3181

PSYCHOSOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF VIETNAMESE IMMIGRANTS IN HAWAI'I

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

DECEMBER 2004

By

Stephen Fox

Thesis Committee:

Anthony Marsella, Chairperson
Ashley Maynard
Clifford O'Donnell

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my father, Henry G. Fox, who always encouraged me to pursue my education and my dreams. He taught me to be a gentleman, and to look for the worth of a man in the qualities of his character.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest gratitude goes to Dr. Anthony Marsella, who had enough faith in me to take me under his wing. He has become my professor, my mentor, and most importantly, my friend. I must also acknowledge Nancy Butler and Duc Truong, the students who assisted in development and data collection for this study. Truong, especially, should be remembered, given that he lost his life from a condition caused by trauma he experienced as a child during the war.

ABSTRACT

Modern human migration poses one of the greatest challenges of our time. In this study, multiple instruments were administered to participants from the Vietnamese community in Hawai'i to measure their ethnic identity, traumatic history, health, and well-being. Responses were analyzed for difference by gender and for change after immigration, as well as testing for correlations between scales and for predictive power of variables. No differentiation by gender was observed. Significant changes after immigration included loss in well-being and increase in HSCL-24 score. Additionally, the correlation of the newly-developed well-being scale with the HSCL-24 suggests convergent validity for that scale.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT v
TABLE OF CONTENTS vi
LIST OF TABLES ix
Chapter 1 1
Introduction 1
A. The Global Context of Our Lives 1
B. Population Movement 3
C. Refugee Literature Review 4
Stages of Process 5
Stresses of Migration in Refugees 7
Adaptation, Acculturation and Assimilation: Terms of Reference 10
The Generation Gap 13
Coethnics & Multiculturalism 14
D. The Vietnamese in America 15
History 15
Gender 20
E. Current Situation of Refugees from Vietnam 22
F. Emerging Questions 23
G. Research Objectives 24
Chapter 2 27
Methodology 27
A. Participants (Ps) 27
B. Instruments 28
Instrument Development 32
C. Procedures 32
D. Data Analysis 33
Chapter 3 34
Results 34
A. Means by scale 34
LSAT-V 34
LSAT-A 34
VEIQ 34
TVAS 35
LEQ 35
VWBC-V 35
VWBC-A 35
HSCL-24-V 35
HSCL-24-A 36
B. Analysis of Variance by Gender 37
LSAT-V 37
LSAT-A 38

VEIQ 39
TVAS 39
LEQ 40
VWBC-V 41
VWBC-A 42
HSCL-24-V 43
HSCL-24-A 44
C. Comparison Between Vietnam and America Scales 45
VWBC-V and VWBC-A Anova 45
HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V Anova 45
LSAT-A and LSAT-V Anova 46
HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V Chi-square for Cut-off Scores 46
D. Correlation Table 47
E. Linear Regression Analysis 50
VWBC-A 50
HSCL-A 52
LSAT-A 54
Chapter 4 57
Discussion 57
A. Demographics 57
B. Scale Analyses 57
Life Satisfaction in Vietnam 57
Life Satisfaction in Hawai'i 58
Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire 58
Traditional Values Assessment Survey 59
Life Events Questionnaire 60
Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-Vietnam 60
Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-America 61
Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-Vietnam 62
Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-America 62
C. ANOVA by Gender 63
LSAT 63
VEIQ 63
TVAS 64
LEQ 64
VWBC 65
HSCL-24-V 65
HSCL-24-A 65
D. Comparison Between Vietnam and America Scales 66
ANOVA Between Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-Vietnam and -America scores 66
ANOVA Between Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-Vietnam and -America scores 67
ANOVA Between Life Satisfaction Scale-Vietnam and -America scores 67
HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V Chi-square for Cut-off Scores 68

E. Relations Among Variables: Scale Inter- Correlation Table 68
F. Discussion of Linear Regression Analysis 71
VWBC-A 71
HSCL-24-A 73
LSAT-A 74
G. Methodological Problems 75
H. Future Directions 76
Chapter 5 79
Conclusions 79
APPENDIX A Demographic Questionairre 83
APPENDIX B Life Satisfaction Scale Questionairre 86
Appendix C Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaires 97
Appendix D Traditional Values Assessment Survey Questionnaires 102
APPENDIX E Life Events Questionairre 105
APPENDIX F Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist Questionnaires 113
APPENDIX G Hopkins Symptom Checklist Questionnaires 117
APPENDIX H Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire Results 122
APPENDIX I Traditional Values Assessment Survey Results 126
APPENDIX J Life Events Questionnaire Results 129
APPENDIX K Life Satisfaction Scale-Vietnam Results 137
APPENDIX L Life Satisfaction Scale-America Results 141
APPENDIX M Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-Vietnam Results 145
APPENDIX N Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-America Results 149
Appendix O Hopkins Symptom Checklist-Vietnam Results 153
Appendix P Hopkins Symptom Checklist-America Results 158
References 163

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHICS OF PARTICIPANTS 27
TABLE 2. AGE AND DATE OF ARRIVAL OF PS 28
TABLE 3. STUDY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS 30
TABLE 4. INSTRUMENT ABBREVIATIONS 31
TABLE 5. AGGREGATE SCORES OF ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS 36
TABLE 6. LSAT-V WITH GENDER: MEANS 37
TABLE 7. LSAT-V WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 37
TABLE 8. LSAT-A WITH GENDER: MEANS 38
TABLE 9. LSAT-A WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 38
TABLE 10. VEIQ WITH GENDER: MEANS 39
TABLE 11. VEIQ WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 39
TABLE 12. TVAS WITH GENDER: MEANS 40
TABLE 13. TVAS WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 40
TABLE 14. LEQ WITH GENDER: MEANS 41
TABLE 15. LEQ WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 41
TABLE 16. VWBC-V WITH GENDER: MEANS 42
TABLE 17. VWBC-V WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 42
TABLE 18. VWBC-A WITH GENDER: MEANS 43
TABLE 19. VWBC-A WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 43
TABLE 20. HSCL-24-V WITH GENDER: MEANS 43
TABLE 21. HSCL-24-V WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 44
TABLE 22. HSCL-24-A WITH GENDER: MEANS 44
TABLE 23. HSCL-24-A WITH GENDER: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE 44
TABLE 24. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN VWBC-V AND VWBC-A 45
TABLE 24. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN HSCL-24-A AND HSCL-24-V 46
TABLE 26. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN LSAT-A AND LSAT-V 46
TABLE 27. CROSSTABULATION COUNT 47
TABLE 28. CHI-SQUARE TESTS 47
TABLE 29. CORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDY SCALES AND TWO TAILED SIGNIFICANCE TESTS 49
TABLE 30. MODEL SUMMARY FOR VWBC-A LINEAR REGRESSION 51
TABLE 31. ANOVA FOR LINEAR REGRESSION OF VWBC-A 51
TABLE 32. MODEL SUMMARY FOR HSCL-24-A LINEAR REGRESSION 53
TABLE 33. ANOVA FOR LINEAR REGRESSION OF HSCL-24-A 53
TABLE 34. MODEL SUMMARY FOR LSAT-A LINEAR REGRESSION 55
TABLE 35. ANOVA FOR LINEAR REGRESSION OF LSAT-A 56
TABLE 36. RESULTS OF VEIQ: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 123
TABLE 37. RESULTS OF TVAS: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 127
TABLE 38. RESULTS OF TVAS: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 130
TABLE 39. RESULTS OF LSAT-V: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 138
TABLE 40. RESULTS OF LSAT-A: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 142
TABLE 41. RESULTS OF VWBC-V: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 146
TABLE 42. RESULTS OF VWBC-A: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 150
TABLE 43. RESULTS OF HSCL-24-V: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 154
TABLE 44. RESULTS OF HSCL-24-V: FREQUENCIES 157
TABLE 45. RESULTS OF HSCL-24-A: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER 159
TABLE 46. RESULTS OF HSCL-24-A: FREQUENCIES 162

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In this study, the psychosocial conditions of a sample of Vietnamese immigrants and refugees in Honolulu are assessed in a broad set of measures in an attempt to contribute to the body of information on the psychosocial processes experienced by refugees. The hope is that the understanding yielded by this study will provide another piece of the greater picture of understanding Southeast Asian refugees, and on a macro level, of understanding the process of refugee migration and the required response in the host countries, given that refugees and immigrants experience a common set of postmigration psychosocial adjustment issues (Bemak, Chung, & Pederson, 2003).

In 1987, the World Health Organization (WHO) defined health as "a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being." For this reason, the study employs several instruments to assess a range of mental and physical health, well-being, and acculturation factors.

A. The Global Context of Our Lives

The human population on Earth has now reached an unprecedented level, retaining its ageless problems of struggles for survival and dominance, and adding a host of new problems. The problems facing humanity range from societal to environmental (Krauss, 2002), and insurmountable obstacles abound in each domain. Massive movements of entire populations have become increasingly frequent, with a snarled web of causes and consequences affecting the people moving and the people already living

where the migrants arrive (United States Committee for Refugees, 2000).

On the environmental level, global warming is expected to raise the oceans as much as ten feet in this century, rendering several South Pacific island nations and many coastal areas worldwide uninhabitable (Krauss, 2002). Climatic changes have brought droughts and floods to huge areas. Sometimes both conditions occur in the same region, as in Malawi, where flooding and subsequent drought have left at least 2.6 million people in that country and 20 million in the region at risk of starvation (Jeter, 2002). The sub-Saharan sahel expands each year, and the areas that have ceased to sustain crops or livestock are not likely to ever become habitable again (USCR, 2003). Drought now affects large areas of the United States, driving wild animal populations into urban areas. A recent study suggests that the sequelae of these climatic and habitation shifts will have far reaching effects on the human population (Honolulu Advertiser 4/20/02).

Armed conflict is ongoing in a host of countries, at least 68 at present (USCR, 2000). Many of these include criminal cartels or warlords who have agendas which are not conducive to peace negotiation (Marsella & Ring, 2001). Ongoing conflicts spawn a steady stream of refugees, and more conflicts may erupt at any time. Large numbers of armed guerillas and terrorists can at any time form into armies of insurgents in virtually any country. Previous wars in Africa, especially, have left alarming numbers of orphans, who are the prime constituency for recruitment as guerilla fighters or armies of criminal cartels. These situations are fraught with likelihood to generate new conflicts with resulting waves of migration.

B. Population Movement

Humans have roamed the earth since pre-historic times. Large-scale migration, however, began to appear with the discovery of the Americas. Slave trading accounted for several millions arriving, with huge numbers of immigrants from Europe and later Asia. The refugee and immigrant populations in the United States have burgeoned even further in the twentieth century. The category of "immigrant" includes all those who arrive in a new country. Refugees form a special class of immigrants who flee their native land due to experience or fear of war, violence, or political oppression (Marsella, Bornemann, Ekblad, & Orley, 1994).

Millions of immigrants, including refugees, now live in the United States, forming an unprecedented percentage of the population, even given the long history of immigration that populated the country. In the early 20th century, the previous peak of immigration numbered only 13.5 million. The number has rocketed from 9.6 million in 1970 to 28.4 million in 2000, or 10.4 percent of the total population. Immigrants statistically form a group with lower levels of education, lower socioeconomic status, and higher utilization of public resources (Camarota, 2001).

In 2002, 34.8 million people were classified as involuntarily displaced. These included 13 million refugees and asylum seekers (those who have left their home country) (Bemak, Chung, & Pederson, 2003), and 21.8 million internally displaced persons (USCR, 2002) (those who are displaced within their own country) (Bemak et al., 2003). Some have been in this condition for decades, and for others, the journey began in that year (USCR, 2002). These individuals face numerous difficulties relating to survival after leaving their homes. Basic physical needs for food, water, and shelter are often not met as displaced populations flee disaster (Mollica & Lavelle, 1988). Even

after arrival in a new place, economic viability is an overwhelming question as new job and language skills must be acquired and new social settings must be navigated (Nguyen, Messe, & Stollack, 1999). For each immigrant, the past also follows in memories of the families and homes left behind. Often, life before immigration included horrific, tragic, or violent events (Bemak & Chung, 1998; Kinzie, Manson, Vinh, Tolan, Anh, & Ngoc, 1982; Mollica & Lavelle, 1988), the loss of home being only part of events so traumatic that more specific ranges of pathology result, e.g. post traumatic stress disorder and major depression (Kinzie, 1981).

C. Refugee Literature Review

The refugee experience is a complex process that has been the subject of a growing number of studies in many scholarly disciplines (Nguyen et al., 1999). Yet studies in regard to refugees' mental and physical well-being are a relatively recent undertaking (Felsman, Leong, Johnson, & Fellsman, 1990; Mollica & Lavelle, 1988), and are an important area to address, given their proportionately large utilization of public health resources (Camarota, 2001). The results of studies that have been conducted also show wide disparities in epidemiological results, suggesting that the studies are often confounded by the lack of understanding of the cultures involved, or of the transmigration process (Leong & Johnson, 1994; Nguyen et al., 1999). There is also little pre-migration data to differentiate the precipitating factors of pathology (Felsman et al., 1990).

Stages of Process

The refugee process can be viewed in terms of stages, each of which may have corresponding experiences that could contribute to later pathology. McKelvey, Mao, and Webb (1990) describe these as:

(a) Pre-departure (experience in the home country)
(b) Departure (actual flight from the home country)
(c) Transition (time in refugee camps or processing centers)
(d) Post-arrival (adjustment to the host country)

With specific study of these phases, McKelvey (1990) attempted to establish a baseline for understanding what specific experiences contribute to risk. In the transition phase, for instance, mothers of Amerasian children who had spent more time at the Phillipine Refugee Processing Center were more likely to exhibit psychological distress than those who spent less time at the camp (Leong & Johnson, 1994).

All immigrants face multiple issues inherent to their life situations. They have left behind their native cultures and must, therefore, adapt to new cultural settings (Lim & Levenson, 1999; Nguyen et al., 1999). In their new setting, they are required to engage in new repertoires of behaviors (Staats, 1972), which are inherently unlike those to which they are accustomed (Nguyen et al., 1999). Immigrant and refugee populations exhibit generally low socioeconomic status due to their arrival without economic support, and their difficulties in navigating the new culture. These populations also exhibit a high rate of delinquency and psychopathology as well as a high utilization of public health resources, factors which arise both from the sociocultural status which immigrants experience upon their arrival and during their attempts to integrate into the host culture (Camarota, 2001).

Refugees face those and other difficulties. They often had multiple exposures to trauma and life threatening events preceding their departure from their native land (Bemak, et. al. 2003; Kinzie, 1981; Mollica & Lavelle, 1988). Added to this is the simple fact that they did not leave their homes by choice, but rather by force or coercion. They have, by definition, departed from their native lands and cultures as a result of political or social pressures that strike at their existential natures; by international definition, they have had to flee to preserve their lives. In these situations, they have been marginalized at best, or at worst, threatened with extinction. These events are by nature stressful, to state the obvious (Bemak, et. al., 2003; Carlson & Rosser-Hagen, 1993).

As immigrants attempt to assimilate into a new country, they also pose difficulties for the host population. Exposed as they were to risk precipitating factors, they arrive in their new community with inherent sets of difficulties for their new hosts. Immigrants compete for jobs in the host community and draw upon public resources there. Often levels of pathology are alarmingly high in refugee populations, as was concluded in a study of Cambodians immigrants in North Carolina, which observed Hopkins Symptom Check List rates of 2.33 on a scale of one to four. The anxiety and depression subscales (HSCL-A and HSCL-D) showed rates of 2.41 and 2.29, respectively, with 1.75 being the cutoff for indication of pathology. Pathology was indicated in 86% of participants, whereas the mean epidemiological rate for the US is eight percent (Carlson & Rosser-Hagen, 1993). Southeast Asian immigrants have been observed to exhibit much higher rates of pathology than native or other immigrant populations (Liebkind, 1996).

Stresses of Migration in Refugees

Events of the types that precede forced migration are the most horrific humans can face (Bemak et al., 2003; USCR, 2000). Events of such an excruciatingly existential nature are among those most likely to have lasting and damaging sequelae. At best, they have experienced monumental stresses (Carlson & Rosser-Hagen, 1993). Jablensky, Marsella, Ekblad, Jannsonn, Levi, & Bornemann (1994) state that "There is compelling evidence that specific configurations of migration and displacement have a major impact on both short-term and long-term mental health and well-being." These authors cited a list of risk factors encountered by migrants, affecting especially the refugee populations including:

Marginalization and minority status
Socioeconomic disadvantage
Poor physical health
Starvation and malnutrition
Head trauma and injury
Collapse of social supports
Mental trauma
Adaptation to host culture. (pp. 330-332)

The authors further cited a list of pathologies found among migrant groups:

Anxiety disorders
Depressive disorders
Anger, aggression and violent behavior
Drug and alcohol use
Paranoia, suspicion and distrust
Somatization and hysteria
Sleeplessness (p. 332)

Orley (1994) considers the risk factors on the basis of stages of journey: "stress-provoking conditions" prior to flight, on the actual journey, upon arrival at a new place, and in further migrations. He states that several studies have found admission rates into

psychiatric hospitals are higher for the refugee segment of the population than for "control populations." He cites a Rubonis and Brickman (1991) study showing a 17% increase in pathology among those exposed to trauma, and studies showing increases of psychiatric disorders among refugees ranging from 3.5% to 88% above host populations.

Experiences of violence and murder have been shown to be significant predictors of stress and anxiety (Liebkind, 1996). The previously mentioned population of non-clinical Cambodian refugees in North Carolina bore witness to the infamous "killing fields" under the Khmer Rouge. These were some of the most brutally violent times ever seen. In a study by Carlson & Rosser-Hogan (1993), participants demonstrated extremely high levels of PTSD, with 86% meeting a "modified DSM-III-R criterion," Of the 21 possible items, the mean number endorsed was 11.7. On the HSCL-24, 86% of participants exceeded the cutoff score for significant emotional distress.

Previous studies have attempted to identify factors that predispose toward or mitigate against potential pathological sequelae among immigrants. Factors may include outlook or expectations, premigratory trauma, acculturation, and family presence. In a study of Hmong in Minnesota, Westermeyer, Vang, & Neider (1983) found that those who had a hopeful outlook scored lower on the Zung Depression scale and the 90-item Symptom Checklist. Higher premigratory expectations for self and father among Amerasian youths from Vietnam were found to correlate with lower scores on the HSCL-24 and the Vietnamese Depression scale (McKelvey et al., 1993). That study also demonstrated that a history of hospitalization, no school in Vietnam, and negative or indifferent feelings toward the (American) father were significant risk factors.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the connection between stress and

pathology. Rating scales of intensity of stress have shown that loss of loved ones, changing jobs, and moving are significant stressors to the general population in the relatively affluent and politically stable United States. Often immigrants have numerous stressors simultaneously, accentuating pathologies of both physical and mental types, and adding to the sequelae of traumas that led to migration (Carlson & Rosser-Hagen, 1993). Certainly, the immigrant and refugee populations are by definition at great risk.

Assessing the mental health condition of Southeast Asians has an added methodological difficulty resulting from their differing modes of experiencing and expressing symptoms from those of European-American (Phan & Silove, 1997). Often symptoms are expressed as somatic complaints (Carlson & Rosser-Hogan, 1993; Institute for Psycho-Social Support, 1993; Kinzie et al., 1982). In fact, in development of the VDS, no word could be found for translation of "depression" into Vietnamese (Kinzie et al., 1982). In addition, the Southeast Asian culture has been reported to associate the admission of emotional problems with "shame and disgrace." This may have resulted in an ongoing underreporting of symptoms (Liebkind, 1996).

In addition, Southeast Asian populations are often misdiagnosed in cases of mental disorder. The stigma attached to mental illness, combined with differing modes of expression, lead to perhaps 50% rates of misdiagnosis (Hinton, Ladson, Du, Yung-Cheng, Tran, Newman, & Lu, 1992). Southeast Asians have been observed to express psychological pathology as somatic complaints, such as "unremitting headaches" (Institute for Psycho-Social Support, 1993; Kinzie et al., 1982). Thus, they frequently enter the health system via primary care in public medical clinics. Adequate planning for provision of health services requires understanding of needs of these populations and accurate forecast of the demands that will be placed upon such resources (Hinton, et al.,

1992). Arriving and existing as they do in their new settings, at generally low SES and with high pathologies, these populations are also at great risk in the domain of illegal and criminal activities (Thai, 2002). These factors provide particularly poignant challenges as the competing needs and expectations of host and immigrant populations attempt to achieve a precarious balance.

Adaptation, Acculturation and Assimilation: Terms of Reference

Life is a constant process of adaptation. "Adapting is understood as achieving a more or less stable reciprocal relationship with one's environment" (Brody, 1994). Immigration of any sort, of course, disturbs equilibrium. The more severe the circumstance, the more the reciprocity is broken, and the more adaptation is required. In the new areas to which migrants move, they must find new means of livelihood in situations which are in their nature different from the situations they left behind. These new situations require changes in "identity, values, behaviors, cognition, attitudes and affect" (Bemak et. al., 2003, p.31), or the learning of new skills and the acceptance of a new set of social norms, to an extent that varies by context (Nguyen et al., 1999). The behavioral options available have been described in numerous ways. One perspective posits that three options exist for these migrants: assimilation into the new culture, biculturality straddling both cultures, or marginalization in the host culture. Ekblad et al. (1994) begin their discussion of adaptation by citing a similar set of three general patterns as described by Khoa and Van Deusen (1981):

1. The old line pattern, adopted by many of the older refugees, consists primarily of a total rejection of any attempt to adapt to the new culture
2. The assimilative pattern is seen primarily among younger refugees who readily embrace new customs and relinquish old ones.

3. The bicultural pattern consists of selectively adopting new customs while also maintaining old ones.

Each of these responses has an associated set of benefits and problems. Assimilation or biculturality is unlikely for the adult component of migrant populations, because their initial cultural experiences occurred in their native countries, with the values of those cultures inculcated from birth (Liebkind, 1996).

The milieu into which the migrants arrive may be a major factor in the adaptation process. Liebkind (1996) studied young Vietnamese and their caregivers in Finland, which is a largely homogenous, monocultural milieu. Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok (1987) observed that a host culture which tolerates multiculturality may result in less stress for immigrants than an assimilationist one. In Finland, as in the United States, societal norms also diverge sharply from those of the Vietnamese in terms of roles, hierarchies and obedience behaviors. Liebkind (1996) assumed this to be a "salient stressor." Nguyen et al. (1999) observed a Vietnamese refugee population in Ingham County, Michigan, which is predominantly American-Caucasian in composition. The authors noted that the observed negative correlation between adoption of American values and pathology could be different in an area of different ethnic composition.

An important factor in any study of any ethnic population is the degree to which the subjects are aligned with and participate in the values and behaviors of their ethnic group (Marsella, 2000). Single indices, such as ethnicity or generational status, give insufficient information to assess numerous factors that may have far reaching consequences in an individual's life (Nguyen et al., 1999). In the absence of this knowledge, there is no clear way of establishing the participant's actual ethnic identity, which is really a set of attitudes and self perceptions that constitute the individual's self

concept. A continuum of possibilities ranges from traditional and fully identified with the native culture, to completely identified with another cultural set of values and behaviors. Further, the diversity of ethnic groups in Vietnam brings another variable: the individual could be Vietnamese, Chinese, or tribal, though the majority of Vietnamese immigrants are Vietnamese or Chinese (Liebkind, 1996; Yu, 1985)

Acculturation has had a wide range of meanings and of perspectives applied to it as researchers have ventured toward greater understanding. One perspective emphasizes degree of assimilation, another emphasizes a continuum of ethnic pluralism (Nguyen et al., 1999). Acculturation, in the psychological dimension, refers to alteration of "identity, values, behavior, and attitudes" (Liebkind, 1996), which come about as a result of new cultural contact (Berry, 1990; Liebkind, 1996). The acculturation process itself has been identified as a source of stress (Ascher 1985; Lim & Levenson, 1999; Westermeyer, 1989; Yu, 1984). This process is not well understood, given that studies of various populations have yielded remarkably varied results in terms of the relationship between acculturation, adjustment, and functionality. It is clear that correlations occur, but their exact natures, and their associated risks or benefits need further study (Nguyen et al., 1999).

Assimilation in the extreme is a condition in which the individual is subsumed into or identifies solely with the norms and activities of the new host culture. The native cultural paradigm is abandoned in favor of the adopted one (Liebkind, 1996). This trend is sometimes observed with the generation born or largely raised in the new location. While this condition can be conducive to economic and social success in the host cultural paradigm, there is associated risk of pathology resulting from the stress of the adaptation. Assimilative patterns are more often found among younger refugees and immigrants, to

whom the process of adopting new customs comes more easily (Ekblad, 1994).

Marginalization results when the culture native to the individual is lost through migration or becomes unacceptable due to perceived rejection of that paradigm by the dominant or host culture. The native paradigm is abandoned, and the new host paradigm is perceived to be unavailable or unacceptable. Lee (1988) states, "The greatest threat to identity is not the feeling of belonging to two cultures but the feeling of belonging to none." Individuals experiencing this form of maladaptation are at greatest risk of pathology, and may be a greater risk for criminal activity. Marginalization is the worst-case scenario, as the result is a scenario full of economic difficulty, psychopathology, and legal difficulty.

Biculturality is the condition wherein an individual is fully integrated and able to function in both the native and adopted cultural milieu (Nguyen et al., 1999). Each culture is comfortable enough to the individual that he or she can function with relative ease with those others of the native culture in appropriate moments, and with the host culture at other times. Of available options, bicultural individuals have been shown to exhibit the lowest prevalence of distress (Rumbaut, 1991). There is a range of possible bicultural conditions, however. A person could be "truly" bicultural and exhibit high involvement with both cultures, or "mock" bicultural, who has low involvement with both (Nguyen et al., 1999).

The Generation Gap

In the eventuality that children of the immigrants adapt to the host culture, a new problem may arise in the form of a cultural schism that occurs between parents and

children and brings a new and unique set of difficulties. American social norms differ significantly from those of Asia and Southeast Asia (Miller & Rasco, 2004; Nguyen et al., 1999). Of particular relevance are norms about independence, respect for elders, and contribution to collective well-being of an extended family unit. The younger generation, whether born in America or not, is socialized among schoolmates and other peer groups to adopt the United States social norms, though these are in marked contrast to the norms of their parents at home. Adults must depend on the language and literacy skills of younger people who, in traditional settings, should be dependent on and obedient to them (Miller & Rasco, 2004). The children are pushed to adopt western normative patterns, and the result is often an increase in dissonance in their homes (Liebkind, 1996). Liebkind's study showed a significant correlation between dissociation from traditional Vietnamese values and anxiety or stress. This leads to further problems, as it has been shown that conflict in the home is a risk factor for antisocial patterns of behavior.

