (Atkinson & Gim, 1989; Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992).

Suinn et al. (in press) added 4 items (questions #22-26) to the original SL-ASIA. These questions focus on values, behavioral competencies, and self-identity. Questions #22 and #23 are called the "SL-ASIA **values** score"; and questions #24 and #25 are called the "SL-ASIA **behavioral competencies** score." Because responses to values and behavioral competencies questions (#22-25) involve discrete categories, and are not measured on a continuum, these questions were not included in scoring the SL-ASIA Scale. Question #26 is called the "SL-ASIA **self-identity** score". This question was scored the same way as the original 21 items and was included along with questions #1-21, making it 22-item scale. The SL-ASIA Scale is presented in Appendix B.

(3) **The Rotter's Internal-External (I-E) Control Scale** (Rotter, 1966). This scale consists of 29 pairs of questions presented in a forced-choice format. Six out of the 29 questions are filler questions. The scale is scored in the external direction, i.e. the higher the score, the more external the respondent's perceived locus of control. A possible range of score is between 0 (internalizer) to 23 (externalizer). The Rotter I-E Control Scale is presented in Appendix C..

Procedure:

Participants were asked to fill out the questionnaires, which were integrated into one survey instrument. The order of presentation of the questionnaires for all participants was the same (i.e. demographic information, the SL-ASIA Scale, and the Rotter I-E Control

Scale). A cover letter explained the purpose of the study, participant anonymity, and confidentiality of the data. Participants were asked to return the questionnaires by mail using an enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Of the 20 people from the Japanese Overseas Voters Network New York and Japan Student Network (JSN) who were contacted by the investigator and were given the questionnaires in person, 7 responded by returning completed surveys (response rate = 35%). Of the 40 people at Kinokuniya Book Store to whom the questionnaires were given in person and who were asked to send it back later, 11 responded by returning completed surveys (response rate = 27.5%). Of the 110 people who were contacted by the investigator in person or on the phone, and who later were sent the questionnaires, 52 responded by returning completed surveys (response rate = 47%). Of the 120 Baruch college students who were selected through the International Student Office, 5 questionnaires were returned due to a change of address, 26 responded by returning completed surveys (response rate = 23%). The overall usable response rate was 32%.

RESULTS

Means and standard deviations for each variable (longevity, acculturation level, and external locus of control) are presented in Table 1. Mean length of residence was 6.03 years. Mean score on the SL-ASIA Scale was 2.11. Mean score on Rotters's I-E Locus of Control was 11.08.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were computed to examine the relationship between variables. Longevity and acculturation level were found to be positively correlated ($r = .34$, $p < .05$). Longevity and external locus of control were negatively correlated ($r = -.21$, $p < .05$). Although it was not significant, acculturation level and external locus of control were positively correlated ($r = .14$). Pearson correlations of variables are presented in Table 1.

[Table 1]

In order to examine the relationship between the length of residence in the United States (longevity), acculturation level, and externality of locus of control, the sample was divided into three groups according to resident status: "Recent Residents" (subjects who have lived in the United States for 0-3.5 years); "Medium-term Residents" (subjects who have lived in the United States for 4-7.5 years); and "Long-term Residents" (subjects who have lived in the United States for more than 8 years). A comparison was made between the two extreme groups (i.e. "Recent Residents" and "Long-term Residents"). The means and standard deviations of longevity, acculturation level, and locus of control for each group are presented in Table 2.

[Table 2]

In order to test the hypothesis that the longer Japanese reside in the United States, the more acculturated they become, a t-test was computed comparing the observed means. The mean acculturation score for "Recent Residents" (2.07) was lower than that of "Long-term Residents" (2.33). This t test resulted in a significant finding: $t(90) = 5.43$, $p < .05$, which confirmed the hypothesis. The longer the participants have resided in the United States, the more acculturated they have become.

In order to test the hypothesis that the longer Japanese reside in the United States, the less externally controlled they become (i.e. the more internally controlled they become), a t-test was computed comparing the observed means. The mean locus of control score for "Recent Residents" (12.12) was significantly higher than that of "Long-term Residents" (8.70). This t test resulted in a significant finding: $t(90) = 3.71$, $p < .05$, which confirmed the hypothesis. The longer the participants have resided in the United States, the less externally controlled they have become (i.e. the more internally controlled they have become).

In order to test the hypothesis that the more acculturated Japanese, the less externally controlled they become (i.e. the more internally controlled they become), the sample was divided into two groups according to the acculturation scores. Participants who scored lower than 2.11, mean score of all participants, were labeled "Less Acculturated" ($n = 49$). Participants who scored higher than 2.11 were labeled "More Acculturated" ($n = 43$). A t-test was computed comparing observed means of locus of control scale. The mean locus of control score for "Less Acculturated" participants (11.14) was higher than that of "More Acculturated" participants (11.00). This test failed to achieve statistical significance: $t(90) = 0.9$.

Note that question #26 in the SL-ASIA Scale has a potential scaling problem. It is not coded in the same direction as questions #1 through #21. However, because all of the participants in the present study scored identically on this question (score = 1), it did not affect the data analyses.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study provide evidence that there is a relationship between the length of residence in the United States, acculturation level, and locus of control among Japanese respondents. The longer the Japanese stayed in the United States, the more acculturated they were; the longer they stayed in the United States, the less externally controlled they were (i.e. the more internally controlled they were). The hypothesis that the more acculturated the Japanese are, the less external they would be, was not confirmed in the present study. Thus, the results confirmed two of the hypotheses.

These findings are consistent with previous studies of Japanese participants. Padilla et al. (1984) reported that third/later generation Japanese were less externally oriented than first-generation Japanese. Heine and Lehman (1995) reported that with increased

exposure to Western culture, Japanese respondents showed higher reports of internal locus of control and lower reports of control by powerful others or by chance. All of these changes are consistent with a shift towards a more "Western" of independent view of self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). It appears that with increased exposure to Western culture, people of Eastern ancestry, such as the Japanese, begin to view themselves more and more like agentic and autonomous individuals. This seems to be a shift from an interdependent view of the self in a collectivistic country to an independent view of the self in an individualistic country.

The present study echoes the findings of a recent study by Heine and Lehman (1995), which found that increased exposure to Western culture led to higher scores on internality of locus of control among Japanese participants. This implies that as length of residence increases, individuals become more internally controlled. Similarly, Padilla et al. (1984) found that third generation Japanese-Americans scored higher on internality of locus of control than did first generation respondents. As in the present study, the length of residence in the United States was found to be a significant determinant of acculturation level and locus of control.

There are at least two explanations can be offered for the correlations between length of residence in the United States and acculturation level. "Recent Residents," who are most likely to be the least acculturated in terms of language, social customs, and behavior, may experience greater difficulty with interpersonal relationships than "Long-term Residents." By contrast, as individuals became more familiar with cultural customs (e.g. "Long-term Residents), the level of acculturation increased as they succeeded in the process of adjustment.

The range of acculturation level score was narrow (mean score of all participants = 2.11, standard deviation = .32; mean score of "Recent Residents" = 2.07, "Long-term Residents" = 2.33). The range of scores still falls below 3, considered to be more towards "Asian-identified." This might be due to a defect of the instrument (SL-ASIA) pointed out by Kodama and Canetto (1995) that the scale may not be appropriate when measuring Japanese temporary residents. This might have affected the results of this study, and it may explain why hypothesized correlation between acculturation level and locus of control was not confirmed.

The mean score of 11.08 on Locus of Control in the present study was lower than that of 12.61 reported by Smith et al. (1995) for Japanese respondents in Japan. This implies that Japanese living in the United States are more internally controlled than are Japanese living in Japan.