Coethnics & Multiculturalism

An important factor in the adaptation process is the degree of acceptance from the surrounding community: is diversity tolerated, or does prejudice and rejection greet the immigrant (Marsella, 1994)? In the struggle to adapt, a controversial factor is the presence of coethnics in the community, perhaps forming an ethnic enclave. Some researchers suggest the enclave maximizes social support, thereby mitigating identity erosion and pathology. Others suggest strong coethnic presence inhibits the process of acculturation (Brody, 1994; Liebkind, 1996).

D. The Vietnamese in America

History

Vietnam has experienced struggle for most of the last millennium, dating to withdrawal of the original Chinese occupation in the 11th century from the Red River region, where the Ly Dynasty was established. The overthrow of Champa occupation in the 15th century added the central region to the country. It was not until Cambodia lost control of the Mekong Delta in the late 17th century that the full country was united. Briefly, beginning in 1786, the Tay Son ruled the country, but they quickly lost control. After a period of struggle, the Nguyen family line won control of the country in 1802, and remained the dominant power until their abdication to the Ho Chi Minh faction in 1945. The unique shape of the country contributes to its persistent instability, with two large regions in the north and south, distinct in terrain and filled with 17 tribal groups and a mix of Southeast Asian and Chinese who have migrated in and out of the country for centuries. The narrow belted central region has made rule over north and south difficult logistically, and the regions have drifted apart politically several times. Further complicating the situation were waves of European traders and missionaries, culminating with the French, who chose to institute rule by force beginning in the 1850s (VWAM, 2002).

Following the expulsion of the Japanese in 1945, the French attempted to return to their former colonial control, but were defeated and withdrew by 1954. It was at this point that the United States stepped in, and the country was partitioned at the infamous 17th parallel, or Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). A massive migration began at that time, when over a million North Vietnamese were forced to move across the DMZ (Yu, 1985).

The United States participation in the civil war began to precipitate slowly at that time in support of the South Vietnamese government, against insurgents in the country and from the north. These insurgents were backed by China and Russia, and were politically aligned with communism. The ensuing war was very much part of the Cold-War era and process. United States participation continued until 1975.

The United States provided military advisors, who were more accurately and increasingly combatants. Extensive bombing of huge areas, widespread spraying of the defoliant Agent Orange, and complete disruption of the Vietnamese economy and agricultural production infrastructure plunged the country into a morass of violence, hunger, and despair. These actions did little to quell the insurgency, however, and the United States military action escalated. The guerilla tactics of the Vietnamese were difficult to counter and deeply disturbing to the United States military. Casualties, however, were far heavier among the Vietnamese than among the Americans, and included great numbers of civilians.

In 1975, after the country had been subjected to years of devastation by American military forces, Saigon was taken by the communists and the United States withdrew. The wake of this event saw a mass exodus of Vietnamese who were affluent or connected to the fallen government, or who happened to be lucky enough to be included in the evacuation. A total of 130,000 Indochinese refugees came to the US at that time (Nguyen et al., 1999; Thai, 2002).

The second wave of migration consisted of those escaping by virtually any desperate means that could be found. Most of these were the "boat people" who departed between 1978 and 1982 (Nguyen et al., 1999; Thai, 2002). Often the escape

vehicle was a leaking boat, and many perished at sea. During the 1980s the number of Vietnamese in America climbed to 266,000 (Center for Immigrant Studies, 2001). These immigrants arrived in perhaps the worst socioeconomic condition. Many had paid their life savings to embark on their perilous journey. Many were then also robbed at sea by pirates, and many were raped or killed (Yu, 1986).

In 1987, the United States government established a priority protocol for authorized immigration of Amerasian children conceived by American servicemen during the war, called the Amerasian Homecoming Act (McKelvey, Mao, & Webb, 1993). It was required that these individuals pass through the Philippines Refugee Processing Center (PRPC) prior to entering the United States. In Vietnam, these half-American children were often outcast due to their obviously different appearance, and to the cultural disapproval of mixed ethnicity, especially when (as in cases where the American father was a person of color) the child had darker skin. Further, they were associated by their ethnicity with those who had wreaked such havoc on the country (Bemak & Chung, 1998).

The set of immigrants referred to as the "third wave" were those who left primarily between 1991 and 1994. These people were primarily supported by the Amerasian and Orderly Departure programs of the United States Federal Government (Nguyen et al., 1999).

The United States is currently home to 1,122,528 Vietnamese (U. S. Census Bureau, 2000). Prior to 1970, there were 20,000 or less. In the first wave of migration during the 1970s, the number rose to 150,000, and during the 1990s the number reached 427,000 (CIS, 2001). Clearly, the Vietnamese constitute a growing population, with

7,860 in Hawai'i alone (Thai, 2002). A wide range of experiences have ensued, with some having low SES, joining youth gangs (Thai, 2002), and generally experiencing difficulty, while others prosper marvelously, such as Thanh Quoc Lam of Honolulu, who was honored by the Small Business Administration as the 2002 small business person of the year (Nakaso, 2002).

Culturally, the Vietnamese are a generally communal society. Families are organized in an extended system, with several generations residing together. Identity is based on family and the role each member plays within the family. Family interests are paramount. Families and communities emphasize cooperative activity and support. It is a patriarchal society, and unquestioning obedience to authority is emphasized (Nguyen et al., 1999; Thai, 2002).

Among adolescents, unaccompanied minors, and young adults screened at the Philippine First Asylum Camp, up to 41% of youths exceeded the clinical threshold on the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ). On the HSCL-A, 15% of young adults showed clinical level scores (Felsman, 1990). Some of these were the Amerasians, whose experiences in Vietnam have consistently been demonstrated to increase risk of mental health problems, and whose lack of fathers prevented normal patrilineally-based acceptance into Vietnamese society (Bemak & Chung, 1998). Counting accompanying family members, 77,032 individuals had entered the United States by 1998. Accounts of high suicide rates and widespread reporting of these in the media have led to several studies of this population (McKelvey et al., 1993). Leong and Johnson (1994) cite depression rates, which vary by instrument, from 4.6% on the Vietnamese Depression Survey (VDS) to 26.3% on the Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) in this population, and an anxiety rate of 13.1% on the Hopkins Symptom

Checklist (HSCL-A).

Literally related to this population are the mothers of Vietnamese Amerasians (MVA), who were studied by Leong and Johnson (1994). Of the subject population, only six percent had finished 12 years of school. The study involved administering the VDS, the HSCL-24, the CES-D, and the GHQ. Results were mixed, with a 9.6% clinical rate on the VDS, but a rate of 24.5% on the CES-D (CES-D rates for white Americans is 8.7%, and 17.4% for "another sample community"). On the GHQ, a clinical level of distress was found among 35% on subjects, whereas 24% of British females had clinical level scores. Among the clinical level group, income was found to be the most significant predictor of high CES-D and HSCL-D scores. Mothers who had spent more time at the PRPC were more likely to exhibit psychological distress. Interestingly, those with more education were more likely to experience distress.

Vietnamese immigrants have enthusiastically embraced their new country. Of those Vietnamese who have arrived in America, 47.6% have become citizens. Due to their complex and difficult experiences and situations, the Vietnamese population draws heavily upon public resources, as compared with the native-born population. While 3.9% of native-born Americans receive supplemental security income assistance, 19.6% of Vietnamese immigrants do. Foodstamps are used by 15.2% of Vietnamese immigrants, contrasted with use by 5.3% of those born in the U. S. Regarding Medicaid, 26.6% of Vietnamese utilize this resource, compared to 12.1% of the native population. Fully 31.1% of Vietnamese immigrants utilize some form of public assistance, contrasted with 13.3% for the native population. This is approximately 263,000 individuals, or roughly one person per hundred in the general population (CIS, 2001).

A number of instruments have been developed to address the need for understanding of the dynamics of this population, including the VDS, which began as a translation of the Beck scale for use in Oregon clinics. Cultural variation in expression of symptoms led to creation of a new 18-item protocol adapted specifically to be culturally sensitive to the Vietnamese population (Kinzie et al., 1982). Ngyuen et al. (1999) developed a scale for study of acculturation and adjustment using a two dimensional model (ASVA). The GHQ was developed by Goldberg in Britain (1979) and translated by Felsman et al. (1990). It is intended to serve in screening for physical and psychological distress (McKelvey et al., 1993). McKelvey et al. (1993) developed a 12-item Expectation Questionnaire for their study of premigratory expectations of Amerasian youth.

Gender

Gender is a basic differentiation among people, especially in traditional Asian cultures, where strictly proscribed gender roles predate 2,500 year-old "Confucian" writings. Kun-fu-tzu (551-479 B. C.) formalized a traditional approach, *Ju-chia*, which attempted to reflect social order under the legendary sage-kings of the Shang dynasty (c. twenty-third century B. C.) (Tu, 1998). Vietnamese social structures are heavily influenced by Chinese Confucian thought, as a result of centuries of political and commercial interaction, especially after assimilationist policies were instituted by governing Chinese in the early centuries of their rule (after 111 B. C.) (Huy, 1998). Individuals within this system are assigned strict roles and behavioral constraints based on family order, but most notably based on gender. The concept of "filial piety" is deeply rooted in the values and behavioral expectations of Vietnam, giving the oldest

male of a family absolute authority (Miller & Rasco, 2004, Huy, 1998).

In the neighboring Laotian culture, for example, the father is decision-maker and head of household, while the mother is responsible for budget and household maintenance. In their status as refugees, economic necessity often forces both husband and wife to work, yet frequently the wife knows more English than the husband, and may therefore be more employable. This causes stress as the traditional familial order is disturbed by the greater earning power of the woman (Gerber et. al., 1999).

Thus, life in a new cultural environment brings about changes in social structure and norms for families. Characteristically, women gain autonomy, while men lose authority. The sequelae of the changes may include insecurity, anxiety, and marital conflict (Eckblad et. al., 1994). Life in America has necessitated changes in gender roles for the Vietnamese, which have brought about stresses and conflicts. Women have entered the labor force, while men are sometimes under- or unemployed, which is a reversal of traditional roles. The loss of status for men outside their home, while that of their wives increases, is a source of frustration, with corresponding loss of traditional in-home status (Denmark, Eisenberg, Heitner, & Holder, 2003)

Pre- and postmigration stressors also differ by gender. It has been observed that women often experienced rape, violence, forced prostitution, and widowhood prior to or during their migration (Bemak et al., 2003). Rates of rape have been observed as high as 95% (Mollica, Lavelle, & Khuon, 1985, cited in Bemak, 2003). Graves (2003), in discussion of victims of sexual trauma and exploitation observes, "These victims... continue to experience the lingering effects of sexual trauma in the form of various psychological sequelae." Symptoms among the women he studied were similar in

severity to those of U. S. veterans of the Vietnam war with PTSD.

E. Current Situation of Refugees from Vietnam

Vietnam continues to produce a small stream of refugees who are fleeing Vietnam but are from different tribal and ethnic groups. For example, the Montagnards, an ethnic group from the central highlands, have fled religious and political persecution, and sought asylum in Cambodia. In 2002, United Nations High Commisioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and United States Committee for Refugees (USCR), having been blocked from supervision of repatriation in the Vietnam highlands, established two refugee camps and began relocation of Vietnam refugees in the U. S. That year, 791 Montagnards were admitted to the US, with 144 expected to have been admitted in 2003. In China, 295,000 Vietnamese refugees remain, primarily of ethnic Chinese descent. Roughly 1000 of those in Hong Kong have been granted citizenship, but the 294,000 on the Chinese mainland are still considered refugees and UNHCR provides assistance to those below poverty level (USCR, 2003). The psychosocial status of these populations, as well as their process of adaptation and assimilation, may differ from previous Vietnamese refugees in the U. S. As a result, continued studies are needed to provide insight into the dynamics and consequences of Vietnamese migration.

Vietnamese asylum seekers continue to enter the U. S. through a program called "Resettlement Opportunities for Vietnamese Returnees," in which those former refugees who returned to Vietnam are interviewed for resettlement in the United States. Forty-one entered the country under this program in 2002, and 26 cases remained open at that time. Residual cases from the Orderly Departure Program also continue to be processed.

In 2002, the United States admitted 326 Amerasians, 154 family members of previously admitted refugees, and 1,979 others, including Montagnards, former re-education camp detainees, and adult children of previously admitted refugees under that program (UNHCR, 2003).

F. Emerging Questions

The broader issue that must eventually be addressed is how to respond, on governmental and societal levels, to the demands of the burgeoning immigrant population in the United States and throughout the world. To facilitate this, the various immigrant populations must be studied in order to reach an understanding of the actualities of their situations and their needs, and of the effects of their presence upon preexisting populations (Martin, 1994). The examination of this data can become another piece in the puzzle in understanding the process of human migration and management of public resources on a global level, a puzzle that must be assembled one piece at a time.

The Vietnamese population in particular has been very difficult to study because of the historical factors leading to their migration. Most notably, they experience an extreme distrust of investigators, which arises from the translation of the term to *khao sat vien chinh*, a term which is linked to the secret police of Vietnam, and who are perceived to be corrupt officials thriving on exploitation of the population (Yu, 1985).

This study and the analyses that will constitute the thesis will address the Vietnamese population in Hawai'i. This population is currently virtually absent from published research. As a multi-ethnic, culturally-accepting island population composed

almost exclusively of one-time newcomers, the dynamics of life in Hawai'i are undoubtedly very different from those of ethnically more homogenous areas (Liebkind, 1996; Nguyen et al., 1999). Census research has shown Hawai'i to be one of the most ethnically diverse places on the planet, with some 249 ethnic and racial groups represented in the population (Tolbert, 2003). Study of psychological epidemiology, stress levels and acculturation may yield a significantly different picture from what has been observed in other localities.

To contribute to the small but growing pool of data on this subject, this study attempts to describe the conditions of Vietnamese refugees and immigrants living in Hawai'i in 1998, the time at which the instruments were administered. The participants (N = 91) are described in terms of demography, ethnic identity, life satisfaction, traumatic history, and HSCL symptomatology. Although the sample size is not large, this is typical of published studies on the subject (Carlson & Rosser-Hagan, 1993), due to a variety of issues in recruitment, and perhaps more importantly, in eliciting response from subjects about events that are difficult or unpleasant for them to recall and discuss for a myriad of psychological and sociocultural reasons (Mollica & Lavelle, 1988).

G. Research Objectives

The present study developed from a growing concern for understanding the dynamics and consequences of Vietnamese refugee resettlement in Hawai'i. As discussed in the preceding pages, it is clear that refugee adaptation and adjustment constitutes a major challenge for both the Vietnamese immigrants and for their host cultures. The contrasts in the two cultures as well as the circumstances under which the

Vietnamese were forced to migrate constitute serious stressors for individuals, families, and community groups. In the interest of providing improved services that are relevant and meaningful to Vietnamese refugees, it is essential that efforts be made to assess and evaluate variables that moderate the adaptation and adjustment process. In the present study, emphasis was placed on comparing life satisfaction and health and well being in Vietnam and in Hawai'i. In addition, the study sought to explore ethnic identity and traditional value dynamics. The specific research questions addressed in the present study are:

1. What were the life satisfaction ratings in Hawai'i of Vietnamese immigrants at the time of the study (i.e., 1997)?

2. What were the perceptions of Vietnam life satisfaction ratings for a sample of Vietnamese immigrants living in Hawai'i prior to and after their immigration?

3. What is the ethnic identity of a sample of Vietnamese immigrants living in Hawai'i ?

4. To what degree does a sample of Vietnamese immigrants living in Hawai'i subscribe to traditional Vietnamese values?

5. What is the frequency of traumatic events experienced by a sample of Vietnamese immigrants living in Hawai'i preceding their departure from Vietnam as assessed by the Life Events Questionnaire?

6. What is the well-being status of a sample of Vietnamese migrants living in Hawai'i?

7. What are the psychological symptom means and frequencies of a sample of Vietnamese immigrants living in Hawai'i?

8. Are there significant gender variations in these variables?

9. Are there significant variances of scores between those reported for Vietnam and America?

10. What are the relations (i.e., correlations) among the different study instruments?

11. To what extent can scale results be used as constants to predict the different health and psychosocial scale results observed in the host community using a step-wise regression prediction equation model (i.e., $Y = A + Bx$)?

CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

A. Participants (Ps)

The sample for this study was immigrant and refugee natives of Vietnam residing on the island of O'ahu in Hawai'i. The participants were located through the efforts of immigrant centers and Vietnamese community organizations. Recruitment was on a voluntary basis. Participation was enthusiastic, participants expressing that they considered the project to be important for their welfare and well-being. Of the participants (N = 91), 52 were female and 39 were male. The small number of respondents is typical of studies of Southeast Asian immigrant populations (Lim & Levenson, 1999; Yu, 1985). A description of the sample's demographic parameters is presented in Tables 1 and 2:

Table 1. Demographics of participants

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	**Male**	39	42.9
	Female	52	57.1
	Total	91	100.0
Place of birth	**Vietnam**	91	100.0
Mother's Ethnicity	**Vietnamese**	83	91.2
	Chinese	2	2.2
	No response	3	3.3
Father's Ethnicity	**Vietnamese**	78	85.7
	Chinese	2	2.2
	Indian	1	1.1
	American	1	1.1
	Japanese	1	1.1
	No response	6	6.6

Table 2. Age and date of arrival of Ps

	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Age	32.38	27.00	28	16.62	13	83
Year of arrival	1987.16	1990.00	1991	6.198	67	94

As Table 1 indicates, the participant sample consisted of 91 individuals. Thirty-nine of the participants were male, and fifty-two were female. Ages of participants at the time of administration ranged from 23 to 83 (see Table 2). All were born in Vietnam. Year of arrival in the United States ranged from 1965 to 1994, with the mean year being 1987 and the median year being 1990 (see Table 2). Responses to maternal ethnicity included three unknown, 83 Vietnamese, two Chinese, and three with no response. Responses to paternal ethnicity included one unknown, 78 Vietnamese, two Chinese, one Indian, one American, one Japanese, and six with no response (see Table 1).

B. Instruments

The study participants (Ps) were asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire and six self-report instruments designed to assess the dynamics and consequences of adaptation and adjustment in Hawai'i, including the following: Life Satisfaction Scale (LSAT), Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire (VEIQ), Traditional Values Assessment Survey (TVAS), Life Events Questionnaire (LEQ), Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist (VWBC-Am and VWBC-V), and the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24 (HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V). Table 3 provides a description

of the various instruments used in the study. Table 4 summarizes the abbreviations for each instrument in context of time period being reported (e. g. Vietnam residency or Hawai'i residency).

Table 3. Study assessment instruments

Instrument	Description
1. Demographic Data	Questionnaire is composed of 20 items relating to age, gender, language, religion, education and occupation. (Appendix A)
2. Life Satisfaction Scale	Self-report questionnaire composed of 21 items matching those in the US scale. These items relate to living conditions, living skills, outlook, health, political perspective and relationships. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale from "extremely satisfied" to "not at all satisfied," with an additional choice for "not applicable." (Appendix C)
3. Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire	Composed of a 21 items list of activities and behaviors associated with the Vietnamese ethnocultural tradition. These items include food, clothing, Vietnamese language, publications and cultural activities. Each item is rated on a 4-point Likert scale for frequency of participation from "very much" to "none." (Appendix D)
4. Traditional Values Assessment Survey	Composed of 10 items associated with moral values of the Vietnamese ethnocultural tradition. Items include social and familial relationship patterns, and philosophical attitudes. Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." (Appendix E)
5. Life Events Questionnaire	Self-report questionnaire composed of 57 items regarding the actual occurrence of a range of traumatic events in the subject's life experience. Each item is rated "Yes, it has occurred," "no, it has not occurred," or "unknown, not sure if the incident has occurred." An adjoining space is filled in with the number of times the event occurred. (Appendix G)
6. Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist	Self-report questionnaire composed of 31 items indicative of psychopathology or illness. Each item is rated on a 4-point Likert scale "not at all" to "extremely." (Appendix H)
7. Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24	Self-report questionnaire composed of 24 items adapted for use in a clinic serving Southeast Asian refugees in the Boston area by Westermeyer et al. in 1983. It is included in an attempt to ascertain the actual epidemiological prevalence of symptoms. Hopkins Symptom Checklist for diagnostic use in an Oregon health clinic. It has also been tested for validity and reliability by Mollica, et al., 1987. Symptoms are rated on a scale of one ("not at all") to four ("always"). (Appendix I)

Table 4. Instrument abbreviations

Instrument	Vietnam Recollection	Status in Hawai'i
Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire	(not applicable)	VEIQ
Traditional Values Assessment Survey	(not applicable)	TVAS
Life Events Questionnaire	(not applicable)	LEQ
Life Satisfaction Scale	LSAT-V	LSAT-A
Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist	VWBC-V	VWBC-A
Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24	HSCL-24-V	HSCL-24-A

The multiple instruments are intended to assess the broadest possible range of symptoms and life conditions, without relying upon conventional Western instruments that may be inconsistent with Vietnamese cultural idioms and understandings of mental disorder. Further, the differing approaches of the instruments allow cross-checking of results between instruments, including the HSCL, which has been shown to be a valid instrument for Southeast Asians (Westermeyer et al., 1983) and potentially other Indochinese immigrant populations. Use of multiple instruments and strategies has been recommended as the best way to understand the psychological distress process in this population (Leong & Johnson, 1994).

Inclusion of the Vietnamese ethnic identity instrument is crucial to an understanding of how the participants perceive themselves as individuals, whether they actually identify themselves as Vietnamese and continue to participate in typical Vietnamese traditions currently in this new cultural milieu, or have adopted new identities and behaviors of the host culture (Marsella, 1994, 2000). "It is not whether a person is Japanese or Swedish, it is how much they are Japanese or Swedish that determines their culture" (Marsella , Dubanoski, Hamada, & Morse, 2000). Adherence

to or changes from perception of self as Vietnamese may constitute a significant and fascinating factor in the immigration experience.

Instrument Development

The Demographic Data, Life Satisfaction Scale, US; Life Satisfaction Scale, Vietnam; Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire; Traditional Values Assessment Survey; Life Events Questionnaire, Frequency; Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist instruments were developed and pre-tested by Nancy Butler and Duc Truong (psychology students of Vietnamese ancestry) and Anthony Marsella (Professor, Department of Psychology). Interviews were conducted by Butler and Truong with Vietnamese community members and leaders to establish agreement upon items of relevance to the Vietnamese ethnic tradition for the VIEQ and TVAS scales. These materials were then translated by Butler and Truong, themselves Vietnamese immigrants and bilingual speakers, and were then subjected to back-translation procedures using other bilingual Vietnamese speakers. After several iterations, a final corrected translation was obtained that met criteria for definition and meaning. The HSCL-24, which was adapted for use with Vietnamese by Westermeyer et al. in 1983, was accepted as previously translated.

C. Procedures

Initially, participants were presented with a consent form, and encouraged to ask any questions. After consenting to participation, the participants were then asked to sign the consent form and to complete the demographic information form and questionnaires.

For the Life Satisfaction Scale, Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist and Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24, two copies of each were administered. Participants were instructed to respond to one copy with their current status information (LSAT-A, VWBC-A, and HSCL-24-A), and to the other with their recollection of their status information during their time in Vietnam (LSAT-V, VWBC-V, and HSCL-24-V).

D. Data Analysis

The previously collected data points were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis. Mean scores were calculated for each item and each scale. Twelve one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were employed to determine statistical significance for the relationship between gender of participant and each of the following scales: Life Satisfaction Scale, US; Life Satisfaction Scale, Vietnam; Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire; Traditional Values Assessment Survey; Life Events Questionnaire, Frequency; Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist, US; Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist, Vietnam; Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24, US; and Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24, Vietnam. To protect against multicolinearity and multiple ANOVA comparisons, statistical significance levels were set at $p < .01$ for a result to be accepted as significant.

CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

A. Means by scale

Mean scores and standard deviations for all scales are displayed in Table 5.

LSAT-V

The mean Life Satisfaction score for all the Ps' recollection of their lives in Vietnam was 3.4 (SD = 0.56), within the "moderately satisfied" range on a Likert scale from one ("extremely satisfied") to five ("not at all satisfied").

LSAT-A

The mean Life Satisfaction Scale score for all the Ps' lives in the US was 2.93 (SD = 0.46), within the "moderately satisfied" range.

VEIQ

The mean VEIQ score was 1.99 (SD = 0.43), indicating "sometimes" on a 4-point Likert scale for frequency of participation from one ("very much") to four ("none").

TVAS

The mean Traditional Values Assessment Survey score for all the Ps was 1.72 (SD = 0.41), indicating "agree" on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

LEQ

The mean frequency of LEQ occurrences for all the Ps was 14.56 (SD = 11.36), on a scale rated from zero ("No, it has not occurred," or "Unknown, not sure if the incident has occurred"), or one ("Yes, it has occurred") to an itemized number of times the event occurred.

VWBC-V

The mean VWBC-V score for all the Ps was 1.55 (SD = 0.52), indicating "a little" on a 4-point Likert scale "not at all" to "extremely."

VWBC-A

The mean VWBC-A score for all the Ps was 1.81 (SD = 0.51) indicating "a little."

HSCL-24-V

The mean HSCL-24-V score for all the Ps was 1.55 (SD = 0.51), indicating "a little" on a scale of one ("not at all") to four ("always"). In frequency, 63 Ps were below the 1.75 symptom cut-off, and 28 were above (see Appendix O, Table 42).

HSCL-24-A

The mean Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-A score for participants was 1.68 (SD = 0.49), indicating "a little." In frequency, 54 Ps were below the 1.75 symptom cut-off, and 37 were above (see Appendix P, Table 44).