In the present study, all of the subjects were first-generation residents. Generational status has been found to be a good predictor of acculturation and locus of control (Padilla et al., 1984). Respondents in the present study were either in the United States on a student or work visa or as permanent residents or citizens. Temporary residents may have less commitment to American society, so that there is less need and/or intention to acculturate than in the case for permanent residents. In the present study, "Recent Residents," were

more likely to be temporary residents with student or work visas; whereas "Long-term Residents" were more likely to be permanent residents or citizens. These conditions might have affected the results of this study. Also, it raises a question that the intention or motivation for residence in the United States among the Japanese may be an important factor when investigating acculturation and locus of control. Is acculturation level determined entirely by longevity in the United States; or is intention to become a permanent resident also a determinant? This could be determined by comparing acculturation and locus of control scores for short-term residents who intend to return to Japan following a brief stay in the United States with those who intend to apply for permanent residence.

Age at time of migration may be an important predictor of examining acculturation and locus of control. As pointed out by Padilla et al. (1983) and Grove and Torbiorn (1986), individuals, who immigrate to a new country at a relatively later age face more difficulty adjusting to a new culture, because they are accustomed to functioning well in their own culture. One might predict that the younger individuals are when they come to the United States, the more acculturated and the less externally controlled they would be expected to become and the more rapid the process of acculturation.

Future studies should be concerned with visa status as well as the age of migration among Japanese residents in the United States when acculturation and locus of control are involved. This will facilitate a clearer understanding of Japanese immigrants living in the United States.

ENDNOTES

1. 1603-1867. The *Tokugawa* regime created a strong centralized government in which there was an untransferable caste system, with four distinguished levels, throughout Japan. Japanese people had to stay in their classes, and obey the government, otherwise they would be killed.

REFERENCS

Atkinson, D.R., & Gim, R. H. (1989). Asian-American cultural identity and attitudes toward mental health services. **Journal of Counseling Psychology**, 36(2), 209-212.

Barling, J., & Finchan, F. (1978). Locus of control beliefs in male and female Indian and White school children in South Africa. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 9, 227-235.

Bellack, A. S. (1975). Self-evaluation, self-reinforcement and locus of control. **Journal of Research in Personality**, 42, 330-336.

Benedict, R. (1946). **The chrysanthemum and the sword: Patterns of Japanese culture**. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Bennett, M. J. (1986). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), **Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications** (pp. 27-69). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Berry, J. W. (1971). Ecological and cultural factors in spatial perceptual development. **Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science**, 3, 324-336.

Berry, J. W. (1980). Social and cultural change. In H. C. Triandis & R. Brislin (Eds.), **Handbook of cross-cultural psychology**. Vol. 5. Social psychology. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation: Understanding individuals moving between cultures. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), **Applied cross-cultural psychology: Cross-cultural research and methodology series**, Vol. 14 (pp.232-253). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Berry, J. W., & Annis, R. C. (1974). Acculturative stress. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 5, 382-405.

Biondo, J., & MacDonald, A. P. (1971). Internal-external locus of control and response to influence attempts. **Journal of Personality**, 39, 406-419.

Bond, M. H., & Tornatzky, L. G. (1973). Locus of control in students from Japan and the United States: Dimensions and levels of response. **Psychologia**, 16, 209-213.

Caudill, W., & DeVos, G. (1956). Achievement, culture, and personality: The case of the Japanese Americans. **American Anthropology**, 58, 1102-1126.

Connor, J. W. (1994). The cultural, historical antecedents of Chinese and Japanese personality characteristics and nineteenth century modernization. In L. B. Boyer, R. M. Boyer & H. F. Stein (Eds.), **The psychoanalytic study of society series**, Vol. 19 (pp.213-239). Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press, Inc.

Crowne, D., & Liverant, S. (1963). Conformity under varying conditions of personal commitment. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 66, 547-555.

Doctor, R. D. (1971). Locus of control of reinforcement and responsiveness to social influence. **Journal of Personality**, 39, 542-551.