Table 5. Aggregate Scores of Assessment Instruments

Scale Name	Mean	Standard Deviation
VEIQ	2.00	.43
TVAS	1.72	.41
LEQ	14.56	11.36
LSAT-V	3.82	.77
LSAT-A	3.44	.60
VWBC-V	1.56	.53
VWBC-A	1.81	.51
HSCL-24-V	1.55	.51
HSCL-24-A	1.68	.49

B. Analysis of Variance by Gender

LSAT-V

As Table 6 indicates, the mean Life Satisfaction score for all the Ps' recollection of their lives in Vietnam was 3.4 (SD = 0.56) on a Likert scale from one ("extremely satisfied") to five ("not at all satisfied"). For males, the mean Life Satisfaction score was 3.51 (SD = 0.59), within the "a little satisfied" range. For females, it was 3.31 (SD = 0.56), within the "moderately satisfied" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Tables 6 and 7).

Table 6. LSAT-V with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	3.52	.59	.09
Female	52	3.31	.55	.08
Total	91	3.40	.58	.06

Table 7. LSAT-V with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.97	1	.97	2.98	.09
Within Groups	28.87	89	.32		
Total	29.83	90			

LSAT-A

As Table 8 indicates, the mean Life Satisfaction Scale score for all the Ps' lives in the US was 2.93 (SD = 0.46) on a Likert scale from one ("extremely satisfied") to five ("not at all satisfied"). The Life Satisfaction scale score for males was 2.85 (SD = 0.46), and for females it was 2.99 (SD = 0.44), both within the "moderately satisfied" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Tables 8 and 9).

Table 8. LSAT-A with gender: means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	2.85	.46	.074
Female	52	2.99	.44	.062
Total	91	2.94	.46	.05

Table 9. LSAT-A with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.40	1	.40	1.97	.164
Within Groups	18.24	89	.21		
Total	18.65	90			

VEIQ

As Table 10 indicates, the mean Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire score for all the Ps was 1.99 (SD = 0.43) on a 4-point Likert scale for frequency of participation from one ("very much") to four ("none"). For males, the mean VEIQ score was 1.93 (SD = 0.44), and for females, it was 2.05 (SD = 0.42), both within the "sometimes" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Tables 10 and 11).

Table 10. VEIQ with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	1.93	.44	.07
Female	52	2.05	.42	.06
Total	91	2.00	.43	.05

Table 11. VEIQ with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.32	1	.32	1.69	.20
Within Groups	16.56	89	.19		
Total	16.87	90			

TVAS

As Table 12 indicates, the mean Traditional Values Assessment Survey score for all the Ps was 1.72 (SD = 0.41) on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to

"strongly disagree." For males, the mean was 1.65 (SD = 0.49), and for females, it was 1.77 (SD = 0.32), both within the "sometimes" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Tables 12 and 13).

Table 12. TVAS with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	1.65	.49	.08
Female	52	1.77	.32	.04
Total	91	1.72	.41	.04

Table 13. TVAS with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.30	1	.30	1.85	.18
Within Groups	14.53	89	.16		
Total	14.83	90			

LEQ

In analysis of the Life Events Questionnaire, the mean frequency of events for all the Ps was 14.56 (SD = 11.36), on a scale rated from zero ("No, it has not occurred," or "Unknown, not sure if the incident has occurred"), or one ("Yes, it has occurred") to an itemized number of times the event occurred, as indicated in Table 14. For males, the mean frequency was 13.68 total events (SD = 9.99), and for females, it was 15.22 (SD = 12.34). A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences

between the genders ($F(1,89) = 1.85, p = .18$), as shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14. LEQ with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	13.68	9.99	1.60
Female	52	15.22	12.34	1.71
Total	91	14.56	11.36	1.19

Table 15. LEQ with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.01	1	.01	.18	.68
Within Groups	3.53	89	.04		
Total	3.54	90			

VWBC-V

In analysis of the Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist Vietnam, the mean well-being score for all the Ps was 1.55 (SD = 0.52) on a 4-point Likert scale "not at all" to "extremely," as indicated in Table 16. For males, the mean score was 1.57 (SD = 0.60), and for females, it was 1.54 (SD = 0.47), both within the "a little" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Table 16 and 17).

Table 16. VWBC-V with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	1.57	.6	.20
Female	52	1.55	.47	.06
Total	91	1.56	.52	.06

Table 17. VWBC-V with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.02	1	.02	.06	.82
Within Groups	24.84	89	.28		
Total	24.85	90			

VWBC-A

In analysis of the Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist America, the mean score for all the Ps was 1.81 (SD = 0.51) on a 4-point Likert scale "not at all" to "extremely," as indicated in Table 18. For males, the mean frequency was 1.69 (SD = 0.41), and for females, it was 1.90 (SD = 0.56), both within the "a little" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Table 18 and 19).

Table 18. VWBC-A with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	1.69	.41	.07
Female	52	1.90	.56	.08
Total	91	1.81	.51	.05

Table 19. VWBC-A with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.94	1	.94	3.73	.06
Within Groups	22.40	89	.25		
Total	23.34	90			

HSCL-24-V

As Table 20 indicates, the mean Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24 Vietnam score for all the Ps was 1.55 (SD = 0.51), on a scale of one (" not at all") to four ("always"). For males it was 1.51 (SD = 0.51), and for females, it was 1.58 (SD = 0.51), both within the "a little" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Table 20 and 21).

Table 20. HSCL-24-V with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	1.51	.51	.08
Female	52	1.58	.51	.07
Total	91	1.55	.51	.05

Table 21. HSCL-24-V with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.10	1	.10	.39	.53
Within Groups	23.10	89	.26		
Total	23.21	90			

HSCL-24-A

As Table 22 indicates, the mean Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24 America score for participants was 1.68 (SD = 0.49), on a scale of one (" not at all") to four ("always"). For males, the mean was 1.58 (SD = 0.39), and for females, it was 1.76 (SD = 0.55) both within the "a little" range. A one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Table 22 and 23).

Table 22. HSCL-24-A with Gender: Means

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error
Male	39	1.58	.39	.06
Female	52	1.76	.55	.07
Total	91	1.68	.49	.05

Table 23. HSCL-24-A with Gender: Analysis of Variance

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.69	1	.69	2.89	.09
Within Groups	21.14	89	.24		
Total	21.829	90			

C. Comparison Between Vietnam and America Scales

VWBC-V and VWBC-A ANOVA

A one-way ANOVA between the VWBC-V and VWBC-A scales reveals a statistically significant difference between the two scales ($F(39, 51) = 3.46$, $p = .00$), as shown in Table 24.

Table 24. Analysis of Variance between VWBC-V and VWBC-A

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	10390.69	39	266.42	3.46	.00
Within Groups	3925.28	51	76.97		
Total	14315.97	90			

HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V ANOVA

A one-way ANOVA between the HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V scales reveals no statistically significant difference between the two scales ($F(47, 43) = 1.23$, $p = .25$), as shown in Table 25.

Table 25. Analysis of Variance between HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6594.56	40	164.86	1.38	.14
Within Groups	5979.22	50	119.58		
Total	12573.78	90			

LSAT-A and LSAT-V Anova

A one-way ANOVA between the LSAT-A and LSAT-V scales reveals no statistically significant difference between the two scales ($F(47, 43) = 1.23, p = .25$). (See Table 26).

Table 26. Analysis of Variance between LSAT-A and LSAT-V

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8080.43	47	171.92	1.23	.25
Within Groups	6021.17	43	140.03		
Total	14101.60	90			

HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V Chi-square Test of Independence

Scores were recoded to "0" for those Ps below diagnostic criterion, and "1" for those above the cut-off. The scales were then analyzed using a chi-square test of independence to determine significance of difference between the expected and observed

number of Ps in the HSCL-24-V and HSCL-24-A scales who were above the 1.75 diagnostic cut-off level. A difference was observed which was significant at $p < .01$ (See Table 28). On the HSCL-24-V, 63 Ps scored below the 1.75 diagnostic cut-off, and 28 scored above the cut-off. On the HSCL-24-A, 54 scored below the 1.75 cut-off, and 37 scored above the cut-off, as indicated in Table 27. This constitutes a 37% increase in the number of Ps above diagnostic criterion.

Table 27. Crosstabulation Count

		HSCLV		Total
		.00	1.00	
HSCLA	.00	45	9	54
	1.00	18	19	37
Total		63	28	91

Table 28. Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.40	1	.00
Likelihood Ratio	12.41	1	.00
Linear-by-Linear Association	12.26	1	.00
N of Valid Cases	91		

a. Computed only for a 2x2 table
b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.38.

D. Correlation Table

Table 29 displays the results of all scales across all other scales using a Pearson Product Moment (SPSS, 2003). As Table 29 indicates, there were ten correlations that

were significant at the $p < .01$ level. Since it was possible to have 34 correlations, this shows that 29% of those correlations were statistically significant.

The scales that showed correlations across other scales were for the VWBC-V, VWBC-A, HSCL-24-V, VEIQ, and TVAS scales. The scale that had the most correlations across measures was the VWBC-V scale, which had significant correlation with four other measures: VWBC-A ($r = .35$, $p < .01$), HSCL-24-A ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), HSCL-24-V ($r = .81$, $p < .01$) and LEQ ($r = .43$, $p < .01$). The VWBC-A scale correlated with three scales: VWBC-V ($r = .35$, $p < .01$), HSCL-24-V ($r = .31$, $p < .01$), and HSCL-24-A ($r = .81$, $p < .01$). The HSCL-24-A had significant correlation with the VWBC-V ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), VWBC-A ($r = .81$, $p < .01$), and HSCL-24-V ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) scales. The HSCL-24-V also had significant correlation with two scales: HSCL-24-A ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and LEQ ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). LEQ had significant correlation with two scales: HSCL-24-V ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and VWBC-V ($r = .43$, $p < .01$). Two scales had significant correlation only with each other: VEIQ with TVAS ($r = .34$, $p < .01$).

Life satisfaction in Vietnam had no significant correlations across the other measures. The LSAT-V correlated somewhat with the LSAT-A and LEQ scales ($r = .21$, $p = .04$), though not satisfying the adjusted $p < .01$ criterion. Life satisfaction in America also had no significant correlations across the other measures. The LSAT-A correlated somewhat with the LSAT-V, VEIQ and TVAS scales, though not satisfying the adjusted $p < .01$ criterion.

Table 29. Correlation Matrix of Study Scales and Two Tailed Significance Tests

		LSAT A	LSAT V	VEIQ	TVAS	VWBC V	VWBC A	HSCL V	HSCL A	LEQ
LSAT-A	**Correlation**	1	.21	.25	.23	-.08	-.02	-.08	.05	.00
	Sig.	.	*.04	*.02	*.03	.44	.84	.46	.64	.97
LSAT-V	**Correlation**	.21	1	.08	.12	.01	-.19	-.05	-.21	-.21
	Sig.	*.04	.	.43	.26	.92	.08	.66	*.05	*.04
VEIQ	**Correlation**	.25	.08	1	.34	-.00	.09	-.03	-.02	.13
	Sig.	*.02	.43	.	**.00	.98	.41	.76	.82	.22
TVAS	**Correlation**	.23	.12	.34	1	.09	-.07	.09	-.04	.17
	Sig.	*.03	.26	**.00	.	.39	.52	.39	.69	.11
VWBC-V	**Correlation**	-.08	.01	-.00	.09	1	.35	.81	.32	.43
	Sig.	.44	.92	.97	.39	.	**.00	**.00	**.00	**.00
VWBC –A	**Correlation**	-.02	-.18	.09	-.07	.35	1	.31	.81	.15
	Sig.	.84	.08	.40	.52	**.00	.	**.00	**.00	.14
HSCL-24-V	**Correlation**	-.08	-.05	-.03	.09	.82	.31	1	.38	.38
	Sig.	.46	.66	.76	.39	**.00	**.00	.	**.00	**.00
HSCL-24-A	**Correlation**	.05	-.2	-.02	-.04	.32	.81	.38	1	.18
	Sig.	.64	*.05	.82	.69	**.00	**.00	**.00	.	.09
LEQ	**Correlation**	.00	-.21	.13	.17	.43	.15	.38	.18	1
	Sig.	.97	*.04	.22	.11	**.00	.15	**.00	.09	.

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

E. Linear Regression Analysis

To determine the extent to which the several scale results can be used as constants to predict specific scale outcome results in Hawai'i, three Linear Regression Models were analyzed, using the VWBC-A, HSCL-24-A, and LSAT-A scales as dependent variables. The VWBC-A and HSCL-24-A scales showed significance at the $p < .05$ level, but when the significance criterion was adjusted to $p < .01$, the equations were not significant.

VWBC-A

A Linear Model was created using the results of the VWBC-A scale as the dependent variable, and the HSCL-24-A, HSCL-24-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ, and LSAT-V scale results as predictor variables. In analysis of the relation of the VWBC-A to the other scales as the product of the linear model, a significant relationship was observed at the $p < .05$ level. Results of the step-wise analysis are displayed in Tables 30 and 31.

For the complete model, as well as subsequent regressed equations, the adjusted R Square value was .68, explaining 68% of the observed variance. In Analysis of Variance, all models showed significance at $p < .01$, with F ratio for the complete model at $F(8,82) = 24.42$. For Model 2, elimination of the LSAT-V predictor resulted in $F(7,83) = 28.23$. In Model 3, elimination of the LSAT-V and LEQ predictors resulted in $F(6,84) = 33.10$. For Model 4, elimination of the LSAT-V, LEQ, and TVAS predictors resulted in $F(5,85) = 39.34$. The final regression, with only the HSCL-24-A, HSCL-24-V, VEIQ, and VWBC-V predictors remaining, resulted in $F(4,86) = 48.11$ (See Tables 30 and 31).

Table 30. Model Summary for VWBC-A Linear Regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.84	.70	.68	.30	.70	24.42	8	82	.00
2	.84	.70	.68	.29	.00	.04	1	84	.84
3	.84	.70	.68	.29	-.00	.41	1	85	.52
4	.84	.70	.68	.29	-.00	1.26	1	86	.27
5	.83	.69	.68	.29	-.01	2.01	1	87	.16

1 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ, LSAT-V
2 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ
3 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS
4 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A
5 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V

Table 31. ANOVA for Linear Regression of VWBC-A

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.43	8	2.06	24.42	.00
	Residual	6.90	82	.084		
	Total	23.34	90			
2	Regression	16.43	7	2.35	28.23	.00
	Residual	6.90	83	.083		
	Total	23.34	90			
3	Regression	16.40	6	2.73	33.10	.00
	Residual	6.94	84	.083		
	Total	23.34	90			
4	Regression	16.30	5	3.26	39.34	.00
	Residual	7.04	85	.083		
	Total	23.34	90			
5	Regression	16.13	4	4.03	48.11	.00
	Residual	7.21	86	.084		
	Total	23.34	90			

1 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ, LSAT-V
2 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ
3 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS
4 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A
5 Predictors: (Constant), HSCL-A, HSCL-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V
6 Dependent Variable: VWBC-A

HSCL-A

A Linear Model was created using the results of the HSCL-A scale as the dependent variable, and the VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-24-V, VEIQ, LSAT-A, LSAT-V, LEQ, and TVAS scale results as predictor variables. In analysis of the relation of the VWBC-A to the other scales as the product of the linear model, a significant relationship was observed at the $p < .05$ level. Results of the step-wise analysis are displayed in Tables 32 and 33.

For the complete model, as well as regressed models 2, 5, and 6, the adjusted R Square value was .68. For models 3 and 4, the adjusted R Square value was .69 (See Table 30). In Analysis of Variance, all models showed significance at $p < .01$. The F ratio for the complete model was $F(8,82) = 24.82$. For Model 2, elimination of the TVAS predictor resulted in $F(7,83) = 28.61$. In Model 3, elimination of the TVAS and LEQ predictors resulted in $F(6,84) = 33.67$. For Model 4, elimination of the TVAS, LEQ, and LSAT-V predictors resulted in $F(5,85) = 40.22$. For Model 5, elimination of the TVAS, LEQ, LSAT-V, and VEIQ predictors resulted in $F(5,85) = 48.61$. The final regression, with only the VWBC-A, VWBC-V, and HSCL-24-V predictors remaining, resulted in $F(3,87) = 63.39$ (See Tables 30 and 31).

Table 32. Model Summary for HSCL-24-A Linear Regression

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.84	.71	.68	.28	.71	24.82	8	82	.00
2	.84	.71	.68	.28	-.00	.20	1	84	.65
3	.84	.71	.69	.28	-.00	.18	1	85	.67
4	.84	.70	.69	.28	-.00	.98	1	86	.32
5	.83	.69	.68	.28	-.01	2.74	1	87	.10
6	.83	.69	.68	.28	-.01	2.03	1	88	.16

1 Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-V, VEIQ, LSAT-A, LSAT-V, LEQ, TVAS
2 Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-V, VEIQ, LSAT-A, LSAT-V, LEQ
3 Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-V, VEIQ, LSAT-A, LSAT-V
4 Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-V, VEIQ, LSAT-A
5 Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-V, VEIQ
6 Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-V

Table 33. ANOVA for Linear Regression of HSCL-24-A

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	15.45	8	1.93	24.82	.00
	Residual	6.38	82	.08		
	Total	21.83	90			
2	Regression	15.43	7	2.21	28.61	.00
	Residual	6.40	83	.08		
	Total	21.83	90			
3	Regression	15.42	6	2.57	33.67	.00
	Residual	6.41	84	.08		
	Total	21.83	90			
4	Regression	15.34	5	3.07	40.22	.00
	Residual	6.49	85	.08		
	Total	21.83	90			
5	Regression	15.14	4	3.78	48.61	.00
	Residual	6.70	86	.08		
	Total	21.83	90			
6	Regression	14.98	3	4.99	63.39	.00
	Residual	6.85	87	.08		
	Total	21.83	90			

a Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, LSAT-A-, LEQ, VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-V, TVAS-, VWBC-V
b Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, LSAT-A, LEQ, VEIQ-, LSAT-V, HSCL-V, VWBC-V
c Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, LSAT-A, VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-V, VWBC-V
d Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, LSAT-A, VEIQ, HSCL-V, VWBC-V
e Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, VEIQ, HSCL-V, VWBC-V
f Predictors: (Constant), VWBC-A, HSCL-V, VWBC-V
g Dependent Variable: HSCL-A

LSAT-A

A Linear Model was created using the results of the LSAT-A scale as the dependent variable, and the VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-24-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-24-V, LEQ, and VWBC-V scale results as predictor variables. Results of the step-wise analysis are displayed in Tables 34 and 35.

In analysis of the relation of the VWBC-A to the other scales as the product of the linear model, the complete model resulted in an adjusted R Square value of .08. Significance for the complete model was $p = .05$ ($F(8,82) = 2.04$), which does not meet the adjusted criterion for significance of $p < .01$. Model 2, after removal of VWBC-V as a predictor, had an adjusted R square value of .09, and a significance level of $p = .03$ ($F(7,83) = 2.33$). Model 3, after removal of VWBC-V and LEQ as a predictors, had an adjusted R square value of .10, and a significance level of $p = .02$ ($F(6,84) = 2.61$). Model 4, after removal of VWBC-V, LEQ, and HSCL-24-V as predictors, had an adjusted R square value of .09, and a significance level of $p = .02$ ($F(5,85) = 2.82$). Model 5, after removal of VWBC-V, LEQ, HSCL-24-V, and TVAS as predictors, had an adjusted R square value of .09, and a significance level of $p = .02$ ($F(4,86) = 3.16$). Model 6, after removal of VWBC-V, LEQ, HSCL-24-V, TVAS, and VWBC-A as predictors, had an adjusted R square value of .08, and a significance level of $p = .02$ ($F(3,87) = 3.49$). The seventh regression, with only the VEIQ and LSAT-V predictors remaining, also resulted in an adjusted R Square value (2,88) of .08. Significance for that model was $p = .01$ ($F(2,88) = 4.78$) (see Tables 34 and 35).

Table 34. Model Summary for LSAT-A linear regression

	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
Model					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.41	.17	.08	.57	.17	2.04	8	82	.05
2	.41	.16	.09	.57	-.00	.15	1	84	.70
3	.40	.16	.10	.57	-.01	.73	1	85	.40
4	.38	.14	.09	.57	-.02	1.45	1	86	.23
5	.36	.13	.09	.57	-.01	1.41	1	87	.24
6	.33	.10	.08	.57	-.02	2.05	1	88	.16
7	.31	.10	.08	.57	-.01	.91	1	89	.34

1 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-V, LEQ, VWBC-V
2 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-V, LEQ
3 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-V
4 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS
5 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A
6 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A
7 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V

Table 35. ANOVA for Linear Regression of LSAT-A

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5.30	8	.66	2.04	.05
	Residual	26.67	82	.33		
	Total	31.98	90			
2	Regression	5.25	7	.75	2.33	.03
	Residual	26.72	83	.32		
	Total	31.98	90			
3	Regression	5.02	6	.84	2.61	.02
	Residual	26.96	84	.32		
	Total	31.98	90			
4	Regression	4.55	5	.91	2.82	.02
	Residual	27.42	85	.32		
	Total	31.98	90			
5	Regression	4.10	4	1.02	3.16	.02
	Residual	27.88	86	.32		
	Total	31.98	90			
6	Regression	3.43	3	1.14	3.49	.02
	Residual	28.54	87	.33		
	Total	31.98	90			
7	Regression	3.13	2	1.57	4.78	.01
	Residual	28.84	88	.33		
	Total	31.98	90			

1 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-V, LEQ, VWBC-V
2 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-V, LEQ
3 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-V
4 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A, TVAS
5 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A, VWBC-A
6 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-A
7 Predictors: (Constant), VEIQ, LSAT-V
8 Dependent Variable: LSAT-A

CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

A. Demographics

Given the greater number of females and younger people in the sample population and the preponderance of 1990s arrivals, the sample probably does not represent the diversity of the Vietnamese community in America or in Hawai'i as described in historical and demographic literature. The arrival date frequencies may be affected by the subsequent relocation of many Vietnamese who arrived in the preceding decades, and by the fact that the immigration centers that provided some Ps services typically serve their clients for only a few years after arrival.

It is notable, in consideration of traumatic experience, that those individuals who entered the United States during and after the Orderly Departure Program that started in 1992 had endured life either under communist rule or in Thai refugee camps for approximately two decades beginning with the fall of Saigon in 1975.

B. Scale Analyses

Life Satisfaction in Vietnam

The mean Life Satisfaction Scale score for all the Ps' lives in Vietnam was the scale degree signifying "moderately satisfied." The fact that mean score is only slightly higher than the midpoint of the scale may be the result of the tendency of Asians to choose responses near the middle of any scale (e. g. Marsella, 2000); however, the score is slightly beyond the midpoint toward the "dissatisfied" direction of the scale. An even-

numbered set of choices may prompt a more decisive choice.

It is possible that the world-view of the Ps encourages a moderate attitude toward life. Moderation is certainly a component of both Buddhist and Confucian thought. It may be that moderation has been perceived culturally as a means toward resiliency. Whether events and experiences are good or bad, the person who stays balanced may be best equipped for survival.

Life Satisfaction in Hawai'i

The mean Life Satisfaction Scale score for all the Ps' lives in Hawai'i falls at the same scale degree denoting "moderately satisfied" observed for the Vietnam scale. The score showed slight improvement from the score in Vietnam, suggesting a potential that the Ps feel their lives in Hawai'i are more satisfying than they were in Vietnam. The score may also reflect the Asian tendency toward central answers, as well as the religious factors mentioned above.

Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire

The mean Vietnamese Ethnic Identity Questionnaire score for all the Ps fell at the degree indicating "somewhat" (see Table 10). Though "somewhat" sounds less than strong as an endorsement, the mean score was very close to the "very much" end of the scale. Especially considering the tendency toward moderate answers mentioned above, this result suggests that the Ps, and perhaps the population from which they were drawn, strongly endorse frequent participation in the activities and behaviors identified their ethnic group.

If one takes a walk through Honolulu's Chinatown, it is immediately apparent that the Vietnamese there are speaking Vietnamese, shopping in stores with signage in Vietnamese, and attending events for which advertising is in Vietnamese. This robust participation is most likely due, at least in part, to the greater ease of speaking their native language. Further, the events, the store items, and the conversations are familiar in form and content. This brings up an interesting question about whether the scores would be significantly different in an area without such a concentrated Vietnamese community. Would people continue to identify so strongly without such abundant reinforcement?

Traditional Values Assessment Survey

The mean Traditional Values Assessment Survey score for all the Ps fell within the range indicating "agree" (see Table 12). Since the mean score was so close to the "strongly agree" end of the scale, this result suggest that the Ps, and perhaps the population from which they were drawn, strongly subscribe to traditional ethnic values. In fact, the values at the first standard deviation would be 0.16 and 2.214, with a standard error of .08. This places the sample largely in either "strongly agree" or "agree" ranges, so only a small percentage of Ps could fall past the point of "disagree." For an Asian sample, this is a profoundly enthusiastic endorsement of their native values.

Thus, as represented by this sample, the Vietnamese people in Honolulu are devoted to their values. In speaking with them, even casually, one quickly understands that these are people who are happy with and proud of their native traditions. This is a marked contrast with the very different social conditions for life and work they

encounter. Despite altered roles and responsibilities, the values continue to be endorsed. As with the ethnic identity, however, these values are sustained in a cultural milieu with many opportunities for interaction with and reinforcement from other Vietnamese.

Life Events Questionnaire

The mean frequency of events for all the Ps' was 14.56 (SD = 11.36), on a scale rated from zero ("No, it has not occurred," or "Unknown, not sure if the incident has occurred"), or one ("Yes, it has occurred") to an itemized number of times these traumatic events occurred (see Table 14). All but four of the participants have experienced multiple traumas. Given the nature of events on this scale, this appears to be quite a high frequency for a small sample group, though only research on frequencies for other populations can establish such a baseline. Further, the high standard deviation indicates that there are some Ps with a mean around three events, while others have had approximately 28.

Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-Vietnam

The mean score on the Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist Vietnam was within the "a little" range, close to the scale degree indicating "not at all." This suggests that the level of well-being in Vietnam for these Ps was relatively free of problems and indicators of pathology.

It is a surprising result, given the realities of war, widespread poverty, and governmental oppression experienced by many Vietnamese. One possible explanation,

however, is that this is a self-report measure based solely on the Ps' recollection. Traumas and their effects may not be preserved accurately in memory, given that they are not pleasant to recall, and healthy adjustment may require that these thoughts be minimized. Also, nostalgia for one's home may sweeten the recollection. It may also be that the traditional values, leaning toward moderation and familial responsibility, provide skills for maintenance of mental health.

This scale would be most effective in comparison of well-being before and after immigration if it is actually administered in the country of origin to those preparing to emigrate, with a control group of those who are not leaving. It could then administered to those participants again after adjustment to the new country. Administration to participants of other ethnicities and in other life situations could also contribute to baselines for comparison.

Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-America

The mean score on the Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-America fell in the "a little" range, but still close to the scale degree indicating "not at all." This suggests that the level of well-being in America for these Ps remains relatively free of problems and indicators of pathology, though the scores show slightly less well-being in America than in Vietnam (1.81, SD = 0.51, as opposed to 1.55, SD = 0.52 in Vietnam). The decrease in well-being may be a result of inaccurate memory, or simply of aging effects. It may, alternatively, reflect traumas experienced during migration, or be the result of stresses of adaptation.

Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-Vietnam

The mean HSCL-24-V score for all the Ps fell midway between degree one, "not at all," and degree two, "a little," indicating that the sample chose responses generally consistent with very low symptomatology. This indicates that the Ps do not recollect responses that would indicate likelihood of pathology. As with the VWBC, responses may not reflect the actual conditions in Vietnam for a variety of reasons.

Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-America

The mean HSCL-24-A score for all the Ps corresponded most closely to the degree "a little," indicating that the sample has generally very low symptomatology, but that this symptomatology has increased slightly in America from the levels chosen by the Ps in response to the Vietnam scale. This mean is vastly different from other studies mentioned in the introduction and literature review sections, such as Carlson & Rosser-Hagen (1993), who observed rates of 2.41 and 2.29 on the anxiety and depression subscales (HSCL-A and HSCL-D) respectively among Cambodians, an 86% rate of rosk of pathology, whereas the mean epidemiological rate for the US is eight percent.

This result may have been caused by the sampling technique. Many of those who participated were involved in community organizations and activities, and could be generally healthier than many individuals within the community. Also, it would be best to retest the sample at a later time to assure accuracy of results.

C. ANOVA by Gender

LSAT

The one-way ANOVA by gender revealed no significant different in Life Satisfaction for either scale (Tables 7 and 9). This suggests a uniformity across gender in the perceptions of total Life Satisfaction scores. In different question areas, however, there may be differences between the genders for specific items, but these comparisons were not made in the present study. Total scores can be the same but the patterns of item endorsement could differ.

VEIQ

The one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Table 11), indicating an overall similarity in the mean scores for ethnic identity for both genders. There are differences on certain items (see Table 35 in Appendix B, which was prepared for the benefit of future researchers), which may warrant further study, but these were primarily items such as "shop at Vietnamese stores," which was endorsed more often by women, and "read Vietnamese newspapers," which was endorsed more often by males. Obviously, these are items that indicate variation in gender roles rather than true variation in ethnic identity. However, overall, both genders appear to endorse ethnic identity equally.

Though equal in mean endorsement, another possibility is that there are significant differences on a qualitative level. The Ps may identify themselves as Vietnamese for entirely different reasons that are not illuminated by these questions.

TVAS

The one-way ANOVA for gender revealed no statistically significant differences between the genders (see Table 13). As with the previously discussed scales, this suggests that endorsement of ethnic values is not affected by gender. This is especially notable given that the Ps are adapting to conditions for living and working which, by definition, are incongruous with the social and familial structures of traditional Vietnam. As with the VEIQ, further inquiry on a qualitative level may provide insight into the Ps actual feelings, and to why they hold those feelings.

LEQ

For males, the mean frequency of events was 13.68 (SD = 9.99), and for females, it was 15.22 (SD = 12.34). This indicates a slightly higher rate of traumatic events for females than for males, though the one-way ANOVA for gender revealed that this was not a statistically significant difference. Despite the participation of males in military action, which could seemingly produce a higher score than that of females, it appears that the Ps were equally subject to traumatic events.

Especially in regards to this scale, it should be considered that many of these experiences are highly personal, and no assurances of anonymity might induce accurate responses. Further qualitative research may be necessary to determine whether this is true.

VWBC

In the one-way ANOVAs for gender differences on these well-being scales for both America and Vietnam, results revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference (see Tables 17 and 19). One must suppose, therefore, that stressors and coping skills are shared equally among genders, resulting in equal sense of wellness.

HSCL-24-V

In the one-way ANOVAs for gender differences on these scales for both America and Vietnam, results revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference (see Tables 21 and 23). Symptomatology, as measured by the HSCL, is evidently shared equally among genders.

In the one-way ANOVA for gender differences on this scale, results revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference (see Table 21). For males, the mean score was 1.51 (SD = 0.51), and for females, it was 1.58 (SD = 0.51), indicating a slightly higher prevalence of symptoms among the females. This slight difference could suggest that further studies with more participants might find that females are at higher risk for pathology, possibly due to higher levels of stress or other factors, none of which are clearly delineated in the data analyzed in this study.

HSCL-24-A

In the one-way ANOVA for gender differences on this scale, results revealed that there was not a statistically significant difference (see Table 23). For males it was 1.58

(SD = 0.39), and for females, it was 1.76 (SD = 0.55), indicating a slightly higher prevalence of symptoms among the females. The female Ps fall slightly above the 1.75 cut-off for indication of pathology (Oppedal & Røysamb, 2004), suggesting that, despite lack of significant difference from males, they are a population at risk.

D. Comparison Between Vietnam and America Scales

ANOVA Between Vietnamese Well-Being Checklist-Vietnam and -America scores

A one-way ANOVA between the VWBC-V and VWBC-A scales reveals a statistically significant difference between the two scales (see Table 24). The resulting scores show a slight increase (less well-being) in America from the scores reported for Vietnam (1.81, SD = 0.51 in America, as opposed to 1.55, SD = 0.52 in Vietnam). This aspect of the results poses a puzzle, since the pre-immigration period included times of war, political repression, refugee status and/or refugee camp experience, and one might expect improved well-being in a region without war.

In the United States, these Ps experience a great many additional stressors in everyday life. In Vietnam, housework is divided amongst females of the extended family, with males being primary breadwinners. In the United States, males and females frequently all work, sometimes at multiple jobs, and live in an alien cultural and social setting, making life much more demanding and solitary. It follows logically that well-being could be adversely affected.

Detailed analysis by checklist item, preferably with a much larger sample, would be the only way to gain insight into the exact reasons for this result. Confounding factors could also include a general decrease in well-being (increase in score number) as individuals age, or simply faulty recollection of the actual incidence of symptoms and issues presented in the items included.

ANOVA Between Hopkins Symptom Checklist-24-Vietnam and -America scores

A one-way ANOVA between the HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V scales reveals no statistically significant difference between the two scales ($F(40,50) = 1.38$, $p = .14$), as shown in Table 25, despite the slight increase in symptoms indicated in the Ps responses. The symptomatology of Ps as assessed by this instrument remains relatively unchanged.

ANOVA Between Life Satisfaction Scale-Vietnam and -America scores

A one-way ANOVA between the LSAT-A and LSAT-V scales reveals no statistically significant difference between the two scales ($F(47, 43) = 1.23$, $p = .25$). Despite the slight increase in life satisfaction indicated in the Ps' responses (a decrease in numeric value of mean) the life satisfaction of Ps as assessed by this instrument remains relatively unchanged.

As discussed previously, this result could stem from the tendency of Asians to choose central answers on a Likert scale, combined with a high regard for moderation. Still, the result seems unexpected. One would expect, given higher SES and increased opportunity, that life in the US would be better. A different range of life opportunities

are available, annual wages tend to be higher, and consumer goods are more available. Actually, as discussed in the VWBC section, "different" may not necessarily be "better." Increased stress, loss of familial support, and an unfamiliar milieu could be among many factors that would make life less rather than more satisfying, or result in the lack of statistical change observed here.

HSCL-24-A and HSCL-24-V Chi-square for Cut-off Scores

There was a significant increase in the number of Ps who met diagnostic criterion on the HSCL-24-A when compared to their Vietnam recollections. The 37% increase in such subjects is an alarming number. There are several possible factors that may have contributed to this increase. It is possible that the increased stresses of adaptation (e. g. heavy work schedule and loss of social supports) have had adverse effects on the Ps. It is also possible that the increase is due to sequelae of traumatic experiences prior to immigration.

E. Relations Among Variables: Scale Inter- Correlation Table

The inter-correlation matrix reported in the Results chapter provides an opportunity to explore relations among the different scales for the Ps. Statistically significant results were found in 29 percent of correlation pairs. Six scales had multiple relations with other scales (see Table 29).

A significant pair-wise correlation was found between the LEQ scale and both the VWBC-V ($r = .43$, $p < .01$) and the HSCL-24-V ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). It is clear that traumatic life experiences (e.g. Life Event Questionnaire) in Vietnam could have adverse

effects upon the health and well-being recollections of the Ps during their time in Vietnam. It is notable that there is not a statistically significant correlation between LEQ and either the VWBC-A (r = .14) or the HSCL-24-A (r = .09). This finding raises interesting questions about whether certain Vietnamese refugee populations may be able to endure in the face of difficult life events because of specific coping skills or social resource, and may have, by these means, been able to mediate the development of PTSD and other dysfunctions that have been demonstrated in other studies mentioned above.

The VWBC-V scale had a significant correlation with four other measures: VWBC-A (r = .35, p < .01), HSCL-24-A (r = .32, p < .01), HSCL-24-V (r = .81, p < .01) and LEQ (r = .43, p < .01). The strength of the correlation of VWBC-V with HSCL-24-V suggests that the VWBC measure of well-being is validated by its relation to the established measure of health indicators of the HSCL-24-V. It also suggests that the Ps were consistent in their recollections of conditions in Vietnam when responding to both scales. The strength of the correlation of VWBC-A with the HSCL-24-A (r = .81, p < .01) supports this validation. In both cases, approximately 66% of the variance is explained by the correlation. The significant strong correlation of VWBC-V with the VWBC-A and HSCL-24-A scales suggests that the well-being scores in Vietnam are predictive of the Ps well being scores in America. This raises interesting questions about personal resiliency and hardiness across settings. In other words, are there personality traits that make an individual more or less capable of coping effectively across different stressful situations?

An interesting finding that casts some light on the migration experience for the present Ps is that the mean wellness scores in America on the VWBC-A (X = 1.81, SD = 0.51) were slightly higher than the mean wellness scores in Vietnam for the VWBC-V

(X = 1.55, SD = 0.52), scores indicating a statistically significant greater mean in reported problems in the former ($F(1,89) = 3.46$). However, both scores tended to be located toward the lower end of the scale "no problem" or a "little problem," suggesting only a few problems in both settings.

The VWBC-A (X = 1.81, SD = 0.51), and the HSCL-24-A (X = 1.68, SD = 0.49) show a higher frequency symptoms and problems than the reports on the VWBC-V (X = 1.55, SD = 0.52) and HSCL-24-V (X = 1.55, SD = 0.51). This could suggest that illness and reduced wellness in Vietnam have continued to impact the Ps after immigration, or that those individuals with higher scores have less skills for coping and improving wellness.

The VWBC-A scale correlated significantly with three scales: VWBC-V ($r = .35$, $p < .01$), HSCL-24-V ($r = .31$, $p < .01$) and HSCL-24-A ($r = .81$, $p < .01$). These correlations have been reflected in the discussion above, as have the correlations of the HSCL-24-A with the VWBC-V ($r = .32$, $p < .01$), VWBC-A ($r = .81$, $p < .01$) and HSCL-24-V ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) scales, and the correlations of the HSCL-24-V with the HSCL-24-A ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) and LEQ ($r = .38$, $p < .01$).

The statistically significant correlation between the VEIQ scale with the TVAS scale ($r = .34$, $p < .01$) indicates those Ps with higher scores on the ethnic identity scale also endorse more traditional Vietnamese values. These scales are not redundant. Rather, the ethnic identity scale requests the Ps to report their level of behavioral participation in various ethnic–related activities while the traditional Vietnamese values assesses the endorsement of attitudes. The results suggest a modest but positive relation between ethnic attitudes and ethnic activities.

The correlation of the LSAT scales with the VEIQ scale (r =.018) falls short of the $p < .01$ significance standard set for this study to control for multiple colinearity. However, the observed $p = .02$ level of significance of the correlation suggests that there may be a relation between ethnic identity and higher life satisfaction for the present Ps. This is a topic for future study since there is currently a growing debate about what level of ethnic identity may be optimal for the acculturation adjustment among different ethnic groups (e. g. Rudmin, 2003).

The LSAT-V scale, measuring life satisfaction in Hawai'i, had no correlations across any of the other scales. Thus, life satisfaction in Vietnam appears to have no predictive power, but such effects could emerge with different and larger samples.

F. Discussion of Linear Regression Analysis

Three Linear Regression Models were analyzed to determine whether status in the United States could be predicted by the instruments in this study. The VWBC-A, HSCL-24-A, and LSAT-A scales were dependent variables for the models, and the results of the other scales were used as predictors. Two scales, the VWBC-A and HSCL-24-A. had significant results at the $p < .05$ level, but not at $p < .01$. Discussions of the results of these analyses follow in the interest of future research, since the prospects of meeting significance criterion could improve dramatically simply with additional participants.

VWBC-A

To assess the extent to which variance of the VWBC-A can be explained by

relation with the other scales, a Linear Model was created using the results of the VWBC-A scale as the dependent variable, and the HSCL-24-A, HSCL-24-V, VEIQ, VWBC-V, LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ, and LSAT-V scale results as predictor variables. In analysis of the relation of the VWBC-A to the other scales as the product of the linear model, a significant relationship was observed in all models (see Tables 30 and 31).

The complete model explained 68% of the variance of the VWBC-A. All models showed significance at $p < .05$, with F ratio for the complete model at $F(8,82) = 24.42$. The explanatory power appears to rest with the HSCL-24-A, HSCL-24-V, and VWBC-V, with a small amount of variance explained by the VEIQ. The LSAT-A, TVAS, LEQ, and LSAT-V did not contribute significantly to the equation.

The correlation between these scales has been discussed at length in the Correlation Table section. It is clear that health and wellness are strongly related, both pre- and post-migration. The implication is that health and wellness are constant, regardless of setting. A possible explanation is that individuals whose wellness is compromised prior to immigration will not see significant deterioration or improvement after immigration. In other words, those who are well remain well, and those who are not remain compromised. Alternatively, it may be that the experiences and conditions that brought about the initial scores continued to affect the Ps after immigration, whether by injurious effect of illness or experience. A positive explanation would be that the favorable effects of coping skills or good mental health preserve certain Ps across settings.

It is notable that ethnic identity (VEIQ) was the next most significant factor in the regressed equation, though its correlation with the VWBC-A was $p = .40$ (see Table

29). This suggests that in a larger study, increased involvement in ethnic identity could become a significant predictor of a better sense of wellness when combined with the other predictors. On a practical level, this scale indicates the amount of contact a P has with other Vietnamese, whether through club membership or simply by shopping. It is possible that the strong Vietnamese community in Honolulu provides a context of social support and familiarity that reduces the adverse effects of migration and adaptation stressors.

Certainly, it is indicated that good coping skills and mental health in Vietnam are indicative of increased wellness in the host community.

HSCL-24-A

To assess the extent to which variance of the HSCL-24-A can be explained by correlation with the other scales, a Linear Model was created using the results of the HSCL-24-A scale as the dependent variable, and the VWBC-A, VWBC-V, HSCL-24-V, VEIQ, LSAT-A, LSAT-V, LEQ, and TVAS scale results as predictor variables. In analysis of the relation of the VWBC-A to the other scales as the product of the linear model, a significant relationship was observed. Results of the step-wise analysis are displayed in Tables 32 and 33.

For the complete model, as well as regressed models 2, 5, and 6, analyses showed that these models explained 68% of the variance of the VWBC-A. All models showed significance at $p < .05$. The final regression, with only the VWBC-A, VWBC-V, and HSCL-24-V predictors remaining, resulted in the greatest level of significance, with $F(3,87) = 63.39$ (See Table 33). As with the VWBC-A regression, this analysis

indicates that statistical significance was not improved by removal of most predictors in regression. Only the VWBC-A, VWBC-V, and HSCL-24-V predictors were necessary to explain 68% of the observed variance. Similarly, this indicates a strong relation between pre- and post-migration wellness and mental health, and the status of Ps in these areas after migration.

Unlike the VWBC-A regression, ethnic identity predictors were not sufficiently significant to remain a part of the final equation. This could have been observed due to less sensitivity of the HSCL to wellness factors influenced by ethnic identity.

LSAT-A

To assess the extent to which variance of results of the LSAT-A can be explained by correlation with the other scales, a Linear Model was created using the results of the LSAT-A scale as the dependent variable, and the VEIQ, LSAT-V, HSCL-24-A, VWBC-A, TVAS, HSCL-24-V, LEQ, and VWBC-V scale results as predictor variables. Results of the step-wise analysis are displayed in Tables 34 and 35. As with the previous equations, these results did not meet the adjusted criterion of $p < .01$ for significance. Unlike the other models, which explained a large portion of variance, this model explained only eight percent of observed variance.

As indicated by these results, the most significant equation utilized the VEIQ and LSAT-V as predictors. This suggests that ethnic identity and life satisfaction in the native land are important to life satisfaction in Hawai'i. A possible explanation is that the level of life satisfaction in Vietnam for Ps remains consistent after immigration, but certainly that life satisfaction in the native country, combined with higher ethnic

identification, are consistent with higher life satisfaction in the host country.

G. Methodological Problems

A primary problem with this study is in the small sample size ($n = 91$). In such a small sample, even though the participants ranged widely in demographics, a true representation of Vietnamese, even limited to the island of Oahu, is unlikely. Further, with the number of scales employed in the research, a larger n would enhance the statistical validity of the analytical results.

A related problem is the lack of baselines, both for Vietnamese living in Vietnam and for other ethnicities, in varying immigrant and non-immigrant status. Further, the study should be expanded to other populations and ethnicities. Without baselines, meaningful comparisons are impossible.

There were no significant differences between genders of research participants for any of the measures in this study. A possible explanation is that the null hypothesis is true in this case; there are no significant differences between the ways health or life experience affect men and women, despite the strong hierarchic differentiation between genders in the traditional Confucian social structure of Vietnam. Alternatively, the lack of significant main effects for gender may be attributed to the small sample size. It is possible that with a larger sample, which would indeed be more representative of diversity within the Vietnamese community, main effects would emerge.

Another possibility is that some of the specific items of these scales are too personal or emotionally loaded to prompt honest answers from the participants in a self-

report survey. Given the extreme distrust of authority common among Vietnamese, assurances of anonymity may not be enough to assuage fears of embarrassment or persecution.

Another issue is the use of only aggregate means of each scale for analysis. Statistical analysis across other scales utilizing responses to individual questions would be voluminous, but may provide further insight. Perhaps use of highest means score on certain items would be an avenue by which this could be achieved.

Though a qualitative approach was employed in preparation of this study, it is possible that accurate responses may be possible only in a comfortable qualitative setting, for instance a female participant discussion sexual trauma with a trusted female investigator. Further, there may be numerous reasons for responding in the same way to a question, and only through discussion may these reasons be illuminated. This may be especially true of subjects like traditional values, which must be in flux in the new environment.

H. Future Directions

Foremost, this research should be expanded to a much larger sample. A larger sample would allow greater statistical power, and may be more representative of the diversity of the Vietnamese community in Hawai'i. A test-retest process should also be undertaken to further establish reliability of the instruments.

The research should be expanded to Vietnamese communities outside Hawai'i, and to Vietnamese individuals living in areas without significant Vietnamese

populations, both in other parts of the US, and also internationally. This would illuminate possible effects of community environment and milieu upon participants.

To understand the implications of this research, the same instruments should be administered to samples from other immigrant ethnic populations, composed both of those who immigrated as refugees and of those who voluntarily migrated. This would provide baselines for comparison and understanding of whether these results are consistent with the health and experiences of other immigrant populations, and of the effects of forced migration.

Another avenue of inquiry would be comparison by length of time since immigration: how does time in the host country affect observed results? Of course, aging could also cause higher incidence of health problems and would have to be factored into analysis of future studies.

The Ethnic Identity scale scores were less emphatic than the Traditional Values scores. An interesting inquiry would be to see how less-enthusiastic participation in Vietnamese activities might affect values over time and over generations, the underlying question being whether participation in ethnic activities is essential to maintenance of traditional values. Further investigation by qualitative methods may illuminate why these values are or are not maintained, and how this maintenance affects the individual.

It is notable that the HSCL and Wellness scales correlate significantly with Life Experience, but not with Life Satisfaction. The discontinuity between Life Satisfaction results and perceived wellness or actual pathology prompts questions about the interaction between life satisfaction, life experience, and pathology.

Several items in the Life Events survey are specific to a gender. Further comparison of the specific items of this scale to the Life Events rating scale may determine whether certain questions are too personal or emotionally loaded to prompt honest answers from the participants in a self-report survey. These areas of inquiry should be the subject of further qualitative inquiry to determine deeper attitudes, and whether individuals' responses reflect actual experience.

Longitudinal study could also illuminate the processes of adaptation and acculturation, especially if such study could begin prior to immigration, and continue through several years following resettlement. Intergenerational study could also illuminate these processes. The relationship between age, length of time in the host culture, and ethnic identity are a crucial avenue of inquiry, given the possibility of intergenerational conflict, and of the adverse effects of marginalization, should that occur. Observation of immigrant and refugee populations to see how or whether they assimilate or acculturate, and how this affects them, is certainly the key to understanding and responding to the rapidly changing demographics wrought by forced migration.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

In the processes of any migration, individuals confront a range of stressors in the changes they must face: loss of family or friends in support structure, to differences in social or cultural environment, to direct experience of trauma. Any of these may impact the individual's ability to cope and adapt in the new environment. The complex web woven by these factors is a subject that will require copious study to unravel. This study is intended to provide some clues in that journey.

Generally, the Ps are satisfied with their lives, are strongly identified with their ethnicity, and are relatively healthy, despite their traumatic history. The females are at greatest risk of pathology, given their mean score of 1.76 on the HSCL-24-A, which slightly exceeds the 1.75 cut-off. The significant increase in the number of Ps above HSCL-24 diagnostic cut-off is cause for concern, and is an area that warrants further study.

All but four of the participants have experienced multiple traumatic experiences, as indicated in the LEQ scale. This appears to be quite a high frequency for a small sample, though only studies of multiple samples from multiple ethnicities and experiences will establish a baseline for comparison.

Perhaps the most surprising outcome of this study is that traumatic life events as measured by the LEQ appear to have no significant relation with LSAT-A, VWBC-A, or HSCL-24-A scores. This counters accepted theories that traumatic experiences and resulting pathologies (e.g. PTSD) have lasting effects and are predictive of continued pathology and reduced functionality long after the experienced trauma occurred. This

may be an issue of statistical analysis, however, since the LEQ scale correlated at $p < .01$ with both the VWBC-V and HSCL-24-V scales, and these scales correlate at $p < .01$ with the VWBC-A and HSCL-24-A. The implication, logically, is that life events impacted well-being in Vietnam, and these effects continue in Hawai'i. However, even in linear regression, the LEQ was not a significant factor in the variance accounted for by the equation.

Scores on the Well-Being scale were higher in the US than in Vietnam, indicating higher likelihood of mental health disturbances in the US. Though slight, the HSCL-24 scores also indicated increased symptomatology in the US, supporting a perception that migration has not resulted in better health or well-being. Once again, a larger sample may show significance not seen in this study.

Convergent validity for the VWBC is indicated by the correlation with the HSCL-24. The strong correlations between the VWBC-V and HSCL-24-V scales, and between the VWBC-A and HSCL-24-A suggest that results are consistent across scales and across time (as recalled by the Ps). It appears that the VWBC and HSCL scales measure slightly different parameters, given that the means, while identical for the Vietnam forms, differed for the America versions. Also, correlations differ across other scales. Notably, the VWBC-A appears to have greater sensitivity to ethnic identity factors than the HSCL-24-A, since the VEIQ scale remains a significant factor in the linear regression analysis of the VWBC-A scale, and not of the HSCL-24-A.

Given the results of this research, it is evident that gender may be a less important subject of inquiry than that of other factors. In this study, males and females showed no significant differences in their responses to the instruments, whether

regarding traumatic experiences, ethnic identification, life satisfaction, or well-being indicators. Even when coming from a culture with clearly defined gender-based roles, these Ps were not significantly differentiated by gender in any aspect of the study. The effects of migration appear to be, therefore, something more generally human, both in experience and outcome.

A caveat to the lack of differentiation by gender may exist, however, though the statistical significance was not evident in the study. While both genders show improved Life Satisfaction in the US, males were less satisfied with their lives than females in Vietnam, but females are less satisfied in the US. These females may experience more autonomy and economic viability than was customary prior to migration, but the study indicates that the ultimate effect on the female is less than favorable.

Despite exposure to Western culture, the Ps adhere to their native values structures, their mean score on the Traditional Values Assessment Scale (1.78) falling between "strongly agree" and "agree" (one and two on a one to six Likert scale), indicating that this sample of Vietnamese residents of Hawai'i are very traditional in their values. Though males were slightly more traditional in their responses, it was not a significant difference. Conversely, with a mean score of 2.00 on the Vietnamese Ethnic Identity scale, "sometimes" on a one to four Likert ranging from "always" to "none of the time," it may be that the participants did not identify as strongly with Vietnamese ethnicity as measured by this scale at the time of the research. The two scales did correlate, however, at a $p = .00$ level of significance, so the endorsement of values and participation in cultural activities of these Ps are related.

Both traditional values and ethnic identity correlate favorably with level of life

satisfaction in the US, though not at $p < .01$ level. In linear regression, the most effective equation for prediction of LSAT-A scores was the combination of LSAT-V and VEIQ scores. This suggests that life satisfaction may be a trait which remains constant across setting, but which is favorably affected by increased ethnic identity.

The outcomes of this study may yield more questions than answers. The relative health and resiliency of this sample is inspiring, given their life experiences, but without clear data for comparison to other populations, few conclusions can be drawn. Whether these results reflect the conditions of Vietnamese in other geographical areas, or even of the population in Hawai'i, is a subject of speculation and further inquiry. Should these results prove consistent among Vietnamese, one must ask how other populations fare. An investigation of the factors that invigorate and inspire refugees and immigrants toward healthy and effective adaptation would be of huge benefit in understanding how best to deal with the inevitability of future forced migration.