Doi, T. (1971). ***The anatomy of dependence (Amae no kozo***. Tokyo: Kodansha International.

Dyal, J. A. (1984). Cross-cultural research with the locus of control construct. In H. Lefcourt (Ed.), **Research with the locus of control construct**, Vol.3(pp. 209-306). New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Dyal, J. A., & Dyal, R. Y. (1981). Acculturation, stress and coping. **International Journal of Intercultural Relations**, 5, 301-328.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). **Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach**. New York, Plenum.

Geertz, C. (1975). On the nature of anthropological understanding. **American Scientist**, 63, 47-53.

Getter, H. A. (1966). A personality determinant of verbal conditioning. **Journal of Personality**, 34, 397-405.

Grove, C. L., & Torbiorn, I. (1986). A new conceptualization of intercultural adjustment and the goals of learning. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), **Cross-cultural orientation: New conceptualizations and applications** (pp. 71-109). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Heaton, R. C., & Duerfeld, P. H. (1973). The relationship between self-esteem, self-reinforcement, and the internal-external personality dimension. **Journal of Generic Psychology**, 123 , 3-13.

Heider, F. (1958). **The psychology of interpersonal relations**. New York: John Wiley;

Heine, S., & Lehman, D. R. (1995, August). Self-assessments and exposure to Western culture. Poster session presented for the **103rd Conference of the American Psychological Association**, New York, NY.

Henkin, W. A. (1985). Toward counseling the Japanese in America: A cross-cultural primer. **Journal of Counseling and Development**, 63, 500-503.

Herskovits, M. I. (1938). **Acculturation: The study of culture contact**. New York: Augustin.

Hsu, F. L. K. (1953). **Americans and Chinese: Two ways of life**. New York: Akerlard-Schuman.

Julian, J. W., & Katz, S. B. (1968). Internal versus external control and the value of reinforcement. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 8, 89-94.

Julian, J. W., Lichtman, C. M., & Ryckman, R. M. (1968). Internal-external control and the need to control. **Journal of Social Psychology**, 76, 43-48.

Kawanishi, Y. (1995). The effects of culture on beliefs about stress and coping: Causal attribution of Anglo-American and Japanese persons. **Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy**, 25(1), 49-60.

Kim, Y. Y. (1978). A communication approach to the acculturation process: A study of Korean immigrants in Chicago. **International Journal of Intercultural Relations**, 2, 197- 223.

Kodama, K., & Canetto, S. S. (1995). Reliability and validity of the Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale with Japanese temporary residents. **Psychologia**, 38, 17-21.

Kondo, D. (1990). **Crafting selves: Power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese work place**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lao, R. C. (1978). Levenson's IPC (Internal-External Control) Scale: A comparison of Chinese and American students. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 9, 113-122.

Lebra, T. S. (1976). **Japanese patterns of behavior**. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.

Lefcourt, H. M. (1976). **Locus of control**. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lefcourt, H. M. (Ed.). (1984). **Research with the locus of control construct: Vol. 3. Extensions and limitations**. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

Lesser, O. S., & Peter, H. W. (1975). Training foreign nationals in the United States. In R. Likert & S. P. Hayes, Jr. (Eds.), **Some applications of behavioural research**. Paris: UNESCO.

Mahler, I. (1974). A comparative study of locus of control. **Psychologia**, 17, 135-139.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. **Psychological Review**, 98, 224-253.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1995). The cultural construction of self and emotion: Implication for social behavior. In S. Kitayama & H. R. Markus (Eds.), **Emotion and culture: Empirical study of mutual influence** (pp.89-130). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, R. T. (1986). Personality, coping, and coping effectiveness in an adult sample. **Journal of Personality**, 54, 384-405.

McGinnies, E., Nordholm, L.A., Ward, C. D., & Bhanthumnavin, D. L. (1974). Sex and cultural differences in perceived locus of control among students in five countries. **Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology**, 42, 451-155.