APPENDIX A
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Please reply to the following questions by filling in the space, or by making a check mark when appropriate

1 Age:_____ Birth date: M:_____ D:_____ Y:_____

2 Gender: Male:_____ Female:_____

3 Marital Status: Single: _____ Married:_____ Divorced_____

4 Native Language:_____

5 Second Language Spoken:_____

6 Religion:_____ 6a Are you currently practicing? Yes:__ No:__

7 Place of Birth:_____

8 Year arrived in United States"_____

9 Occupation:_____Full Time:_____ Part Time:_____

10 Family Monthly Income:_____

11 Mother's Occupation: _____

12 Mother's Ethnicity:_____

13 Highest Grade Level Mother Completed:_____

14 Father's Occupation: _____

15 Father's Ethnicity:_____

16 Highest Grade Level Father Completed:_____

17 Are You in School?_____

18 Highest Grade Level You Completed:_____

19 Ages of Brothers:_____

20 Ages of Sisters:_____

21 What is Your Immigration Status: Refugee (forced relocation):_____
Immigrant (voluntary relocation):____

Lý Lịch Tổng Quát

Xin làm ơn trả lời những câu hỏi sau đây vào trong khoảng trống, hoặc gạch dấu vào khi nào cảm thấy gần đúng

(1) Tuổi:_____ Ngày sinh T:_____ Ng:_____ N:_____

(2) Giống Nam:_____ Nữ:_____

(3) Hôn cảnh: Độc thân:____ Đã lập gia đình:____ Ly dị:____

(4) Tiếng mẹ đẻ:_____

(5) Tiếng nước ngoài (bạn có thể nói được):_____

(6) Tôn giáo:_____

(6a) Hiện nay bạn còn tôn thờ hay hết? Còn:___ Hết:___

(7) Nơi sinh:_____

(8) Năm đến nước Mỹ:_____

(9) Nghề nghiệp:_____ Cả ngày:_____ Nửa ngày:_____

(10) Tiền lương hàng tháng của gia đình:_____

(11) Nghề nghiệp của mẹ:_____

(12) Mẹ là người gì (dân tộc nào?):_____

(13) Lực học của mẹ:_____

(14) Nghề nghiệp của cha:_____

(15) Cha là người gì (dân tộc nào?):_____

(16) Lực học của cha:_____

(17) Bạn hiện nay còn đi học không: Còn:_____ Không:_____

(18) Lực học của bạn:_____

(19) Tuổi của anh em trai:_____

(20) Tuổi của chị em gái:_____

(21) Vào nước Mỹ cách nào?

Tỵ nạn (bắt buộc):_____ Xin nhập cảnh (tự nguyện)_____

APPENDIX B
LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE
QUESTIONNAIRES

LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE- VIETNAM

Please circle the most appropriate answer for each of the following questions.

1 How satisfied were you with your past housing situation in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

2 How satisfied were you with the educational assistance you received in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

3 How satisfied were you with your English language skills in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

4 How satisfied were you with your work situation in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

5 How satisfied were you with your past personal relationships with people in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

6 How satisfied were you with your family life in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

7 How satisfied were you with your recreational activities in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

8 How satisfied were you with the possibilities for your future when in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

9 How satisfied were you with your health in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

10 How satisfied were you with the way of life in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

11 How satisfied were you with your economic situation in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

12 How satisfied were you with your marital situation in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

13 How satisfied were you with your neighborhood in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

14 How satisfied were you with your community social activities in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

15 How satisfied were you with your religious practices in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

16 How satisfied were you with your friendships in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

17 How satisfied were you with your political freedom in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

18 How satisfied were you with your experiences with governmental offices in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

19 How satisfied were you with the medical services offered to you in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

20 How satisfied were you with the media entertainment programs (e.g. TV, radio, Newspaper) in Vietnam?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

Thỏa mãn về sự sinh sống lúc còn ở Việt Nam

Xin làm ơn vòng quanh câu đáp thích hợp nhứt cho mỗi câu hỏi sau đây

1. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề nhà cửa ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

2. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề học hành ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

3. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề học Anh ngữ ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

4. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề việc làm ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

5. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về sự liên hệ giữa bạn và người trong gia đình lúc còn ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

6. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về sự sinh hoạt c a gia đình bạn lúc còn ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

7. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề hoạt động tiêu khiển ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

8. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề hy vọng cho tương lai lúc còn ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

9. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề sức khỏe ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

10. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề đời sống ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

11. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề kinh tế ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

12. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về sự liên hệ giữa vợ chồng bạn ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

13. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề hàng xóm ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

14. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về sự hoạt động của các cộng đồng ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

15. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề tôn thờ tôn giáo của bạn ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

16. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề tình bạn bè ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

17. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề tự do chánh trị ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

18. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề kinh nghiệm với những nhân viên chính quyền và những văn phòng chính phủ ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

19. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề chữa bệnh của các bệnh viện và bác sĩ ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

20. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề chương trình giải trí chiêu đãi trên những đài máy và ti vi ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

21. Hồi xưa có được hài lòng về vấn đề di chuyển bạn đã dùng ở Việt Nam không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE- U. S.

Please circle the most appropriate answer for each of the following questions.

1 How satisfied are you with your current housing situation?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

2 How satisfied are you with the current level of educational assistance you have received?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

3 How satisfied are you with your current English language?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

4 How satisfied are you with your current work situation?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

5 How satisfied are you with your current personal relationships with people?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

6 How satisfied are you with your current family life in the United States?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

7 How satisfied are you with your current recreational activities?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

8 How satisfied are you with the possibilities for your future?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

9 How satisfied are you with your current health?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

10 How satisfied are you with the way of life in the United States?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

11 How satisfied are you with your current economic situation?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

12 How satisfied are you with your current marital situation?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

13 How satisfied are you with your current neighborhood?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

14 How satisfied are you with your current community social activities?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

15 How satisfied are you with your current religious practices?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

16 How satisfied are you with your current friendships?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

17 How satisfied are you with your current political freedom?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

18 How satisfied are you with your current experiences with governmental offices?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

19 How satisfied are you with the current medical services offered to you?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

20 How satisfied are you with the current media entertainment programs (e.g. TV, radio, Newspaper)?

Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Moderately Satisfied	A little Satisfied	Not at all Satisfied	Not Applicable

Thỏa mãn về sự sinh sống trên đất Mỹ

Xin làm ơn vòng quanh câu đáp thích hợp nhứt cho mỗi câu hỏi sau đây

1. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề nhà cửa không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

2. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề học hành không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

3. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề học Anh ngữ không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

4. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề việc làm không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

5. Hiện nay có hài lòng về sự liên hệ giữa bạn và người trong gia đình không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

6. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề sinh hoạt của gia đình bạn tại Hoa Kỳ không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

7. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề hoạt động tiêu khiển không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

8. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề hy vọng cho tương lai không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

9. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề sức khỏe không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

10. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề đời sống ở Mỹ không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

11. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề kinh tế không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

12. Hiện nay có hài lòng về sự liên hệ giữa vợ chồng bạn không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

13. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề hàng xóm không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

14. Hiện nay có hài lòng về sự hoạt động của các cộng đồng Việt Nam tại địa phương của bạn không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

15. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề tôn thờ tôn giáo của bạn không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

16. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề tình bạn bè không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

17. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề tự do chánh trị không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

18. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề kinh nghiệm với những nhân viên chính quyền và những văn phòng chính phủ không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

19. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề chữa bệnh của các bệnh viện công cộng không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

20. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề chương trình giải trí chiêu đãi trên những đài máy và ti vi không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

21. Hiện nay có hài lòng về vấn đề di chuyển bạn đang dùng không?

Hết sức hài lòng	Rất hài lòng	Hài lòng	hài lòng chút đỉnh	Bất mãn	Không có liên quan đến tôi

APPENDIX C

VIETNAMESE ETHNIC IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRES

VEIQ

How much do you participate in the following activities and behaviors associated with Vietnamese ethnocultural traditions.

		Very much	Somewhat	A little	None
A	Eat Vietnamese food at home	_____	_____	_____	_____
B	Watch Vietnamese movies	_____	_____	_____	_____
C	Watch Vietnamese TV program	_____	_____	_____	_____
D	Shop at Vietnamese stores (e.g. Chinatown, Asian market)	_____	_____	_____	_____
E	Visit Vietnam	_____	_____	_____	_____
F	Belong to at least one Vietnamese cultural organization	_____	_____	_____	_____
G	Speak Vietnamese	_____	_____	_____	_____
H	Understand Vietnamese	_____	_____	_____	_____
I	Read Vietnamese	_____	_____	_____	_____
J	Dress in Vietnamese clothes	_____	_____	_____	_____
K	Listen to Vietnamese Music	_____	_____	_____	_____
L	Read Vietnamese newspapers	_____	_____	_____	_____
M	Observe Vietnamese Holidays	_____	_____	_____	_____
N	Have Vietnamese hobbies	_____	_____	_____	_____
O	Attend Vietnamese religious services (e. g. Buddhist, Catholics)	_____	_____	_____	_____
P	Learn Vietnamese dances and music	_____	_____	_____	_____
Q	Use Vietnamese traditional medicine	_____	_____	_____	_____
R	Furnish house with Vietnamese furniture and artifacts	_____	_____	_____	_____

S	Play Vietnamese games	_____	_____	_____	_____
T	Go to physicians, hairstylists, lawyers, or dentists who are Vietnamese	_____	_____	_____	_____
U	Go to Vietnamese restaurants	_____	_____	_____	_____
V	Participate in ancestor worship	_____	_____	_____	_____
W	Have Vietnamese friends	_____	_____	_____	_____

V.E.I.O.

Bạn có tham dự những hoạt động, sinh hoạt liên hệ với truyền thống dân tộc của người Việt nhiều không? Xin làm ơn gạch dấu thích hợp nhứt vào chỗ trống

		Rất nhiều	Vừa thôi	Ít	Không
A.	Ăn thức ănViệt Nam ở nhà	___	___	___	___
B.	Coi phim Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
C.	Coi tình hình ti vi Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
D.	Đi chợ ở tiệm Việt Nam (e.g. chợ tàu, chợ Á Đông, v.v.)	___	___	___	___
E.	Về thăm Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
F.	Có liên hệ với các tổ chức cộng đồng truyền thống Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
G.	Nói tiếng Việt	___	___	___	___
H.	Hiểu tiếng Việt	___	___	___	___
I.	Đọc tiếng Việt	___	___	___	___
J.	Mặc đồ Việt Nam (e.g. aó dài, aó bà ba, v.v.)	___	___	___	___
K.	Nghe nhạc tiếng Việt	___	___	___	___
L.	Đọc báo Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
M.	Tham dự những ngày lễ Việt Nam (e.g. Tết, ngày giỗ, v.v.)	___	___	___	___
N.	Có ưa thích tiêu khiển Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
O.	Đi lễ ở nhà thờ hoạc ở chùa (e.g Phật giáo, Thiên Chúa giáo, v.v.)	___	___	___	___
P.	Biết hát nhạc và tập vũ Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
Q.	Dùng thuốc Bắc (e.g. cạo gió, xông, châm cứu, v.v.)	___	___	___	___
R.	Trang trí nhà cửa theo kiểu Việt	___	___	___	___

		Rất nhiều	Vừa thôi	ít	Không
S.	Chơi trò chơi Việt Nam (e.g. đánh ô, đáng bi, v.v.)	___	___	___	___
T.	Đi bác sĩ VN, đi cắt tóc tiệmVN, đi nha sĩ VN, đi luật sư VN, v.v.	___	___	___	___
U.	Đi ăn tiệm Việt Nam	___	___	___	___
V.	Nhớ ngày dỗ của ông bà tổ tiên	___	___	___	___
W.	Có bạn người Việt	___	___	___	___

APPENDIX D
TRADITIONAL VALUES ASSESSMENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

TVAS

Please place the letter of your choice in before each statement

Strongly agree	Agree	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree	Strongly disagree
A	B	C	D	E	F

1 _____ Children should always obey their parents wishes and desires

2 _____ Females should be responsible for family affairs and house works (e. g. cooking, cleaning, childrearing, etc)

3 _____ One should never make another family member lose face in public

4 _____ Family relationships are the most important part of a person's life

5 _____ One should always support an immediate family member and be able to depend on the family for support

6 _____ A parent's obligation is to care for their children to the very best of their abilities (e.g. education, housing medicine)

7 _____ A child's obligation is to care for his/her parents when they reach old age up to the time of death

8 _____ Suffering is a part of life and should be endured and accepted

9 _____ All things in life can be overcome through persistence, hard work, and meeting one's obligations

10 _____ It is the responsibility of each person to contribute to the family in accord with age and ability

11 _____ One must make personal sacrifices for the betterment of the family

12 _____ Women should be encouraged to earn extra income to help the family

13 _____ One should always strive to overcome adversity and to pursue individual/family achievement and success

14 _____ One should maintain respect for family ancestors and heritage

15 _____ One should strive to maintain traditional Vietnamese values

T.V.A.S.

Xin làm ơn viết chữ cái thích hợp nhứt theo sự hiểu biết của bạn vào chỗ trống

Rất đồng ý (A)	Đồng ý (B)	Đồng ý chút đỉnh (C)	Không đồng ý chút ít (D)	Không đồng ý (E)	Hoàn toàn không đồng ý (F)

_____1. Con cái phải luôn luôn vâng lời sự mong muốn và đoài hỏi của cha mẹ

_____2. Phụ nữ có nhiệm vụ lo công việc ở nhà (e.g. nấu ăn, dọn nhà, nuôi con, v.v.)

_____3. Không bao giờ làm người nhà (sấu hổ) mất mặc ngoài xã hội

_____4. Sự liên hệ giữa bà con thân thuộc là rất quan trọng trong đời sống của con người

_____5. Người trong nhà phải luôn luôn ủng hộ anh em bà con ruột thịt của mình và người ấy cũng có thể tin cậy đến người trong gia đình để ủng hộ

_____6. Bổn phận của cha mẹ là phải hết sức trông nom chăm sóc cho con cái của mình (e.g. giáo dục, thuốc men, nhà của)

_____7. Bổn phận của người con là chăm sóc cho cha mẹ lúc cha mẹ già yếu đến lúc chết

_____8. Sự đau khổ là một phần của đời sống và phải cam chịu và chấp nhận

_____9. Mọi điều trên đời có thể vượt qua bằng cách kiên nhẫn, bền chí, hết sức cố gắn làm việc và đạt được mục đích của mình

_____10. Bổn phận của mọi người là đóng góp cho gia đình đúng theo tuổi và khả năng của mình

_____11. Người nhà phải hy sinh lợi riên cá nhân để làm cho gia đình cải tiến hơn

_____12. Nên khuyến khích đàn bà đi làm phụ và thu nhập tiền thêm để giúp gia đình

_____13. Phải luôn luôn cố gắng vượt qua vận nghịch và theo đuổi đạt đến thành công và kết qủa tốt cho mình/gia đình

_____14. Phải duy trì sự tôn kính cho ông bà tổ tiên và (truyền thống) giòng họ

_____15. Phải cố gắng duy trì truyền thống qúy trọng của người Việt

APPENDIX E
LIFE EVENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

Life Events Questionnaire

Y = Yes It has occurred
N = No It has not occurred
U = Unknown Not sure if the incident has occurred

	# of times				
1	_____	Y	N	U	Abandoned by spouse or other
2	_____	U	Y	N	Victim of extortion (someone forces you to give them money so that they will not physically harm you) or blackmail (someone requires payment in exchange for not releasing information about you that is private)
3	_____	N	U	Y	Discovered you partner/spouse was having an affair
4	_____	Y	N	U	Taunted for being "different" during childhood
5	_____	U	Y	N	Serious injury and/or illness to parent, child or other loved one
6	_____	N	U	Y	Loss of limb (amputation) or loss of use of one or more limbs
7	_____	Y	N	U	Victim of sexual abuse/incest during childhood and/or adolescence
8	_____	U	Y	N	Had your children taken away from you or were forced to give your children away
9	_____	N	U	Y	Watched someone die while you were unable or unwilling to help
10	_____	Y	N	U	Victim of an accident (e.g. hit by a car, in a fire, etc.)
11	_____	U	Y	N	Loss of the use of a sensory organ (vision, hearing, taste, touch, smell)
12	_____	N	U	Y	Killed someone in line of duty
13	_____	Y	N	U	Suffered physical abuse or beatings from a parent, spouse or other
14	_____	U	Y	N	Gave birth to severely ill or disabled child
15	_____	N	U	Y	Diagnosed with an illness that will lead to death
16	_____	Y	N	U	Forced to sleep in the streets at night
17	_____	U	Y	N	Experienced natural disasters (e.g. flood, earthquake, monsoons)

	# of times				
18	_____	N	U	Y	Loved one died in accidental and/or unexpected death
19	_____	Y	N	U	Victim of a violent crime
20	_____	U	Y	N	Victim of kidnapping or held hostage
21	_____	N	U	Y	Tortured or detained against your will
22	_____	Y	N	U	Loved one is murdered
23	_____	U	Y	N	Severely beaten during childhood
24	_____	N	U	Y	Loss of home or business due to man made (e. g. war, accident fire) or natural forces (e.g. earthquake monsoon, etc.)
25	_____	Y	N	U	You/your partner had an abortion or miscarriage
26	_____	U	Y	N	Victim of a violent crime (e.g. mugging, riots, physical assault)
27	_____	N	U	Y	Charged with and imprisoned for committing a crime
28	_____	Y	N	U	Orphaned as a child or your adult
29	_____	U	Y	N	Victim of a shooting
30	_____	N	U	Y	Witnessed a violent death
31	_____	Y	N	U	Not having enough money to buy food
32	_____	U	Y	N	Separated unwillingly from family and loved ones
33	_____	N	U	Y	Victim of physical rape
34	_____	Y	N	U	Child of a substance abusing parents (e.g. opium, heroin, cocaine, etc.)
35	_____	U	Y	N	Forced to leave behind family to fight m a war
36	_____	N	U	Y	Unable to get medical help for yourself or family member
37	_____	Y	N	U	Lost harvest due to natural disaster
38	_____	U	Y	N	Not having enough food to eat
39	_____	N	U	Y	Unable to have children after marriage

	# of times				
40	_____	Y	N	U	Victim of starvation
41	_____	U	Y	N	Forced into an arranged marriage
42	_____	N	U	Y	Unable to make enough money to feed the family
43	_____	Y	N	U	Parents disapproved of your chosen spouse/partner
44	_____	U	Y	N	Denied opportunity for education
45	_____	N	U	Y	Forced into prostitution to buy necessities
46	_____	Y	N	U	Left alone without anyone to care for you
47	_____	U	Y	N	Had an evil person curse you to take advantage or hurt you (e.g. economically, sexually, emotionally, etc.)
48	_____	N	U	Y	Had to unwillingly become a concubine/mistress
49	_____	Y	N	U	Parents unable to bear chosen lifestyle (e.g. religion, sexual orientation)
50	_____	U	Y	N	Loss of economic stability due to gambling as a result of either you or family member
51	_____	N	U	Y	Unable to divorce a spouse, for whom you no longer cared
52	_____	Y	N	U	Did something the family really disapproved of
53	_____	U	Y	N	Your spouse's parents do not approve of you
54	_____	N	U	Y	Married someone with a different religious affiliation
55	_____	Y	N	U	Married a foreigner (someone not of your ethnicity)
56	_____	U	Y	N	Victim of war explosion or bomb (e.g. bomb, bullets, explosions, mortar)
57	_____	N	U	Y	Family member was victim of physical rape
58	_____	Y	N	U	Over one year spent in a refugee relocation camp
59	_____	U	Y	N	Moved because of proximity to battles
60	_____	N	U	Y	Danger to friends or relative's lives

Bản câu hỏi về việc xảy ra trong cuộc đời

Xin làm ơn cho biết những biến cố chấn thương sau đây có bao giờ xảy ra hay chưa bằng cách vòng quanh chữ "C," "K," hay "U" đúng theo sự kinh nghiệm của bạn và cho biết đã xảy ra bao nhiêu lần rồi

C = Có	Đã có xảy ra
K = Không	Chưa có xảy ra
U = Không biết	Không chắc chắn

Xảy ra bao nhiêu lần rồi				
1._____	C	K	U	Bị chồng/vợ/người khác bỏ rơi
2._____	C	U	K	Nạn nhân của kẻ lừa dối (có người ép buộc trả tiền để khỏi làm tổn hại đến thân thể của bạn) hay bị hăm dọa để lấy tiền (có người đòi hỏi trả tiền để trao đổi sự kín đáo của những gì bí mật của bạn)
3._____	U	C	K	Khám phá ra người yêu của mình có người yêu khác
4._____	C	U	K	Bị người khác mắng nhiếc vì thân thể khác biệt với mọi người lúc còn thơ ấu
5._____	U	K	C	Con cái, cha mẹ, hay người yêu bị thương và/hay đau nặng
6._____	K	C	U	Bị chặt chân tay hay không sử dụng được chân/tay
7._____	C	K	U	Bị hiếp dum lúc còn thơ ấu và/hay lúc thời thanh niên
8._____	U	C	K	Con em của bạn bị bắt đi hay bắt bạn phải giao con em của bạn cho họ
9._____	K	U	C	Nhìn thấy người chết nhưng không thể cứu giúp được hay không muốn cứu giúp
10._____	C	U	K	Nạn nhân của tai nạn (e.g. bị xe cán, bị lửa cháy, v.v.)
11._____	U	K	C	Bị mất sử dụng giác quan (e.g. quan sát giác, thính giác, vị giác, xúc giác, khứu giác)
12._____	K	C	U	Giết chết người lúc đi đánh giặc

C = Có	Đã có xảy ra
K = Không	Chưa có xảy ra
U = Không biết	Không chắc chắn

Xảy ra bao nhiêu lần rồi				
13._____	C	K	U	Bị cha mẹ/vợ chồng/người khác đánh đập hành hạ thân thể
14._____	U	C	K	Sinh con bị bệnh nặng hay tàn tật
15._____	K	U	C	Triệu chứng với thứ bệnh sẽ bị chết (vì không điều trị được)
16._____	C	U	K	Bắt buộc phải ngủ ngoài đường ban đêm
17._____	U	K	C	Trải qua tai họa do thiên nhiên tạo ra (e.g. lụt, động đất, bão, v.v)
18._____	K	C	U	Người bà con chết vì tai nạn và/hay chết thình lình
19._____	C	K	U	Nạn nhân của hoàn cảnh hung bạo tội ác
20._____	U	C	K	Nạn nhân của (kẻ) bắt cóc hay bị bắt làm con tin
21._____	K	U	C	Bị hành hạ khổ sở hay cản trở chống lại ý muốn của bạn
22._____	C	U	K	Người bà con thân thuộc bị ám sát
23._____	U	K	C	Bị đánh đập ác liệt lúc còn thơ ấu
24._____	K	C	U	Mất nhà, mất cơ sở buôn bán do nhân tạo (e.g. chiến tranh, tai nạn, v.v.) hay thiên nhiên tạo (e.g. động đất, lụt, v.v)
25._____	C	K	U	Bạn/vợ bạn có phá thai hay bị sẩy thai
26._____	U	C	K	Nạn nhân của hoàn cảnh hung bạo tội ác (e.g. ăn cướp, nổi loạn, hiếp dâm, v.v.)
27._____	K	U	C	Bị buộc tội và bỏ tù vì phạm tội
28._____	C	U	K	Thành trẻ mồ côi từ lúc còn thơ hay lúc thanh niên
29._____	U	K	C	Nạn nhân của bắn súng (bị trúng đạn)

C = Có	Đã có xảy ra
K = Không	Chưa có xảy ra
U = Không biết	Không chắc chắn

Xảy ra bao nhiêu lần rồi				
30._____	K	C	U	Chứng kiến cái chết bất đắc kỳ tử
31._____	C	K	U	Không có đủ tiền mua thức ăn
32._____	U	C	K	Họ hàng thân thuộc ép buộc phải (phân tán)
33._____	K	U	C	Nạn nhân của hãm hiếp
34._____	C	U	K	Con của cha mẹ thường dùng ma túy (e.g. thuốc phiện, he rô in, cô cain, v.v.)
35._____	U	K	C	Bắt buộc rời bỏ gia đình để đi đánh giặc
36._____	K	C	U	Không tìm được bác sĩ để chữa bệnh cho mình hay cho người trong gia đình
37._____	C	K	U	Mất mùa thu hoạch vì tai họa của thiên nhiên
38._____	U	C	K	Không có đủ thực phẩm để ăn
39._____	K	U	C	Không có thể có con sau khi kết hôn
40._____	C	U	K	Nạn nhân của chết đói
41._____	U	K	C	ép buộc kết hôn theo sự thu xếp (của cha mẹ anh chị bà con)
42._____	K	C	U	Không làm đủ tiền để nuôi gia đình
43._____	C	K	U	Cha mẹ không thích (tán thành) người vợ/người chồng bạn đã chọn
44._____	U	C	K	Bị từ chối cơ hội học tập
45._____	K	U	C	ép buộc làm đĩ để cho có tiền mua những đồ cần thiết
46._____	C	U	K	Để lại một mình không có ai chăm sóc

C = Có	Đã có xảy ra
K = Không	Chưa có xảy ra
U = Không biết	Không chắc chắn

Xảy ra bao nhiêu lần rồi				
47._____	U	K	C	Có người ác nguyền rủa để lợi dụng hay hại bạn (e.g. dâm dục, tiền bạc, xúc động, v.v)
48._____	K	C	U	Không bằng lòng nhưng phải trở nên người hầu/vợ bé
49._____	C	K	U	Cha mẹ không có thể chấp thuận đời sống bạn đã chọn
50._____	U	C	K	Mất sự ổn định của kinh tế vì bạn hay người trong nhà đánh bạc
51._____	K	U	C	Không có thể ly dị người vợ/chồng mình không còn thương nữa
52._____	C	U	K	Đã làm những gì người trong gia đình hoàn toàn phản đối
53._____	U	K	C	Cha mẹ chồng/cha mẹ vợ không thích bạn
54._____	K	C	U	Kết hôn với người ngoại đạo
55._____	C	K	U	Kết hôn với người ngoại quốc
56._____	U	C	K	Nạn nhân của chất nổ hay bom (e.g. bom, đạn, chất nổ, súng cối, v.v.)
57._____	K	U	C	Họ hàng thân thuộc bị nạn nhân của hãm hiếp
58._____	U	C	K	ở trại tị nạn trên một năm
59._____	U	K	C	Di chuyển đi nơi khác vì trạng thái gần chỗ chiến trường
60._____	C	U	K	Nguy hiểm đến tính mạng của bà con bạn bè

APPENDIX F

VIETNAMESE WELL-BEING CHECKLIST QUESTIONNAIRES

VIETNAMESE WELL-BEING CHECKLIST

Please read each statement carefully and place a number in the appropriate blank

1 Not at all
2 A little
3 Quite a bit
4 Extremely

	In Vietnam	Now (in US)	
1	_____	_____	The idea that someone else is controlling your thoughts
2	_____	_____	The idea that something is wrong with your mind
3	_____	_____	Feeling easily annoyed or irritated
4	_____	_____	Temper outbursts that you could not control'
5	_____	_____	Having urges to beat, injure or harm someone
6	_____	_____	Getting into frequent arguments
7	_____	_____	Hearing voices
8	_____	_____	The feeling that something bad is going to happen to you
9	_____	_____	Feeling that people are unfriendly
10	_____	_____	Trouble remembering things
11	_____	_____	Having frequent bad dreams and nightmares
13	_____	_____	Difficulty making decisions
13	_____	_____	Your mind going blank
14	_____	_____	Trouble concentrating
15	_____	_____	Unhappy much of the time

16	_____	_____	Having thoughts that are not your own
17	_____	_____	Feel that the future is completely hopeless and nothing can improve
18	_____	_____	Feel that you don't have anything to expect
19	_____	_____	Often have the feeling that you are going crazy
20	_____	_____	Often feel sad
21	_____	_____	Often feel bothered
22	_____	_____	Often feel low-spirited and bored, not wanting to do anything anymore
23	_____	_____	Often feel exhausted, completely tired
24	_____	_____	Often feel desperate (completely hopeless)
25	_____	_____	Often feel downhearted and low-spirited, losing excitement and enjoyment in work and life

Bản câu hỏi về sức khỏe của người Việt

Sau đây là những triệu chứng hoặc vấn đề mà con người thỉnh thoảng cảm thấy, xin vui lòng đọc cẩn thận và coi những triệu chứng đó đã gây khó chịu cho bạn đến mức độ nào trong thời gian còn ở Việt Nam và hôm nay. Xin làm ơn viết số thích hợp nhất vào chỗ trống

1 Không hề có
2 Có chút ít
3 Bị khá nhiều
4 Bị rất nhiều

Lúc còn ở Việt Nam	Hiện nay tại Hoa Kỳ	
_____	_____	Có ý tưởng rằng có kẻ khác điều khiển suy nghĩ của bạn
_____	_____	Có ý tưởng rằng cái tâm của bạn nổi ưu sầu, phiền muộn
_____	_____	Cảm giác dễ bị bực mình tức giận
_____	_____	Không có điều khiển tánh nóng được
_____	_____	Thường có thúc giục để đánh đập, làm tổn hại, tổn thương kẻ khác
_____	_____	Thường hay cãi lộn
_____	_____	Nghe tiếng của kẻ khác (trong lúc không có ai)
_____	_____	Có cảm giác rằng có nhiều điều không may sẽ sảy ra cho bạn
_____	_____	Có cảm giác rằng những người khác không có thân mật với bạn hay ghét bạn
10. _____	_____	Trí nhớ bị quấy rối làm rộn, không nhớ được nhiều
11. _____	_____	Có nhiều lần nằm mơ điều không may và ác mộng
12. _____	_____	Gặp khó khăn quyết định giải quyết
13. _____	_____	Trí nhớ không nhớ được tí gì
14. _____	_____	Khó khăn tập trung tư tưởng

APPENDIX G

HOPKINS SYMPTOM CHECKLIST QUESTIONNAIRES

HOPKINS SYMPTOM CHECKLIST

Please read each statement carefully and place a number in the appropriate blank

1 Not at all
2 A little
3 Quite a bit
4 Extremely

	In Vietnam	Now (in US)	
1	_____	_____	Suddenly scared for no reason
2	_____	_____	Feeling fearful
3	_____	_____	Faintness, dizziness, or weakness
4	_____	_____	Nervousness or shakiness inside
5	_____	_____	Heart pounding or racing
6	_____	_____	Trembling
7	_____	_____	Feeling tense
8	_____	_____	Headaches
9	_____	_____	Spells of terror or panic
10	_____	_____	Feeling restless, can't sit still
11	_____	_____	Feeling low in energy, slowed down
13	_____	_____	Blaming yourself for things
13	_____	_____	Crying easily
14	_____	_____	Poor appetite
15	_____	_____	Difficulty falling asleep
16	_____	_____	Feeling hopeless about the future

17	_____ In Vietnam	_____ Now (in US)	Feeling blue
18	_____	_____	Feeling lonely
19	_____	_____	Thoughts of ending your life
20	_____	_____	Feeling of being trapped or caught
21	_____	_____	Worrying too much about things
22	_____	_____	Feeling no interest in things
23	_____	_____	Feeling everything is an effort
24	_____	_____	Feelings of worthlessness

Hopkins triệu chứng bản

Sau đây là những triệu chứng hoặc vấn đề mà con người thỉnh thoảng cảm thấy, xin vui lòng đọc cẩn thận và coi những triệu chứng đó đã gây khó chịu cho bạn đến mức độ nào trong thời gian còn ở Việt Nam và hôm nay. Xin làm ơn viết số thích hợp nhất vào chỗ trống

1 Không hề có
2 Có chút ít
3 Bị khá nhiều
4 Bị rất nhiều

Lúc còn ở Việt Nam	Hiện nay tại Hoa Kỳ	
1. _____	_____	Bổng dưng lo sợ mà không lý do
2. _____	_____	Cảm giác sợ hải
3. _____	_____	Gần ngất xỉu, ngất xỉu, chóng mặt, suy yếu
4. _____	_____	Run sợ hoạc hồi hợp trong lòng
5. _____	_____	Tim đập mạnh hoạc nhanh
6. _____	_____	Tự dưng cái bắp thịt bị giật run (run rẩy)
7. _____	_____	Cảm giác căng thẳng
8. _____	_____	Bị nhức đầu
9. _____	_____	Bị những cơn hoảng hốt, lo sợ ngắn xảy ra
10. _____	_____	Cảm giác bồn chồn, lo láng khó thể ngồi yên một nơi
11. _____	_____	Cảm giác yếu ớt uể oải
12. _____	_____	Tự trách mình về mọi việc xảy ra
13. _____	_____	Bật khóc dể dàng
14. _____	_____	Ăn không biết ngon

1 Không hề có
2 Có chút ít
3 Bị khá nhiều
4 Bị rất nhiều

Lúc còn ở Việt Nam	Hiện nay tại Hoa Kỳ	
15. _____	_____	Khó đổ giấc ngủ
16. _____	_____	Cảm giác tuyệt vọng về tương lai
17. _____	_____	Cảm giác ảm-u, buồn nản
18. _____	_____	Cảm giác cô đơn
19. _____	_____	Có ý tưởng muốn kết liễu cuộc đời mình
20. _____	_____	Cảm giác mắc kẹt hoặc không lối thoát
21. _____	_____	Lo lắng thái quá về mọi việc
22. _____	_____	Cảm giác không ham thích gì nữa, bất cứ việc gì
23. _____	_____	Cảm giác việc gì cũng khó khăn đòi nhiều cố gắng
24. _____	_____	Cảm giác mình là kẻ bất tài vô dụng

APPENDIX H

VIETNAMESE ETHNIC IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

VIETNAMESE ETHNIC IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Table 36. Results of VEIQ: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptives	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	ANOVA	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	EATVF		1	1.13	.409	.066		Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.007	.936
			2	1.13	.345	.048		Within Groups	12.417	89	.140		
			Total	1.13	.371	.039		Total	12.418	90			
2	WMOV		1	2.21	.894	.143		Between Groups	.111	1	.111	.163	.687
			2	2.13	.768	.106		Within Groups	60.417	89	.679		
			Total	2.16	.820	.086		Total	60.527	90			
3	WTV		1	2.26	.891	.145		Between Groups	.705	1	.705	.773	.382
			2	2.44	.998	.138		Within Groups	80.195	88	.911		
			Total	2.37	.953	.100		Total	80.900	89			
4	SHOP		1	1.67	.662	.106		Between Groups	2.023	1	2.023	5.860	.018
			2	1.37	.525	.073		Within Groups	30.724	89	.345		
			Total	1.49	.603	.063		Total	32.747	90			
5	VISIT		1	3.33	.838	.134		Between Groups	.331	1	.331	.424	.516
			2	3.21	.915	.127		Within Groups	69.340	89	.779		
			Total	3.26	.880	.092		Total	69.670	90			
6	BELONG		1	2.82	1.097	.176		Between Groups	.331	1	.331	.281	.597
			2	2.94	1.074	.149		Within Groups	104.571	89	1.175		
			Total	2.89	1.080	.113		Total	104.901	90			
7	SPEAK		1	1.15	.432	.069		Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.237	.628
			2	1.12	.323	.045		Within Groups	12.385	89	.139		
			Total	1.13	.371	.039		Total	12.418	90			
8	UNDER		1	1.08	.270	.043		Between	.033	1	.033	.625	.431

								Groups					
			2	1.04	.194	.027		Within Groups	4.692	89	.053		
			Total	1.05	.229	.024		Total	4.725	90			
9	READ		1	1.23	.536	.086		Between Groups	.997	1	.997	2.233	.139
			2	1.44	.752	.104		Within Groups	39.750	89	.447		
			Total	1.35	.673	.071		Total	40.747	90			
10	DRESS		1	2.49	1.239	.204		Between Groups	.753	1	.753	.561	.456
			2	2.67	1.098	.152		Within Groups	116.686	87	1.341		
			Total	2.60	1.155	.122		Total	117.438	88			
11	MUSIC		1	1.51	.756	.121		Between Groups	2.411	1	2.411	3.290	.073
			2	1.84	.925	.129		Within Groups	64.489	88	.733		
			Total	1.70	.867	.091		Total	66.900	89			
12	READNEW		1	1.77	1.012	.162		Between Groups	5.571	1	5.571	5.823	.018
			2	2.27	.952	.132		Within Groups	85.154	89	.957		
			Total	2.05	1.004	.105		Total	90.725	90			
13	HOLIDAY		1	1.67	.982	.157		Between Groups	1.938	1	1.938	1.904	.171
			2	1.96	1.028	.143		Within Groups	90.590	89	1.018		
			Total	1.84	1.014	.106		Total	92.527	90			
14	HOBBY		1	1.89	.966	.159		Between Groups	1.765	1	1.765	2.057	.155
			2	2.18	.896	.127		Within Groups	72.948	85	.858		
			Total	2.06	.932	.100		Total	74.713	86			
15	VRELIGIQ		1	1.85	.961	.154		Between Groups	2.975	1	2.975	2.709	.103
			2	2.21	1.109	.154		Within Groups	97.750	89	1.098		
			Total	2.05	1.058	.111		Total	100.725	90			
16	DANCE		1	2.54	1.189	.190		Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.029	.866
			2	2.50	.980	.136		Within Groups	102.692	89	1.154		
			Total	2.52	1.068	.112		Total	102.725	90			
17	MEDS		1	2.67	.869	.139		Between Groups	.688	1	.688	.709	.402
			2	2.49	1.065	.149		Within Groups	85.412	88	.971		

		Total	2.57	.984	.104	Total	86.100	89			
18	FURN	1	2.08	1.194	.194	Between Groups	.386	1	.386	.305	.582
		2	2.21	1.073	.149	Within Groups	111.436	88	1.266		
		Total	2.16	1.121	.118	Total	111.822	89			
19	GAMES	1	2.97	.944	.153	Between Groups	.182	1	.182	.197	.658
		2	2.88	.973	.136	Within Groups	80.268	87	.923		
		Total	2.92	.956	.101	Total	80.449	88			
20	PROF	1	2.08	.862	.142	Between Groups	2.821	1	2.821	3.335	.071
		2	2.44	.958	.133	Within Groups	73.584	87	.846		
		Total	2.29	.932	.099	Total	76.404	88			
21	REST	1	1.77	.583	.093	Between Groups	.008	1	.008	.019	.892
		2	1.79	.723	.100	Within Groups	39.596	89	.445		
		Total	1.78	.663	.070	Total	39.604	90			
22	ANCES	1	1.26	.715	.115	Between Groups	5.015	1	5.015	5.898	.017
		2	1.73	1.050	.146	Within Groups	75.667	89	.850		
		Total	1.53	.947	.099	Total	80.681	90			
23	VFRENZ	1	1.15	.540	.086	Between Groups	.668	1	.668	1.542	.218
		2	1.33	.734	.102	Within Groups	38.519	89	.433		
		Total	1.25	.660	.069	Total	39.187	90			

1=male, 2=female

APPENDIX I

TRADITIONAL VALUES ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS

Table 37. Results of TVAS: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptives	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	CHILD		1	1.74	.880	.141		Between Groups	1.043	1	1.043	1.075	.303
			2	1.96	1.058	.148		Within Groups	85.357	88	.970		
			Total	1.87	.985	.104		Total	86.400	89			
2	FEMALES		1	2.31	1.080	.173		Between Groups	8.975	1	8.975	5.429	.022
			2	2.94	1.420	.197		Within Groups	147.135	89	1.653		
			Total	2.67	1.317	.138		Total	156.110	90			
3	LOSEFACE		1	1.54	1.120	.179		Between Groups	.132	1	.132	.133	.716
			2	1.62	.889	.123		Within Groups	88.000	89	.989		
			Total	1.58	.990	.104		Total	88.132	90			
4	FAMILY		1	1.51	.885	.142		Between Groups	1.059	1	1.059	1.683	.198
			2	1.73	.717	.099		Within Groups	55.974	89	.629		
			Total	1.64	.796	.083		Total	57.033	90			
5	DEPEND		1	1.67	.982	.157		Between Groups	1.254	1	1.254	1.224	.272
			2	1.90	1.034	.143		Within Groups	91.186	89	1.025		
			Total	1.80	1.013	.106		Total	92.440	90			
6	POBLIC		1	1.33	.662	.106		Between Groups	.045	1	.045	.136	.713
			2	1.29	.498	.069		Within Groups	29.340	89	.330		
			Total	1.31	.571	.060		Total	29.385	90			
7	COBLIC		1	1.28	.724	.116		Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.010	.920
			2	1.27	.490	.068		Within Groups	32.128	89	.361		
			Total	1.27	.598	.063		Total	32.132	90			
8	SUFFER		1	2.18	1.189	.190		Between Groups	.059	1	.059	.042	.837
			2	2.23	1.165	.162		Within Groups	122.974	89	1.382		
			Total	2.21	1.169	.123		Total	123.03	90			

								3				
9	PERSER	1	1.72	1.075	.172	Between Groups	1.254	1	1.254	1.620	.206
		2	1.48	.700	.097	Within Groups	68.878	89	.774		
		Total	1.58	.883	.093	Total	70.132	90			
10	CONTRI	1	1.92	.929	.149	Between Groups	.527	1	.527	.809	.371
		2	1.77	.703	.098	Within Groups	58.000	89	.652		
		Total	1.84	.806	.085	Total	58.527	90			
11	SACRIFI	1	1.72	.759	.122	Between Groups	.265	1	.265	.570	.452
		2	1.83	.617	.086	Within Groups	41.340	89	.464		
		Total	1.78	.680	.071	Total	41.604	90			
12	EMONEY	1	1.92	.739	.118	Between Groups	.132	1	.132	.187	.666
		2	2.00	.907	.126	Within Groups	62.769	89	.705		
		Total	1.97	.836	.088	Total	62.901	90			
13	ADVERSE	1	1.44	.680	.109	Between Groups	.331	1	.331	.808	.371
		2	1.56	.608	.084	Within Groups	36.417	89	.409		
		Total	1.51	.639	.067	Total	36.747	90			
14	ANCEST	1	1.26	.715	.115	Between Groups	2.289	1	2.289	4.617	.034
		2	1.58	.696	.096	Within Groups	44.128	89	.496		
		Total	1.44	.718	.075	Total	46.418	90			
15	TRADITIO	1	1.31	.766	.123	Between Groups	.404	1	.404	.732	.395
		2	1.44	.725	.101	Within Groups	49.135	89	.552		
		Total	1.38	.742	.078	Total	49.538	90			

1=male, 2=female

APPENDIX J

LIFE EVENTS QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Table 38. Results of TVAS: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptives	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	ABND		1	.06	.243	.059		Between Groups	321.779	1	321.779	.672	.417
			2	5.65	28.017	5.495		Within Groups	19624.826	41	478.654		
			Total	3.44	21.793	3.323		Total	19946.605	42			
2	EXTORT		1	.06	.243	.059		Between Groups	.083	1	.083	.338	.564
			2	.15	.602	.116		Within Groups	10.349	42	.246		
			Total	.11	.493	.074		Total	10.432	43			
3	EXTRAM		1	.25	.550	.123		Between Groups	.076	1	.076	.287	.595
			2	.17	.482	.098		Within Groups	11.083	42	.264		
			Total	.20	.509	.077		Total	11.159	43			
4	TAUNT		1	.32	.749	.172		Between Groups	.031	1	.031	.061	.806
			2	.26	.689	.144		Within Groups	20.540	40	.514		
			Total	.29	.708	.109		Total	20.571	41			
5	INJURE		1	2.56	5.923	1.396		Between Groups	20.774	1	20.774	1.114	.297
			2	1.18	2.881	.544		Within Groups	820.552	44	18.649		
			Total	1.72	4.324	.638		Total	841.326	45			
6	LOSSLIM		1	.10	.301	.066		Between Groups	.109	1	.109	2.827	.099
			2	.00	.000	.000		Within Groups	1.810	47	.039		
			Total	.04	.200	.029		Total	1.918	48			
7	SEXABU		1	.00	.000	.000		Between Groups	.015	1	.015	.746	.392
			2	.04	.189	.036		Within Groups	.964	47	.021		
			Total	.02	.143	.020		Total	.980	48			
8	TAKEN		1	.10	.301	.066		Between Groups	.040	1	.040	.664	.419
			2	.04	.192	.037		Within Groups	2.772	46	.060		
			Total	.06	.245	.035		Total	2.812	47			

9	DIE	1	.06	.243	.059	Between Groups	.038	1	.038	.423	.519
		2	.12	.332	.066	Within Groups	3.581	40	.090		
		Total	.10	.297	.046	Total	3.619	41			
10	ACCID	1	.06	.236	.056	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.068	.795
		2	.04	.196	.038	Within Groups	1.906	42	.045		
		Total	.05	.211	.032	Total	1.909	43			
11	LOSSORG	1	.05	.229	.053	Between Groups	.030	1	.030	1.380	.247
		2	.00	.000	.000	Within Groups	.947	43	.022		
		Total	.02	.149	.022	Total	.978	44			
12	KILLED	1	.05	.224	.050	Between Groups	.029	1	.029	1.412	.241
		2	.00	.000	.000	Within Groups	.950	46	.021		
		Total	.02	.144	.021	Total	.979	47			
13	BEAT	1	.10	.301	.066	Between Groups	2.116	1	2.116	.592	.446
		2	.52	2.502	.481	Within Groups	164.550	46	3.577		
		Total	.33	1.883	.272	Total	166.667	47			
14	DISABL	1	.10	.308	.069	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.014	.905
		2	.11	.320	.062	Within Groups	4.467	45	.099		
		Total	.11	.312	.045	Total	4.468	46			
15	TERMINA	1	.05	.229	.053	Between Groups	.010	1	.010	.147	.703
		2	.08	.282	.058	Within Groups	2.781	41	.068		
		Total	.07	.258	.039	Total	2.791	42			
16	STREET	1	.25	.639	.143	Between Groups	.372	1	.372	1.781	.189
		2	.07	.262	.050	Within Groups	9.607	46	.209		
		Total	.15	.461	.067	Total	9.979	47			
17	NATDIS	1	.71	1.189	.260	Between Groups	1.714	1	1.714	1.865	.179
		2	.33	.734	.141	Within Groups	42.286	46	.919		
		Total	.50	.968	.140	Total	44.000	47			
18	LOVDIE	1	.55	1.011	.215	Between Groups	6.924	1	6.924	1.633	.208
		2	1.31	2.635	.517	Within Groups	194.993	46	4.239		
		Total	.96	2.073	.299	Total	201.917	47			
19	CRIME	1	.05	.224	.050	Between	.029	1	.029	1.361	.250

							Groups					
		2	.00	.000	.000		Within Groups	.950	45	.021		
		Total	.02	.146	.021		Total	.979	46			
20	KIDNPP	1	.05	.224	.050		Between Groups	.029	1	.029	1.412	.241
		2	.00	.000	.000		Within Groups	.950	46	.021		
		Total	.02	.144	.021		Total	.979	47			
21	TORTUR	1	.20	.410	.092		Between Groups	.910	1	.910	.247	.622
		2	.48	2.502	.481		Within Groups	165.941	45	3.688		
		Total	.36	1.905	.278		Total	166.851	46			
22	MURDER	1	.19	.402	.088		Between Groups	.027	1	.027	.148	.703
		2	.14	.448	.085		Within Groups	8.667	47	.184		
		Total	.16	.426	.061		Total	8.694	48			
23	BEATEN	1	.05	.218	.048		Between Groups	.048	1	.048	.605	.441
		2	.11	.320	.062		Within Groups	3.619	46	.079		
		Total	.08	.279	.040		Total	3.667	47			
24	LOSSHOM	1	.25	.444	.099		Between Groups	.941	1	.941	2.912	.095
		2	.54	.647	.127		Within Groups	14.212	44	.323		
		Total	.41	.580	.086		Total	15.152	45			
25	ABORT	1	.37	.955	.219		Between Groups	.340	1	.340	.652	.424
		2	.19	.491	.096		Within Groups	22.460	43	.522		
		Total	.27	.720	.107		Total	22.800	44			
26	CRIMEVIC	1	.00	.000	.000		Between Groups	.015	1	.015	.710	.404
		2	.04	.189	.036		Within Groups	.964	46	.021		
		Total	.02	.144	.021		Total	.979	47			
27	PRISON	1	.19	.402	.088		Between Groups	.435	1	.435	6.319	.015
		2	.00	.000	.000		Within Groups	3.238	47	.069		
		Total	.08	.277	.040		Total	3.673	48			
28	ORPHAN	1	.05	.218	.048		Between Groups	.007	1	.007	.114	.737
		2	.07	.262	.050		Within Groups	2.810	47	.060		
		Total	.06	.242	.035		Total	2.816	48			
29	SHOOT	1	.00	.000	.000		Between Groups	.015	1	.015	.710	.404

		2	.04	.189	.036	Within Groups	.964	46	.021		
		Total	.02	.144	.021	Total	.979	47			
30	VIODIE	1	.24	.436	.095	Between Groups	.287	1	.287	.416	.522
		2	.39	1.031	.195	Within Groups	32.488	47	.691		
		Total	.33	.826	.118	Total	32.776	48			
31	FOOD$	1	.33	.577	.126	Between Groups	294.175	1	294.175	.906	.346
		2	5.46	24.626	5.027	Within Groups	13954.625	43	324.526		
		Total	3.07	17.995	2.683	Total	14248.800	44			
32	SEPAR	1	.09	.294	.063	Between Groups	1.718	1	1.718	6.450	.014
		2	.46	.637	.120	Within Groups	12.782	48	.266		
		Total	.30	.544	.077	Total	14.500	49			
33	RAPE	1	.05	.213	.045	Between Groups	.025	1	.025	1.280	.264
		2	.00	.000	.000	Within Groups	.955	48	.020		
		Total	.02	.141	.020	Total	.980	49			
34	DRUGS	1	.05	.213	.045	Between Groups	.008	1	.008	.083	.775
		2	.07	.378	.071	Within Groups	4.812	48	.100		
		Total	.06	.314	.044	Total	4.820	49			
35	WAR	1	.14	.359	.078	Between Groups	.138	1	.138	1.831	.182
		2	.04	.189	.036	Within Groups	3.536	47	.075		
		Total	.08	.277	.040	Total	3.673	48			
36	MEDIC	1	.29	.561	.122	Between Groups	.042	1	.042	.135	.715
		2	.35	.562	.110	Within Groups	14.170	45	.315		
		Total	.32	.556	.081	Total	14.213	46			
37	HARVES	1	.29	.463	.101	Between Groups	.159	1	.159	.501	.483
		2	.17	.637	.130	Within Groups	13.619	43	.317		
		Total	.22	.560	.083	Total	13.778	44			
38	FOOD2E	1	8.55	31.874	7.127	Between Groups	714.029	1	714.029	1.653	.205
		2	.67	2.304	.443	Within Groups	19440.950	45	432.021		
		Total	4.02	20.932	3.053	Total	20154.979	46			
39	NOCHILD	1	.05	.229	.053	Between	.002	1	.002	.038	.847

							Groups					
		2	.04	.200	.040		Within Groups	1.907	42	.045		
		Total	.05	.211	.032		Total	1.909	43			
40	STARVE	1	.00	.000	.000		Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.	.
		2	.00	.000	.000		Within Groups	.000	45	.000		
		Total	.00	.000	.000		Total	.000	46			
41	ARRMAR	1	.19	.402	.088		Between Groups	.012	1	.012	.069	.794
		2	.22	.424	.082		Within Groups	7.905	46	.172		
		Total	.21	.410	.059		Total	7.917	47			
42	NO$	1	.35	.489	.109		Between Groups	.037	1	.037	.164	.688
		2	.29	.464	.095		Within Groups	9.508	42	.226		
		Total	.32	.471	.071		Total	9.545	43			
43	BADSPOS	1	.05	.229	.053		Between Groups	.879	1	.879	1.435	.237
		2	.33	1.000	.192		Within Groups	26.947	44	.612		
		Total	.22	.786	.116		Total	27.826	45			
44	NOEDUC	1	.60	1.231	.275		Between Groups	2.250	1	2.250	3.076	.086
		2	.15	.368	.072		Within Groups	32.185	44	.731		
		Total	.35	.875	.129		Total	34.435	45			
45	PROST	1	.00	.000	.000		Between Groups	19.286	1	19.286	1.460	.233
		2	1.29	4.744	.897		Within Groups	607.714	46	13.211		
		Total	.75	3.652	.527		Total	627.000	47			
46	LALONE	1	.00	.000	.000		Between Groups	.015	1	.015	.710	.404
		2	.04	.189	.036		Within Groups	.964	46	.021		
		Total	.02	.144	.021		Total	.979	47			
47	CURSE	1	.10	.436	.095		Between Groups	.007	1	.007	.056	.813
		2	.07	.262	.050		Within Groups	5.667	47	.121		
		Total	.08	.344	.049		Total	5.673	48			
48	MISTRES	1	.05	.218	.048		Between Groups	7.864	1	7.864	.664	.419
		2	.86	4.536	.857		Within Groups	556.381	47	11.838		
		Total	.51	3.429	.490		Total	564.245	48			
49	PARSHAM	1	.32	.749	.172		Between Groups	1.211	1	1.211	.295	.590