Morishima, M. (1982). **Why has Japan "succeeded"?**. London: Cambridge University Press.

Motoaki, H., Noguchi, K., & Shigehisa, T. (1990). Ways of coping with stress in Americans and Japanese: A psychometric analysis of health indexes in a cross-cultural perspective. **Japanese Journal of Health Psychology**, 3(2), 22-31.

Nakamura, H. (1962). **Ways of thinking of Eastern peoples: India, China, Tibet, Japan**. (P. P. Wiener, Ed.). Honolulu: East-West Center Press.

Nakane, C. (1972). ***Personal relations in a vertical society (Tateshakai no ningen kankei)***. Japan: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Nakano, K. (1992). Role of personality characteristics in coping behaviors. **Psychological Reports**, 71, 687-690.

Nowack, K. M. (1988). Coping style, cognitive hardiness, and health status. **Journal of Behavioral Medicine**, 12, 145-158.

Padilla, A. M., Wagatsuma, Y., & Lindholm, K. J. (1984). Acculturation and personality as predictors of stress in Japanese and Japanese-Americas. **The Journal of Social Psychology**, 125(3), 295-305.

Parsons, O. A., & Schneider, J. M.(1974). Locus of control in university students from eastern and western societies. **Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology**, 42, 456-461.

Phares, E. J. (1976). **Locus of control in personality**. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Reitz, H. J., & Groff, G. K. (1974). Economic development and belief in locus of control among factory workers in four countries. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 5, 344-355.

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. **American Anthropologist**, 38, 149-152.

Ritchie, D. E., & Phares, E. J. (1969). Attitude change as a function of internal-external control and communicator status. **Journal of Personality**, 37, 429-443.

Roland, A. (1988). **In search of self in India and Japan**. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Roth, S., & Cohen, L. J. (1986). Approach, avoidance, and coping with stress. **American Psychologist**, 41, 813-819.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J. R., & Snyder, S. S. (1982). Changing the world and changing the self: A two-process model of perceived control. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 42, 5- 37.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. **Psychological Monographs**, 80(1, Whole NO. 609).

Sampson, E. E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. **American Psychologist**, 43, 15-22.

Sampson, E. E. (1989). The challenge of social change for psychology: Globalization and psychology's theory of the person. **American Psychologist**, 44, 914-921.

Segall, M. H. (1979). **Cross-cultural psychology: Human behavior in global perspective**. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Shweder, R. A., & LeVine, R. A. (Eds.). (1984). C**ulture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion**. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, P. B., Trompenaars, F., & Dugan, S. (1995). The Rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries: A test of cultural relativity. **International Journal of Psychology**, 30(3), 377-400.

Social Science Research Council (1954). Acculturation: An exploratory formulation. **American Anthropologist**, 56, 973-1002.

Spradley, J. P., & Phillips, M. (1972). Culture and stress. **American Anthropologist**, 60, 217-233.

Strong, C. (1984). Stress and caring for elderly relatives: Interpretations and coping strategies in an American Indian and white sample. **Gerontologist**, 24, 251-256.

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

Suinn, R. M., Ahuna, C., & Khoo, G. (1992). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale: factorial validation. **Educational & Psychological Measurement**, 52, 1041-1046.

Suinn, R. M., Ahuna, C., & Khoo, G. (in press). The Suinn-Lew Asian self-identity acculturation scale: Concurrent and factorial validation. **Educational & Psychological Measurements**.

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

Torbiorn, I. (1982). **Living abroad**. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism and individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology. In G. K. Verma & C. Bagley (Eds.), **Personality, attitudes, and cognitions** (pp. 60-95). London: Macmillan.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Major cultural syndromes and emotion. In S. Kitayama, & H. R. Markus (Eds.), **Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence** (pp.285-306). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Triandis, H. C., McCusker, C., Berancout, H., Iwao, S., Leung, K., Salazar, J. M., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. P., Touzard, H., & Zaleski, Z. (1993). An etic-emic analysis of individualism and collectivism. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology**, 24(3), 366-383.

Umehara, T. (1994, June). The significance of Japanese religion today: Reflection on Shinto and Buddhism. **Paper presented at the meeting of Japan Society**, New York, NY.

Van Wolferen, K. (1994). **The system that makes Japanese unhappy: The false realities of a politicized society**. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha.

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., Rest, S., & Rosenbaum, R. M. (1971). **Perceiving the causes of success and failure**. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.

Weisz, J. R., Rothbaum, F. M., & Blackburn, T. C. (1984). Standing out and standing in: The psychology of control in America and Japan. **American Psychologist**, 39, 955-969.

Yamamoto, J., & Wagatsuma, H. (1980). The Japanese and Japanese Americans. **Journal of Operational Psychiatry**, 11, 120-135.

Yamamoto, S. (1989). **Understanding Japanese behavior patterns**.Tokyo: PHP Publisher.

Tables

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations for Longevity, Acculturation level, and Externality on Locus of Control.

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3
1. Longevity	6.03	5.51	-		
2. Acculturation level	2.11	.32	.34*	-	
3. Locus of Control	11.08	4.14	-.21*	.14	-

Note: N = 92. * p < .05.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations of Longevity, Acculturation level, and externality on Locus of Control in resident status groups.

	Variables					
	Longevity		Acculturation level		Locus of Control	
Resident status	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Recent residents (0 - 3.5 yrs.)	2.21	.95	2.07	.38	12.12	4.03
Midterm residents (4 - 7.5 yrs.)	5.41	1.08	2.03	.20	11.44	3.89
Long-term residents (8 or more yrs.)	13.60	6.86	2.33	.30	8.70	3.80

Note: Recent residents (n = 37), Midterm residents (n = 34), and Long-term residents (n = 21).

Appendix A

Age:___

Sex: Female___ Male___

Marital Status:
Single___ Married____ Separated _____
Divorced____ Remarried___ Widowed____
Living with an intimate partner_____

Residential Status:
Student visa ____ Permanent Resident____
Work visa _____ Citizen____ Other____

Living Arrangement(check all that apply):
By myself ___ With my family____
With Japanese_____ With Asian Americans____
With Americans _____ With non-Asian or non-American____

1. How old were you when you first came to the United States?
____years old

2. How many years have you lived in the United States?
____ years

3. How many years have you attended school?
In Japan ____ years
In the United States_____ years

4.If you have ever been to school in the United States, at what age did you enter?
____ years old

5. What is the highest degree are you pursuing (did you pursue) in the United States?
Ph.D.____ Masters____ Bachelors____
Associate ____ None____ Other (Specify)_______

6. How many years did you study English before coming to the United States?
____ years

7. What language is spoken at home in the United States?
Japanese____ English_____ Other______

8. If you have a choice, how much would you like to live in the United States (after completing your education)?

Strongly undesirable	Undesirable	Neutral	Desirable	Strongly desirable
1	2	3	4	5

9. How would you define your primary values.

Highly Japanese	Mostly Japanese	Equally Japanese & Western	Mostly Western	Highly Western
1	2	3	4	5

10. To what extent have your values as Japanese person changed since you came the United States?

Not at all	Not much	Neutral	To some extent	Very much
1	2	3	4	5

11. In what way have or have you not changed your values? Please give some specific examples.

Appendix B
Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-Asia)

[Due to copyright restrictions, this appendix is available in the print version found in Baruch College Library.]

Appendix C
The Rotter Internal-External Control Scale

[Due to copyright restrictions, this appendix is available in the print version found in Baruch College Library.]

© Copyright to this work is retained by the author[s]. Permission is granted for the noncommercial reproduction of the complete work for educational or research purposes.