		2	.64	2.542	.480	Within Groups	184.534	45	4.101		
		Total	.51	2.009	.293	Total	185.745	46			
50	GAMBLE	1	.29	.902	.197	Between Groups	.360	1	.360	.874	.355
		2	.11	.320	.062	Within Groups	18.952	46	.412		
		Total	.19	.641	.093	Total	19.313	47			
51	NODIVOR	1	.05	.229	.053	Between Groups	.413	1	.413	.971	.330
		2	.25	.847	.173	Within Groups	17.447	41	.426		
		Total	.16	.652	.099	Total	17.860	42			
52	DISAPP	1	.21	.419	.096	Between Groups	1.034	1	1.034	2.239	.142
		2	.52	.823	.165	Within Groups	19.398	42	.462		
		Total	.39	.689	.104	Total	20.432	43			
53	SPPAREN	1	.14	.359	.078	Between Groups	3.293	1	3.293	.883	.352
		2	.68	2.594	.519	Within Groups	164.011	44	3.728		
		Total	.43	1.928	.284	Total	167.304	45			
54	DIFFREL	1	.00	.000	.000	Between Groups	.061	1	.061	1.454	.234
		2	.07	.267	.051	Within Groups	1.852	44	.042		
		Total	.04	.206	.030	Total	1.913	45			
55	FOREIGN	1	.00	.000	.000	Between Groups	.164	1	.164	2.739	.105
		2	.12	.332	.066	Within Groups	2.640	44	.060		
		Total	.07	.250	.037	Total	2.804	45			
56	BOMB	1	.30	1.129	.252	Between Groups	1.050	1	1.050	1.996	.164
		2	.00	.000	.000	Within Groups	24.200	46	.526		
		Total	.13	.733	.106	Total	25.250	47			
57	FMRAPE	1	.00	.000	.000	Between Groups	.063	1	.063	1.625	.209
		2	.07	.262	.050	Within Groups	1.857	48	.039		
		Total	.04	.198	.028	Total	1.920	49			
58	REFUGEE	1	.76	2.827	.617	Between Groups	2.984	1	2.984	.822	.369
		2	.26	.526	.101	Within Groups	166.995	46	3.630		
		Total	.48	1.902	.274	Total	169.979	47			
59	BATTLE	1	.05	.218	.048	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.032	.859
		2	.04	.192	.037	Within	1.915	46	.042		

							Groups					
		Total	.04	.202	.029		Total	1.917	47			
60	DANGER	1	.14	.478	.104		Between Groups	.121	1	.121	.960	.332
		2	.04	.200	.040		Within Groups	5.531	44	.126		
		Total	.09	.354	.052		Total	5.652	45			

1=male, 2=female

APPENDIX K

LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE-VIETNAM RESULTS

Table 39. Results of LSAT-V: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptives	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	VHOUSE		1	3.38	1.632	.261		Between Groups	.527	1	.527	.166	.684
			2	3.23	1.885	.261		Within Groups	282.462	89	3.174		
			Total	3.30	1.773	.186		Total	282.989	90			
2	VEDUC		1	3.41	1.332	.213		Between Groups	.015	1	.015	.006	.938
			2	3.38	1.682	.233		Within Groups	211.744	89	2.379		
			Total	3.40	1.534	.161		Total	211.758	90			
3	VENGLISH		1	4.46	1.668	.267		Between Groups	1.615	1	1.615	.537	.466
			2	4.19	1.783	.247		Within Groups	267.769	89	3.009		
			Total	4.31	1.730	.181		Total	269.385	90			
4	VWORK		1	4.69	1.749	.280		Between Groups	.668	1	.668	.179	.673
			2	4.87	2.058	.285		Within Groups	332.365	89	3.734		
			Total	4.79	1.924	.202		Total	333.033	90			
5	VFAMILY		1	2.15	1.089	.174		Between Groups	.997	1	.997	.758	.386
			2	2.37	1.189	.165		Within Groups	117.135	89	1.316		
			Total	2.27	1.146	.120		Total	118.132	90			
6	VFLIFE		1	2.64	1.347	.216		Between Groups	1.539	1	1.539	.673	.414
			2	2.90	1.624	.225		Within Groups	203.494	89	2.286		
			Total	2.79	1.509	.158		Total	205.033	90			
7	VREC		1	3.85	1.899	.304		Between Groups	2.382	1	2.382	.684	.411
			2	3.52	1.842	.255		Within Groups	310.058	89	3.484		
			Total	3.66	1.863	.195		Total	312.440	90			
8	VFUTURE		1	4.87	1.609	.258		Between Groups	16.199	1	16.199	6.953	.010
			2	4.02	1.462	.203		Within Groups	207.340	89	2.330		
			Total	4.38	1.576	.165		Total	223.538	90			
9	VHEALTH		1	3.3333	1.54466	.24734		Between Groups	.155	1	.155	.076	.784

		2	3.2500	1.34128	.18600	Within Groups	182.417	89	2.050		
		Total	3.2857	1.42428	.14931	Total	182.571	90			
10	VWAY	1	3.69	1.454	.233	Between Groups	2.975	1	2.975	1.441	.233
		2	3.33	1.424	.197	Within Groups	183.750	89	2.065		
		Total	3.48	1.440	.151	Total	186.725	90			
11	VECON	1	4.31	1.217	.195	Between Groups	.206	1	.206	.084	.773
		2	4.40	1.785	.248	Within Groups	218.827	89	2.459		
		Total	4.36	1.560	.164	Total	219.033	90			
12	VMARRY	1	5.05	2.438	.401	Between Groups	7.777	1	7.777	1.597	.210
		2	5.65	2.028	.281	Within Groups	423.661	87	4.870		
		Total	5.40	2.214	.235	Total	431.438	88			
13	VNEIGH	1	2.87	1.218	.195	Between Groups	.938	1	.938	.480	.490
		2	3.08	1.519	.211	Within Groups	174.051	89	1.956		
		Total	2.99	1.394	.146	Total	174.989	90			
14	VCOMM	1	4.97	1.885	.302	Between Groups	.059	1	.059	.016	.900
		2	4.92	1.939	.269	Within Groups	326.667	89	3.670		
		Total	4.95	1.905	.200	Total	326.725	90			
15	VRELIG	1	3.56	2.049	.328	Between Groups	5.289	1	5.289	1.503	.223
		2	3.08	1.736	.241	Within Groups	313.282	89	3.520		
		Total	3.29	1.881	.197	Total	318.571	90			
16	VFRIEND	1	2.31	1.151	.184	Between Groups	.206	1	.206	.136	.713
		2	2.40	1.287	.179	Within Groups	134.827	89	1.515		
		Total	2.36	1.225	.128	Total	135.033	90			
17	VPOLISC	1	5.51	1.587	.254	Between Groups	.155	1	.155	.069	.794
		2	5.60	1.432	.199	Within Groups	200.263	89	2.250		
		Total	5.56	1.492	.156	Total	200.418	90			
18	VGOVT	1	5.79	1.281	.205	Between Groups	.572	1	.572	.339	.562
		2	5.63	1.314	.182	Within Groups	150.417	89	1.690		
		Total	5.70	1.295	.136	Total	150.989	90			
19	VPHS	1	4.7949	1.41755	.22699	Between Groups	.619	1	.619	.296	.588

			2	4.9615	1.46811	.20359		Within Groups	186.282	89	2.093		
			Total	4.8901	1.44107	.15107		Total	186.901	90			
20	VENTER		1	4.49	1.412	.226		Between Groups	3.408	1	3.408	1.429	.235
			2	4.10	1.636	.227		Within Groups	212.263	89	2.385		
			Total	4.26	1.548	.162		Total	215.670	90			
21	VTRANS		1	4.21	1.576	.252		Between Groups	.265	1	.265	.095	.758
			2	4.10	1.729	.240		Within Groups	246.878	89	2.774		
			Total	4.14	1.657	.174		Total	247.143	90			

1=male, 2=female

APPENDIX L

LIFE SATISFACTION SCALE-AMERICA RESULTS

Table 40. Results of LSAT-A: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptives	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	AHOUSE		1	3.33	1.475	.236		Between Groups	.059	1	.059	.030	.863
			2	3.38	1.331	.185		Within Groups	172.974	89	1.944		
			Total	3.36	1.387	.145		Total	173.033	90			
2	AEDUC		1	3.24	1.635	.265		Between Groups	.705	1	.705	.374	.542
			2	3.06	1.145	.159		Within Groups	165.695	88	1.883		
			Total	3.13	1.367	.144		Total	166.400	89			
3	AENGLISH		1	3.46	1.253	.201		Between Groups	3.635	1	3.635	3.037	.085
			2	3.06	.958	.133		Within Groups	106.519	89	1.197		
			Total	3.23	1.106	.116		Total	110.154	90			
4	AWORK		1	3.67	1.660	.266		Between Groups	3.081	1	3.081	1.103	.296
			2	4.04	1.680	.233		Within Groups	248.590	89	2.793		
			Total	3.88	1.672	.175		Total	251.670	90			
5	AFAMILY		1	2.26	1.163	.186		Between Groups	3.869	1	3.869	2.553	.114
			2	2.67	1.279	.177		Within Groups	134.878	89	1.515		
			Total	2.49	1.242	.130		Total	138.747	90			
6	ALIFE		1	3.03	1.386	.222		Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.018	.895
			2	3.06	.916	.127		Within Groups	115.801	89	1.301		
			Total	3.04	1.134	.119		Total	115.824	90			
7	AREC		1	3.74	1.618	.259		Between Groups	3.224	1	3.224	1.660	.201
			2	3.36	1.191	.168		Within Groups	168.956	87	1.942		
			Total	3.53	1.399	.148		Total	172.180	88			
8	AFUTURE		1	3.10	1.483	.237		Between Groups	.444	1	.444	.317	.575
			2	2.96	.894	.125		Within Groups	123.511	88	1.404		
			Total	3.02	1.180	.124		Total	123.956	89			
9	AHEALTH		1	2.95	1.169	.187		Between Groups	.265	1	.265	.244	.623

		2	3.06	.938	.130	Within Groups	96.724	89	1.087		
		Total	3.01	1.038	.109	Total	96.989	90			
10	AWAY	1	2.79	.923	.148	Between Groups	.938	1	.938	.966	.328
		2	3.00	1.029	.143	Within Groups	86.359	89	.970		
		Total	2.91	.985	.103	Total	87.297	90			
11	AECON	1	3.54	1.335	.214	Between Groups	3.244	1	3.244	1.726	.192
		2	3.92	1.398	.196	Within Groups	165.379	88	1.879		
		Total	3.76	1.376	.145	Total	168.622	89			
12	AMARRY	1	5.21	2.262	.362	Between Groups	7.414	1	7.414	1.686	.198
		2	5.78	1.963	.275	Within Groups	386.986	88	4.398		
		Total	5.53	2.105	.222	Total	394.400	89			
13	ANEIGH	1	3.31	1.379	.221	Between Groups	2.545	1	2.545	1.167	.283
		2	3.65	1.547	.217	Within Groups	191.955	88	2.181		
		Total	3.50	1.478	.156	Total	194.500	89			
14	ACOMM	1	3.79	1.780	.285	Between Groups	3.869	1	3.869	1.208	.275
		2	4.21	1.797	.249	Within Groups	285.032	89	3.203		
		Total	4.03	1.792	.188	Total	288.901	90			
15	ARELIG	1	2.54	1.890	.303	Between Groups	2.382	1	2.382	.712	.401
		2	2.87	1.783	.247	Within Groups	297.750	89	3.346		
		Total	2.73	1.826	.191	Total	300.132	90			
16	AFRIEND	1	2.87	1.472	.236	Between Groups	.234	1	.234	.174	.677
		2	2.77	.854	.118	Within Groups	119.590	89	1.344		
		Total	2.81	1.154	.121	Total	119.824	90			
17	APOLISC	1	4.33	2.399	.384	Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.001	.979
		2	4.35	2.123	.294	Within Groups	448.436	89	5.039		
		Total	4.34	2.232	.234	Total	448.440	90			
18	AGOVT	1	4.05	2.077	.333	Between Groups	.346	1	.346	.091	.763
		2	4.18	1.841	.258	Within Groups	333.309	88	3.788		
		Total	4.12	1.936	.204	Total	333.656	89			
19	APHS	1	3.38	1.549	.248	Between Groups	5.151	1	5.151	1.702	.195
		2	3.87	1.869	.259	Within	269.288	89	3.026		

							Groups					
		Total	3.66	1.746	.183		Total	274.440	90			
20	AENTER	1	2.79	1.174	.188		Between Groups	6.309	1	6.309	3.268	.074
		2	3.33	1.530	.212		Within Groups	171.801	89	1.930		
		Total	3.10	1.407	.147		Total	178.110	90			
21	ATRRANS	1	3.23	1.547	.248		Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
		2	3.23	1.113	.154		Within Groups	154.154	89	1.732		
		Total	3.23	1.309	.137		Total	154.154	90			

1=male, 2=female

APPENDIX M

VIETNAMESE WELL-BEING CHECKLIST-VIETNAM RESULTS

Table 41. Results of VWBC-V: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptiv	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	CONTROL		1	1.248	.5635	.0902		Between Groups	.061	1	.061	.223	.638
			2	1.300	.4914	.0681		Within Groups	24.383	89	.274		
			Total	1.278	.5212	.0546		Total	24.444	90			
2	WWMIND		1	1.579	.7958	.1274		Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.046	.830
			2	1.611	.6141	.0852		Within Groups	43.297	89	.486		
			Total	1.597	.6938	.0727		Total	43.319	90			
3	ANNOYED		1	1.748	.9188	.1471		Between Groups	.195	1	.195	.327	.569
			2	1.654	.6417	.0890		Within Groups	53.083	89	.596		
			Total	1.694	.7694	.0807		Total	53.278	90			
4	TEMPER		1	1.739	.8604	.1378		Between Groups	.688	1	.688	1.227	.271
			2	1.564	.6537	.0906		Within Groups	49.923	89	.561		
			Total	1.639	.7499	.0786		Total	50.611	90			
5	BEAT		1	1.090	.4792	.0767		Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.022	.883
			2	1.079	.2330	.0323		Within Groups	11.497	89	.129		
			Total	1.083	.3575	.0375		Total	11.500	90			
6	ARGUE		1	1.385	.6863	.1099		Between Groups	.179	1	.179	.619	.434
			2	1.295	.3942	.0547		Within Groups	25.821	89	.290		
			Total	1.333	.5375	.0563		Total	26.000	90			
7	VOICES		1	1.188	.4844	.0776		Between Groups	.080	1	.080	.250	.618
			2	1.248	.6175	.0856		Within Groups	28.365	89	.319		
			Total	1.222	.5622	.0589		Total	28.444	90			
8	BAD		1	1.616	.6789	.1087		Between Groups	.104	1	.104	.262	.610
			2	1.548	.5892	.0817		Within Groups	35.220	89	.396		
			Total	1.577	.6265	.0657		Total	35.324	90			
9	DISLIKE		1	1.588	.7901	.1265		Between Groups	.042	1	.042	.101	.752
			2	1.545	.5183	.0719		Within	37.422	89	.420		

						Groups					
		Total	1.563	.6452	.0676	Total	37.465	90			
10	**BADMEM**	1	1.425	.7266	.1163	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.004	.951
		2	1.435	.7084	.0982	Within Groups	45.651	89	.513		
		Total	1.431	.7122	.0747	Total	45.653	90			
11	**BADDREA**	1	1.667	.8481	.1358	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
		2	1.667	.6955	.0964	Within Groups	52.000	89	.584		
		Total	1.667	.7601	.0797	Total	52.000	90			
12	**NODECID**	1	1.849	.7984	.1278	Between Groups	.040	1	.040	.058	.811
		2	1.891	.8586	.1191	Within Groups	61.819	89	.695		
		Total	1.873	.8291	.0869	Total	61.859	90			
13	**BLANK**	1	1.179	.5358	.0858	Between Groups	.011	1	.011	.045	.832
		2	1.157	.4661	.0646	Within Groups	21.989	89	.247		
		Total	1.167	.4944	.0518	Total	22.000	90			
14	**CONCEN**	1	1.488	.7651	.1225	Between Groups	.024	1	.024	.050	.824
		2	1.521	.6259	.0868	Within Groups	42.223	89	.474		
		Total	1.507	.6851	.0718	Total	42.247	90			
15	**UNHAPPY**	1	2.015	.8891	.1424	Between Groups	.319	1	.319	.436	.511
		2	2.135	.8301	.1151	Within Groups	65.181	89	.732		
		Total	2.083	.8531	.0894	Total	65.500	90			
16	**NOTOWN**	1	1.480	.8922	.1429	Between Groups	.053	1	.053	.087	.769
		2	1.431	.6829	.0947	Within Groups	54.030	89	.607		
		Total	1.452	.7752	.0813	Total	54.082	90			
17	**FUTBAD**	1	1.738	1.0531	.1686	Between Groups	.794	1	.794	1.035	.312
		2	1.549	.7151	.0992	Within Groups	68.220	89	.767		
		Total	1.630	.8757	.0918	Total	69.014	90			
18	**NOEXPEC**	1	1.399	.8228	.1318	Between Groups	.074	1	.074	.148	.702
		2	1.342	.6052	.0839	Within Groups	44.405	89	.499		
		Total	1.366	.7030	.0737	Total	44.479	90			
19	**GOCRAZY**	1	1.787	1.1598	.1857	Between Groups	1.989	1	1.989	2.352	.129
		2	1.488	.6882	.0954	Within Groups	75.271	89	.846		

		Total	1.616	.9265	.0971		Total	77.260	90			
20	**FEELSAD**	1	1.738	.9258	.1482		Between Groups	.221	1	.221	.299	.586
		2	1.837	.8060	.1118		Within Groups	65.697	89	.738		
		Total	1.795	.8558	.0897		Total	65.918	90			
21	**FEELBOT**	1	1.674	.8788	.1407		Between Groups	.102	1	.102	.159	.691
		2	1.741	.7345	.1019		Within Groups	56.857	89	.639		
		Total	1.712	.7955	.0834		Total	56.959	90			
22	**VLOWSPR**	1	1.733	.7704	.1234		Between Groups	.078	1	.078	.117	.733
		2	1.792	.8449	.1172		Within Groups	58.963	89	.663		
		Total	1.767	.8099	.0849		Total	59.041	90			
23	**TTIRED**	1	1.313	.6687	.1071		Between Groups	.218	1	.218	.454	.502
		2	1.412	.7113	.0986		Within Groups	42.795	89	.481		
		Total	1.370	.6913	.0725		Total	43.014	90			
24	**DESPAIR**	1	1.623	.9414	.1507		Between Groups	.382	1	.382	.570	.452
		2	1.492	.7143	.0991		Within Groups	59.700	89	.671		
		Total	1.548	.8171	.0857		Total	60.082	90			
25	**DOWNLOW**	1	1.665	.8481	.1358		Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.006	.937
		2	1.652	.7809	.1083		Within Groups	58.434	89	.657		
		Total	1.658	.8058	.0845		Total	58.438	90			

1=male, 2=female

APPENDIX N

VIETNAMESE WELL-BEING CHECKLIST-AMERICA RESULTS

Table 42. Results of VWBC-A: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptiv	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	CONTROL		1	1.228	.5518	.0884		Between Groups	.518	1	.518	1.308	.256
			2	1.380	.6812	.0945		Within Groups	35.236	89	.396		
			Total	1.315	.6303	.0661		Total	35.753	90			
2	WWMIND		1	1.812	.6813	.1091		Between Groups	1.210	1	1.210	2.529	.115
			2	2.045	.6992	.0970		Within Groups	42.571	89	.478		
			Total	1.945	.6975	.0731		Total	43.781	90			
3	ANNOYED		1	1.904	.7191	.1151		Between Groups	1.287	1	1.287	1.923	.169
			2	2.144	.8850	.1227		Within Groups	59.589	89	.670		
			Total	2.041	.8224	.0862		Total	60.877	90			
4	TEMPER		1	1.595	.6517	.1043		Between Groups	.738	1	.738	1.408	.239
			2	1.777	.7733	.1072		Within Groups	46.632	89	.524		
			Total	1.699	.7255	.0761		Total	47.370	90			
5	BEAT		1	1.049	.2830	.0453		Between Groups	.708	1	.708	3.382	.069
			2	1.227	.5529	.0767		Within Groups	18.634	89	.209		
			Total	1.151	.4636	.0486		Total	19.342	90			
6	ARGUE		1	1.273	.4661	.0746		Between Groups	1.876	1	1.876	5.202	.025
			2	1.563	.6837	.0948		Within Groups	32.097	89	.361		
			Total	1.438	.6144	.0644		Total	33.973	90			
7	VOICES		1	1.191	.4847	.0776		Between Groups	.162	1	.162	.583	.447
			2	1.276	.5573	.0773		Within Groups	24.767	89	.278		
			Total	1.239	.5263	.0552		Total	24.930	90			
8	BAD		1	1.665	.7493	.1200		Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.009	.927
			2	1.652	.6432	.0892		Within Groups	42.434	89	.477		
			Total	1.658	.6867	.0720		Total	42.438	90			
9	DISLIKE		1	1.691	.7514	.1203		Between Groups	1.178	1	1.178	2.117	.149
			2	1.920	.7416	.1028		Within	49.507	89	.556		

						Groups					
		Total	1.822	.7504	.0787	Total	50.685	90			
10	BADMEM	1	1.659	.8847	.1417	Between Groups	1.020	1	1.020	1.345	.249
		2	1.872	.8601	.1193	Within Groups	67.473	89	.758		
		Total	1.781	.8724	.0914	Total	68.493	90			
11	BADDREA	1	1.778	.7635	.1223	Between Groups	.862	1	.862	1.414	.238
		2	1.975	.7935	.1100	Within Groups	54.261	89	.610		
		Total	1.890	.7826	.0820	Total	55.123	90			
12	NODECID	1	1.985	.7783	.1246	Between Groups	.477	1	.477	.756	.387
		2	2.131	.8064	.1118	Within Groups	56.181	89	.631		
		Total	2.068	.7934	.0832	Total	56.658	90			
13	BLANK	1	1.341	.6355	.1018	Between Groups	.123	1	.123	.331	.566
		2	1.415	.5906	.0819	Within Groups	33.137	89	.372		
		Total	1.384	.6079	.0637	Total	33.260	90			
14	CONCEN	1	1.780	.7638	.1223	Between Groups	1.068	1	1.068	2.099	.151
		2	1.999	.6730	.0933	Within Groups	45.270	89	.509		
		Total	1.905	.7175	.0752	Total	46.338	90			
15	UNHAPPY	1	2.412	.7246	.1160	Between Groups	.699	1	.699	1.156	.285
		2	2.589	.8145	.1130	Within Groups	53.788	89	.604		
		Total	2.514	.7781	.0816	Total	54.486	90			
16	NOTOWN	1	1.446	.6522	.1044	Between Groups	1.004	1	1.004	1.620	.206
		2	1.659	.8744	.1213	Within Groups	55.158	89	.620		
		Total	1.568	.7900	.0828	Total	56.162	90			
17	FUTBAD	1	1.553	.7290	.1167	Between Groups	.118	1	.118	.211	.647
		2	1.626	.7609	.1055	Within Groups	49.720	89	.559		
		Total	1.595	.7441	.0780	Total	49.838	90			
18	NOEXPEC	1	1.456	.7243	.1160	Between Groups	.499	1	.499	.978	.325
		2	1.606	.7063	.0979	Within Groups	45.376	89	.510		
		Total	1.542	.7139	.0748	Total	45.875	90			
19	GOCRAZY	1	1.536	.8002	.1281	Between Groups	.871	1	.871	1.384	.243
		2	1.733	.7879	.1093	Within Groups	55.994	89	.629		

		Total	1.649	.7949	.0833	Total	56.865	90			
20	**FEELSAD**	1	2.150	.8840	.1416	Between Groups	1.757	1	1.757	2.296	.133
		2	2.431	.8677	.1203	Within Groups	68.095	89	.765		
		Total	2.311	.8810	.0924	Total	69.851	90			
21	**FEELBOT**	1	1.827	.6852	.1097	Between Groups	3.119	1	3.119	4.646	.034
		2	2.201	.9066	.1257	Within Groups	59.759	89	.671		
		Total	2.041	.8359	.0876	Total	62.878	90			
22	**VLOWSPR**	1	1.568	.5686	.0911	Between Groups	1.010	1	1.010	1.918	.170
		2	1.780	.8231	.1141	Within Groups	46.842	89	.526		
		Total	1.689	.7292	.0764	Total	47.851	90			
23	**TTIRED**	1	1.633	.7616	.1219	Between Groups	1.543	1	1.543	2.410	.124
		2	1.897	.8279	.1148	Within Groups	56.997	89	.640		
		Total	1.784	.8065	.0845	Total	58.541	90			
24	**DESPAIR**	1	1.401	.5114	.0819	Between Groups	2.921	1	2.921	5.813	.018
		2	1.763	.8257	.1145	Within Groups	44.715	89	.502		
		Total	1.608	.7275	.0763	Total	47.635	90			
25	**DOWNLOW**	1	1.808	.6806	.1090	Between Groups	.839	1	.839	1.273	.262
		2	2.002	.8974	.1244	Within Groups	58.674	89	.659		
		Total	1.919	.8132	.0852	Total	59.514	90			

1=male 2=female

APPENDIX O

HOPKINS SYMPTOM CHECKLIST-VIETNAM RESULTS

Table 43. Results of HSCL-24-V: Descriptives and ANOVA by gender

Question	Question code	Descriptiv	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	VSUDSCAR		1	1.502	.7523	.1205		Between Groups	.346	1	.346	.555	.458
			2	1.626	.8156	.1131		Within Groups	55.430	89	.623		
			Total	1.573	.7872	.0825		Total	55.775	90			
2	VFEARFUL		1	1.792	1.0301	.1649		Between Groups	.474	1	.474	.484	.488
			2	1.938	.9582	.1329		Within Groups	87.151	89	.979		
			Total	1.875	.9867	.1034		Total	87.625	90			
3	VFAINT		1	1.317	.5670	.0908		Between Groups	.284	1	.284	.653	.421
			2	1.430	.7210	.1000		Within Groups	38.727	89	.435		
			Total	1.382	.6584	.0690		Total	39.011	90			
4	VNERVES		1	1.557	.6773	.1084		Between Groups	2.313	1	2.313	3.389	.069
			2	1.880	.9216	.1278		Within Groups	60.743	89	.683		
			Total	1.742	.8370	.0877		Total	63.056	90			
5	VHEART		1	1.449	.7847	.1257		Between Groups	.313	1	.313	.558	.457
			2	1.568	.7210	.1000		Within Groups	49.912	89	.561		
			Total	1.517	.7470	.0783		Total	50.225	90			
6	VTREMBLE		1	1.263	.5470	.0876		Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.005	.943
			2	1.255	.5180	.0718		Within Groups	25.055	89	.282		
			Total	1.258	.5276	.0553		Total	25.056	90			
7	VTENSE		1	1.605	.8442	.1352		Between Groups	.029	1	.029	.051	.821
			2	1.569	.6644	.0921		Within Groups	49.589	89	.557		
			Total	1.584	.7425	.0778		Total	49.618	90			
8	VHEADACH		1	1.740	.7845	.1256		Between Groups	1.262	1	1.262	1.643	.203
			2	1.978	.9392	.1302		Within Groups	68.378	89	.768		
			Total	1.876	.8796	.0922		Total	69.640	90			
9	VPANIC		1	1.581	.7482	.1198		Between Groups	.457	1	.457	.791	.376
			2	1.724	.7690	.1066		Within	51.431	89	.578		

							Groups					
		Total	1.663	.7593	.0796		Total	51.888	90			
10	VRESTLES	1	1.578	.7825	.1253		Between Groups	.102	1	.102	.181	.672
		2	1.510	.7242	.1004		Within Groups	50.011	89	.562		
		Total	1.539	.7462	.0782		Total	50.112	90			
11	VNOENER	1	1.551	.7504	.1202		Between Groups	.313	1	.313	.606	.438
		2	1.432	.6933	.0961		Within Groups	45.912	89	.516		
		Total	1.483	.7167	.0751		Total	46.225	90			
12	VBLAMING	1	1.578	.8776	.1405		Between Groups	.102	1	.102	.162	.689
		2	1.510	.7242	.1004		Within Groups	56.011	89	.629		
		Total	1.539	.7896	.0828		Total	56.112	90			
13	VCRYEASY	1	1.409	.8418	.1348		Between Groups	.225	1	.225	.387	.535
		2	1.509	.6966	.0966		Within Groups	51.673	89	.581		
		Total	1.466	.7594	.0796		Total	51.898	90			
14	VNOEAT	1	1.551	.8176	.1309		Between Groups	.313	1	.313	.606	.438
		2	1.432	.6342	.0879		Within Groups	45.912	89	.516		
		Total	1.483	.7167	.0751		Total	46.225	90			
15	VNOSLEEP	1	1.552	.7762	.1243		Between Groups	.144	1	.144	.282	.597
		2	1.471	.6673	.0925		Within Groups	45.603	89	.512		
		Total	1.506	.7130	.0747		Total	45.747	90			
16	VNOFUTR	1	1.581	.9072	.1453		Between Groups	.587	1	.587	.697	.406
		2	1.744	.9256	.1284		Within Groups	74.963	89	.842		
		Total	1.674	.9162	.0960		Total	75.551	90			
17	VBLUE	1	1.398	.7089	.1135		Between Groups	1.061	1	1.061	1.932	.168
		2	1.616	.7644	.1060		Within Groups	48.893	89	.549		
		Total	1.523	.7450	.0781		Total	49.955	90			
18	VALONE	1	1.370	.7407	.1186		Between Groups	.222	1	.222	.369	.545
		2	1.470	.8008	.1111		Within Groups	53.553	89	.602		
		Total	1.427	.7730	.0810		Total	53.775	90			
19	VSUICIDE	1	1.108	.4470	.0716		Between Groups	.925	1	.925	3.096	.082
		2	1.312	.6102	.0846		Within Groups	26.581	89	.299		

			Total	1.225	.5528	.0580		Total	27.506	90			
20	**VTRAPPED**		1	1.615	1.0161	.1627		Between Groups	.668	1	.668	.928	.338
			2	1.442	.6977	.0968		Within Groups	64.058	89	.720		
			Total	1.516	.8480	.0889		Total	64.725	90			
21	**V2WORRY**		1	1.542	.7106	.1138		Between Groups	.047	1	.047	.073	.788
			2	1.588	.8672	.1203		Within Groups	57.544	89	.647		
			Total	1.568	.7999	.0839		Total	57.591	90			
22	**VNOINTS**		1	1.579	.9070	.1452		Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.003	.955
			2	1.569	.7984	.1107		Within Groups	63.773	89	.717		
			Total	1.573	.8418	.0882		Total	63.775	90			
23	**VBIGEFF**		1	1.623	.6630	.1062		Between Groups	.042	1	.042	.064	.801
			2	1.666	.9003	.1248		Within Groups	58.038	89	.652		
			Total	1.648	.8033	.0842		Total	58.080	90			
24	**VWORTHLE**		1	1.385	.8068	.1292		Between Groups	1.086	1	1.086	1.490	.225
			2	1.606	.8875	.1231		Within Groups	64.902	89	.729		
			Total	1.511	.8563	.0898		Total	65.989	90			

1=male, 2=female

Table 44. Results of HSCL-24-V: Frequencies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.20	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
	1.00	9	9.9	9.9	11.0
	1.04	2	2.2	2.2	13.2
	1.08	5	5.5	5.5	18.7
	1.13	3	3.3	3.3	22.0
	1.15	1	1.1	1.1	23.1
	1.17	2	2.2	2.2	25.3
	1.21	5	5.5	5.5	30.8
	1.25	2	2.2	2.2	33.0
	1.29	3	3.3	3.3	36.3
	1.33	3	3.3	3.3	39.6
	1.38	5	5.5	5.5	45.1
	1.42	2	2.2	2.2	47.3
	1.46	3	3.3	3.3	50.5
	1.50	6	6.6	6.6	57.1
	1.52	1	1.1	1.1	58.2
	1.52	1	1.1	1.1	59.3
	1.53	1	1.1	1.1	60.4
	1.54	3	3.3	3.3	63.7
	1.57	1	1.1	1.1	64.8
	1.58	2	2.2	2.2	67.0
	1.63	1	1.1	1.1	68.1
	1.71	1	1.1	1.1	69.2
	1.75	1	1.1	1.1	70.3
	1.77	1	1.1	1.1	71.4
	1.79	3	3.3	3.3	74.7
	1.83	3	3.3	3.3	78.0
	1.92	1	1.1	1.1	79.1
	1.96	4	4.4	4.4	83.5
	2.00	2	2.2	2.2	85.7
	2.04	1	1.1	1.1	86.8
	2.21	2	2.2	2.2	89.0
	2.25	1	1.1	1.1	90.1
	2.29	2	2.2	2.2	92.3
	2.41	1	1.1	1.1	93.4
	2.50	1	1.1	1.1	94.5
	2.54	1	1.1	1.1	95.6
	2.63	1	1.1	1.1	96.7
	2.83	1	1.1	1.1	97.8
	3.04	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
	3.17	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	91	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX P

HOPKINS SYMPTOM CHECKLIST-AMERICA RESULTS

TABLE 45. RESULTS OF HSCL-24-A: DESCRIPTIVES AND ANOVA BY GENDER

Question	Question code	Descriptiv	Gender/ Total	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Anova	Level of Analysis	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	ASUDSCAR		1	1.451	.6370	.1020		Between Groups	1.509	1	1.509	2.395	.125
			2	1.712	.8930	.1238		Within Groups	56.091	89	.630		
			Total	1.600	.8000	.0839		Total	57.600	90			
2	AFEARFUL		1	1.452	.6371	.1020		Between Groups	1.981	1	1.981	3.196	.077
			2	1.750	.8828	.1224		Within Groups	55.175	89	.620		
			Total	1.622	.7969	.0835		Total	57.156	90			
3	AFAINT		1	1.242	.4840	.0775		Between Groups	2.227	1	2.227	5.547	.021
			2	1.558	.7253	.1006		Within Groups	35.729	89	.401		
			Total	1.422	.6494	.0681		Total	37.956	90			
4	ANERVES		1	1.480	.5508	.0882		Between Groups	3.653	1	3.653	6.657	.012
			2	1.885	.8553	.1186		Within Groups	48.836	89	.549		
			Total	1.711	.7637	.0801		Total	52.489	90			
5	AHEART		1	1.553	.8175	.1309		Between Groups	.041	1	.041	.061	.806
			2	1.596	.8227	.1141		Within Groups	59.915	89	.673		
			Total	1.578	.8162	.0856		Total	59.956	90			
6	ATREMBLE		1	1.188	.4512	.0722		Between Groups	1.664	1	1.664	4.534	.036
			2	1.462	.6991	.0969		Within Groups	32.659	89	.367		
			Total	1.344	.6175	.0647		Total	34.322	90			
7	ATENSE		1	1.662	.7359	.1178		Between Groups	1.750	1	1.750	2.621	.109
			2	1.942	.8725	.1210		Within Groups	59.406	89	.667		
			Total	1.822	.8243	.0864		Total	61.156	90			
8	AHEADACH		1	1.900	.7186	.1151		Between Groups	3.069	1	3.069	4.724	.032
			2	2.271	.8653	.1200		Within Groups	57.808	89	.650		
			Total	2.112	.8224	.0862		Total	60.876	90			
9	APANIC		1	1.632	.8086	.1295		Between Groups	.064	1	.064	.118	.732
			2	1.686	.6713	.0931		Within	47.824	89	.537		

						Groups					
		Total	1.663	.7294	.0765	Total	47.888	90			
10	ARESTLES	1	1.555	.7505	.1202	Between Groups	.422	1	.422	.744	.391
		2	1.692	.7551	.1047	Within Groups	50.478	89	.567		
		Total	1.633	.7520	.0788	Total	50.900	90			
11	ANOENER	1	1.634	.8086	.1295	Between Groups	.410	1	.410	.607	.438
		2	1.769	.8311	.1153	Within Groups	60.079	89	.675		
		Total	1.711	.8198	.0859	Total	60.489	90			
12	ABLAMING	1	1.686	.7646	.1224	Between Groups	.235	1	.235	.313	.577
		2	1.788	.9359	.1298	Within Groups	66.887	89	.752		
		Total	1.744	.8636	.0905	Total	67.122	90			
13	ACRYEASY	1	1.311	.5590	.0895	Between Groups	4.671	1	4.671	8.134	.005
		2	1.769	.8771	.1216	Within Groups	51.105	89	.574		
		Total	1.573	.7872	.0825	Total	55.775	90			
14	ANOEAT	1	1.658	.6600	.1057	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.001	.979
		2	1.654	.7640	.1059	Within Groups	46.322	89	.520		
		Total	1.656	.7174	.0752	Total	46.322	90			
15	ANOSLEEP	1	1.869	.8326	.1333	Between Groups	.027	1	.027	.038	.845
		2	1.904	.8462	.1173	Within Groups	62.862	89	.706		
		Total	1.889	.8359	.0876	Total	62.889	90			
16	ANOFUTR	1	1.423	.7825	.1253	Between Groups	.208	1	.208	.385	.537
		2	1.519	.6999	.0971	Within Groups	48.247	89	.542		
		Total	1.478	.7338	.0769	Total	48.456	90			
17	ABLUE	1	1.585	.7832	.1254	Between Groups	3.102	1	3.102	3.986	.049
		2	1.958	.9492	.1316	Within Groups	69.257	89	.778		
		Total	1.798	.8967	.0940	Total	72.360	90			
18	AALONE	1	1.843	.8744	.1400	Between Groups	.142	1	.142	.169	.682
		2	1.923	.9465	.1313	Within Groups	74.747	89	.840		
		Total	1.889	.9122	.0956	Total	74.889	90			
19	ASUICIDE	1	1.371	.5815	.0931	Between Groups	.625	1	.625	.372	.544
		2	1.538	1.6385	.2272	Within Groups	149.775	89	1.683		

			Total	1.467	1.2927	.1355		Total	150.400	90			
20	**ATRAPPED**		1	1.578	.9356	.1498		Between Groups	.077	1	.077	.110	.741
			2	1.519	.7538	.1045		Within Groups	62.245	89	.699		
			Total	1.544	.8321	.0872		Total	62.322	90			
21	**A2WORRY**		1	1.815	.6430	.1030		Between Groups	.047	1	.047	.079	.780
			2	1.769	.8544	.1185		Within Groups	52.942	89	.595		
			Total	1.789	.7673	.0804		Total	52.989	90			
22	**ANOINTS**		1	1.685	.7646	.1224		Between Groups	.138	1	.138	.200	.656
			2	1.764	.8765	.1215		Within Groups	61.390	89	.690		
			Total	1.730	.8268	.0867		Total	61.528	90			
23	**ABIGEFF**		1	1.764	.7411	.1187		Between Groups	.088	1	.088	.144	.705
			2	1.827	.8098	.1123		Within Groups	54.312	89	.610		
			Total	1.800	.7775	.0815		Total	54.400	90			
24	***AWORTHLE***		1	1.610	.9334	.1495		Between Groups	1.928	1	1.928	2.211	.141
			2	1.904	.9343	.1296		Within Groups	77.627	89	.872		
			Total	1.778	.9402	.0986		Total	79.556	90			

1=male, 2=female

Table 46. Results of HSCL-24-A: Frequencies

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	.29	1	1.1	1.1	1.1
	1.00	1	1.1	1.1	2.2
	1.02	1	1.1	1.1	3.3
	1.04	2	2.2	2.2	5.5
	1.08	2	2.2	2.2	7.7
	1.13	5	5.5	5.5	13.2
	1.17	1	1.1	1.1	14.3
	1.21	3	3.3	3.3	17.6
	1.29	3	3.3	3.3	20.9
	1.33	2	2.2	2.2	23.1
	1.38	7	7.7	7.7	30.8
	1.42	3	3.3	3.3	34.1
	1.46	2	2.2	2.2	36.3
	1.50	1	1.1	1.1	37.4
	1.54	3	3.3	3.3	40.7
	1.58	6	6.6	6.6	47.3
	1.63	4	4.4	4.4	51.6
	1.65	1	1.1	1.1	52.7
	1.66	1	1.1	1.1	53.8
	1.70	1	1.1	1.1	54.9
	1.70	1	1.1	1.1	56.0
	1.71	3	3.3	3.3	59.3
	1.75	1	1.1	1.1	60.4
	1.79	2	2.2	2.2	62.6
	1.83	4	4.4	4.4	67.0
	1.88	5	5.5	5.5	72.5
	1.88	1	1.1	1.1	73.6
	1.92	2	2.2	2.2	75.8
	1.96	2	2.2	2.2	78.0
	2.00	1	1.1	1.1	79.1
	2.04	2	2.2	2.2	81.3
	2.08	3	3.3	3.3	84.6
	2.13	3	3.3	3.3	87.9
	2.17	2	2.2	2.2	90.1
	2.21	1	1.1	1.1	91.2
	2.29	1	1.1	1.1	92.3
	2.33	2	2.2	2.2	94.5
	2.67	1	1.1	1.1	95.6
	2.71	1	1.1	1.1	96.7
	2.75	1	1.1	1.1	97.8
	3.00	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
	3.74	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	91	100.0	100.0	

REFERENCES

Ascher, C. (1985). The social and psychological adjustment of Southeast Asian refugees. *The Urban Review, 17 (2)*, 147-52.

Bemak, F., & Chung, R. (1998). Vietnamese Amerasians: Predictors of self destructive behavior. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 76 (4)*, 452-58.

Bemak, F., Chung, R., & Pederson, P. (2003). *Counselling Refigees: A Psychosocial approach to innovative multicultural interventions.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Berry, J. W. (1986). The acculturation process and refugee behavior. In J. Westermeyer & C. L. Williams (Eds.), *Refugee mental health in resettlement countries* (pp. 35-56). Washington, D. C.: Hemisphere Publishing.

Berry, J. (1991). Managing the process of acculturation for problem prevention. In J. Westermeyer, C. Williams, & A. Nguyen (Eds.) *Mental health services for refugees* (DHHS publication ; no. ADM 91-1824). (pp. 189-204). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturation stress. *International Migration Review, 21 (3),* 491-511.

Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Vol. 37. Cross Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 201-34). Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Camarota, S. (2001). Immigrants in the United States. Center for Immigrant Studies, Washington DC. [On-line] Available: http://www.cis.org/2001/back101.html.

Carlson, E. & Rosser-Hogan, R. (1993). Mental health status of Cambodian refugees ten years after leaving their homes. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 63 (2)*, 223-31.

Denmark, F, Eisenberg, K., Heitner, E., & Holder, N. (2003). Immigration to the United States: the dream and reality. In Adler, L. & Gielen (Eds.), *U. Migration:*

Immigration and emigration in international perspective (pp. 73-104) Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers

Derogatis, L. R., Lipman, R. S., Rickels, K., Uhlenhuth, E.H., & Covi, L. (1974). The Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL): A self-report symptom inventory. *Behavioral Science.* 19(1), 1-15.

Eckblad, S., Ginsberg, B., Jannson, B., & Levi, L. (1994). Psychosocial and psychiatric aspects of refugee adaptation and care in Sweden. In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, & J. Orley (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain* (pp. 275-92). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Felsman, J. K., Leong, F., Johnson, M., & Fellsman, I. (1990). Estimates of psychological distress among Vietnamese refugees: Adolescents, unaccompanied minors and young adults. *Social Science and Medicine, 31 (11)*, 1251-56.

Gerber, L., Nguyen, Q., & Bounkeua, P. (1999). Working with Southeast Asian people who have migrated to the United States. In K. Nader, N. Dubrow, & B. Stamm (Eds.), *Honoring Differences: Cultural Issues in the Treatment of Trauma and Loss* (pp. 98-120). Ann Arbor, Edwards Brothers.

Graves, G. (2003). Post-Traumatic Stress Syndrome and related disorders among civilian victims of sexual trauma and exploitation in Southeast Asia. In S. Krippner & T. McIntyre (Eds.), *The Psychological impact of war trauma on civilians* (pp. 203-14. Westopt, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Hinton, W., Ladson, R., Du, N., Yung-Cheng, J., Tran, C., Newman, T., & Lu, F. (1992). *Screening for depression in Vietnamese refugees.* Boston: Harvard Medical School.

Huy, N. N. (1998). The Confucian incursion into Vietnam. In W. Slote & G. DeVos (Eds.), *Confucianism and the family* (pp. 91-104). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Institute for Psycho-Social Support (IPSR) (1993). Psychosocial support for Cambodia (draft proposal). Unpublished manuscript, Maastricht.

Jablonsky, A., Marsella, A., Ekblad, S., Jannsonn, B., Levi, L., & Bornemann, T. (1994). In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, J. Orley. (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain* (pp. 327-39). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Jeter, J. (2002, May 11). Graft partly to blame for African famine. Honolulu Advertiser, p. A2.

Khoa, L., & Van Deusen, J. (1981). Social and cultural customs: Their contribution to resettlement. *Journal of Refugee Resettlement, I,* 48-51.

Kinzie, D., Manson, S., Vinh, D., Tolan, N., Anh, B., & Ngoc, T. (1982). Development of a Vietnamese-language depression rating scale. American Journal of Psychiatry. Vol 139(10), Oct 1982, pp. 1276-1281.

Kinzie, J. D. (1981). Evaluation and psychotherapy of Indochinese refugee patients. *American Journal of Psychotherapy.* Vol 35(2), Apr 1981, pp. 251-261.

Krauss, R. (2002, May 11). Crueller Sea Encroaches on Atoll. Honolulu Advertiser, p. B 1.

Kraut, A. (1994). Historical aspects. In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, & J. Orley (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain.* (pp. 341-364). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association

Lee, E. (1988). Cultural factors in working with southeast Asian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescents, 11,* 167-79.

Leong, F., & Johnson, M. (1994). Mothers of Vietnamese Amerasians: Psychological distress and high-risk factors. *Asian American and Pacific Islander Journal of Health, 2 (1),* 31-46.

Liebkind, K. (1996). Acculturation and stress. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 27, (2),* 161-80.

Lim, K., Go, C., & Levensen, M. (1999). Acculturation and delinquency among Cambodian male adolescents. In W. Lonner & D. Dinnel, (Eds.), *Merging past, present, and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the Fourteenth International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology* (pp. 231-244). Bristol, PA: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.

Marsella, A. (1994). Ethnocultural diversity and international refugees. In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, & J. Orley (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain.* (pp. 341-64). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Marsella, A., Dubanoski, J., Hamada, W., & Morse, H. (2000). The measurement of personality across cultures. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44 (1)*, 41-62.

Marsella, A. J., & Ring, E. (2003). Human migration and immigration. In L. Adler & U. Gielen (Eds.), *Migration: Immigrants and emigration in international perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Marsella, A., & Yamada, A. (2000). Culture and mental health. In I. Cuellar & F. Paniagua (Eds.), *Multicultural mental health.* (pp. 22-44). London: Academic Press.

Marsella, A., Bornemann, T., Ekblad, S. & Orley, J. (1994). *Amidst peril and pain.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Marsella, A., Bornemann, T., Ekblad, S. & Orley, J. (1994). In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, & J. Orley (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain* (pp. 1-32). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Marsella, A. J., *et al* (2000). The measurement of personality across cultures: Historical, conceptual, and methodological issues and considerations. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44:* 41-62.

McKelvey, R., Mao, A., & Webb, J. (1993). Premigratory expectations and mental health symptomatology in a group of Vietnamese Amerasian youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry.* Vol 32(2), Mar 1993, pp. 414-418.

Meyer, J. (2003, Feb 12). FBI says al-Qaida Plans attacks. Honolulu Advertiser, p. A 1.

Miller, K.& Rasco, L. (2004). *The Mental Health of Refugees, Ecological Approaches to Healing and Adaptation.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mollica, R. (1994). Southeast Asian refugees: Migration history and mental health issues. In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, & J. Orley. (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain.* (pp. 83-100). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Mollica, R., Lavelle, J., & Khuon, F. (1985). Khmer widows at highest risk. Paper presented at Cambodian Mental Health Conference: a day to explore issues and alternate approaches to health care. New York.

Mollica, R. & Lavelle, J. (1988). Southeast Asian refugees. In L. Comas-Diaz, E. Griffith, & H. Ezra. (Eds), *Clinical guidelines in cross-cultural mental health. Wiley series in general and clinical psychiatry.* (pp. 262-93). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gerber, L., Nguyen, Q., & Bounkeua, K. (1999) "Working with South-east Asian Peoples." In K. Nader, N. Dubrow, & B. Stamm (eds.) *Cultural Issues in the Treatment of Trauma and Loss: Honoring Differences* (pp. 98-118) Philadelphia, PA, US: Brunner/Mazel, Inc.

Nakaso, D. (2002, May 11). Ex-refugee is living the American dream. Honolulu Advertiser, p. G1.

Nguyen, H., Messe, L., & Stollack, G. (1999). Toward a more complex understanding of adjustment and acculturation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30 (1)*, 5-31.

Oppeda, B., & Røysamb, E. (2004). *Mental health, life stress and social support among young Norwegian adolescents with immigrant and host national background. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 45 (2),* 131.

Orley, J. (1994). Clinical and epidemiological considerations. In A. Marsella, T. Bornemann, S. Ekblad, & J. Orley. (Eds.), *Amidst peril and pain* (pp. 193-206). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Phan, P. & Silove, D. (1997). The influence of culture on psychiatric assessment: the Vietnamese refugee. *Psychiatric Services 8 (1)*, 86-90.

Rubonis, A. & Bickman, L. (1991). Psychological impairment in the wake of disaster: The disaster-psychopathology relationship. *Psychological Bulletin 109*, 384-399.

Rumbaut, G. (1991). Migration, adaptation, and mental health. In H. Aldman (Ed.), *Refugee policy. Canada and the United States* (pp. 391-424). Toronto, Canada: York Lanes Press.

Staats, A. (1972). Language behavior therapy: A derivative of social behaviorism. Behavior Therapy, 3 (2), pp. 165-193.

Thai, N. (2002). Vietnamese youth gangs in Honolulu. Unpublished Masters of Arts Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Honolulu.

Tolbert, M. (2003). Census bureau releases next round of Census 2000 Data for up to 249 race/ethnic groups in Hawai'i. Washington, DC: U. S. Census Bureau Public Information Office.

Tu, W-M. (1998). Confucius and Confucianism. In W. Slote & G. DeVos (Eds.), *Confucianism and the family* (pp. 3-36). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

United States Committee for Refugees (2000). World refugee survey 2000. Washington DC. Author.

United States Committee for Refugees (2003). World refugee survey 2003. Washington DC. Author. 116, 135-36

Veterans With a Mission (2002) [Online] Available: http://www.vwam.com/vets/briefhis.htm.

Westermeyer, J. (1989). Causes and Precipitants. In J. Westermeyer (Ed.), *Mental health for refugees and other migrants: Social and preventative approaches.* (pp. 99-130). Springfiled, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Westermeyer, J. Vang, T. F., & Neider, J. (1983). Migration and mental health among Hmong refugees. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, 171*, 92-96.

World Health Organization, Division of Mental Health. (1987). *Care for the mentally ill: Components of mental health policies governing the proivision of psychiatric services*. Geneva: Author.

Yu, L. C. (1984). Acculturation and stress in Chinese families. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 15, (1)*, 77-94.

Yu, E. (1985). Studying Vietnamese refugees: Methodological lessons. In T. C. Owen (Ed.), *Transcultural Research, in Southeast Asian Mental Health*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Mental Health.