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This study examined possible contributing factors to Korean Americans’ levels of depression relating to their interethnic interaction and identity problems. The two types of identity gap--personal-enacted and personal-relational identity gaps--were introduced as the concept reflecting Korean Americans’ interethnic communication. Then, the hypothesized model, including a sequence of relationships from Korean Americans’ three situational variables of intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perceptions of racial hierarchy to the two types of identity gaps to their levels of depression, was formulated and tested. In addition, the mediation effects of the two types of identity gaps between the three situational variables and the levels of depression were checked. The results showed that all three situational variables predicted Korean Americans’ personal-relational identity gaps whereas only intercultural communication competence predicted their personal-enacted identity gaps. Both types of identity gap predicted their levels of depression. Also, Korean Americans’ middleperson status and perceptions of racial hierarchy had direct effects on their reported levels of depression. The personal-relational identity gap significantly mediated the effects of all three situational variables on levels of depression. However, the personal-enacted identity gap mediated only the effect of intercultural communication competence on levels of depression.
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CHAPTER 1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The American dream is sweet enough to attract people from all over the world. Koreans are no exception, and many of them cross the Pacific in pursuit of better lives in the United States. However, the American dream might not be easy for Korean Americans\(^1\) to achieve. As a relatively new immigrant group in the United States,\(^2\) Korean Americans may face various challenges while resettling in the new environment. They may have to overcome language barriers, struggle for jobs, adapt to an ethnically diverse society, deal with a racialized social atmosphere, and so on. If Korean Americans cannot handle these challenges successfully, their dreams of better lives in America will begin to fade.

Whether Korean Americans cope with the various challenges successfully or not may be indicated by their mental-health status. A number of studies report that Korean Americans’ mental health is not in good status. Their levels of depression tend to be higher than other ethnic groups’ in the United States (Hurh & Kim, 1990; Kuo, 1984; Lin et al., 1992). Considering Korean Americans’ levels of depression as an indicator of their overall well-being in the United States, this study addresses the factors that may be responsible for Korean Americans’ levels of depression.

---

\(^1\) Korean Americans are defined as Korean immigrants in the United States, descendents of Korean immigrants, or Koreans who reside in the United States for immigration purpose.

\(^2\) Asians’ immigration to the United States was banned by the 1924 Immigration Act until it was repealed by the 1965 Immigration Act. Significant immigration of Koreans to the United States started after the 1965 Immigration Act.
Among numerous possible contributing factors to Korean Americans' levels of depression--for example, long working time, underemployment, and relatively lower social position in comparison to reference groups in Korea (Kuo, 1984; Hurh & Kim, 1990; Nah, 1993)--this study focuses on Korean Americans’ identities in their interaction with other ethnic group members, such as European Americans, African Americans, and Latinos/as. For Korean Americans who are from an ethnically homogeneous country and, thus, lack previous exposure to ethnically diverse environment, interaction with other ethnic group members in American society may pose difficulties. These problems can lead to Korean Americans’ identity problems because, according to the Communication Theory of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht, Collier, & Ribeau, 1993; Hecht, Jackson, & Ribeau, 2003), interaction is directly related to identity. These identity problems in interethnic interaction may further influence Korean Americans’ levels of depression. To date, however, there has been little research focusing on identity issues as contributing factors to level of depression. This study represents a step toward improving the situation.

In addition, Korean Americans’ identity problems in their interethnic interaction may also be affected by their unique situational characteristics. Therefore, situational factors were another focus of the study.

The Problem of Korean Americans’ Levels of Depression

As mentioned above, Korean Americans’ levels of depression are higher than those of other ethnic groups in the United States (see Table 1.1). In Kuo's study (1984) in Seattle area, Korean Americans showed higher levels of depression than other comparison groups. Korean Americans' mean CES-D (Center for Epidemiologic Studies
Depression Scale) score was 14.7 compared to 6.93 for Chinese Americans, 7.30 for Japanese Americans, and 9.72 for Filipino Americans. In Hurh and Kim's (1990) study in the Chicago area, Korean Americans’ mean score of CES-D was 12.6. Lin et al., (1992) also found Korean Americans’ average CES-D score to be 12.64 in their study of the Los Angeles area. Although this score was lower than the one in Kuo's study, it was still higher than the one for any other Asian American group. Furthermore, the CES-D scores of Korean Americans across studies were higher than the mean scores for European American samples, which ranged from 7.96 to 9.25, and the mean scores for African American and Latino/a samples, which ranged from 9.49 to 11.71 (Frerichs, Aneshensel, & Clark, 1981; Radloff, 1977; Vernon, Roberts, & Lee, 1982). Korean Americans' levels of depression, then, tend to be notably higher than those of other ethnic groups in the United States.

| Table 1.1. Comparison of Korean Americans’ Levels of Depression with Other Ethnic Groups |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Korean Americans                | Other Asians Americans          | African Americans               | Latino/as                       | European Americans              |
| CES-D Scores                    | 12.6-14.7                       | 6.9-9.7                         | 9.5-10.1                        | 10.1-11.7                       | 8.0-9.3                         |

Keifer et al. (1985) reported that elderly Korean Americans in the San Francisco Bay area experienced serious psychological stress after their immigration to the United States. In comparison to a matched sample of European Americans, elderly Korean
Americans had more negative self-concepts and higher levels of somatic symptoms. Kiefer et al. (1985) explained that higher levels of somatic symptoms are signs of attempts to defend against depression, which indicates that Korean American elderly people’s psychological stress is probably related to their depression.

Hwa-Byung is a Korean folk illness, which has somatic and psychological symptoms. Its literal meaning is "anger illness." Chronically bearing and suppressing anger reportedly causes the disease. In Lin et al.’s (1992) study of this Korean folk illness among Korean Americans in Los Angeles area, 11.9% of the sample suffered from Hwa-Byung compared to 4.3% of Koreans living in South Korea (Min, Namkoong, & Lee, 1990). Lin et al. (1992) also found that the symptoms of Hwa-Byung significantly overlapped the symptoms of DSM-III major depression and suggested that Hwa-Byung may be a cultural variation of depression.

From the results of the empirical studies examined above, it seems that Korean Americans undergo relatively more depression-related psychological ill-being in comparison to other ethnic groups in the United States, as well as Koreans in South Korea. As an indicator of Korean Americans’ psychological ill-being and, furthermore, their possible uneasy lives in American society, their high levels of depression are a problem that seems to need investigation.

Korean Americans’ Identity Problems in Interethnic Interaction

Korean Americans’ identity problems emerging in their interethnic interaction may provide a clue for understanding their levels of depression. Identity issues in communication are the focal point of the Communication Theory of Identity. According
to this theory, identity and communication are directly related (Hecht, 1993; Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003). Identity is formed, maintained, and changed through communication. In turn, communication is an enactment of identities. Possible identity problems related to communication are indicated in the four layers of identity addressed in the Communication Theory of Identity.

The four layers of identity are personal, relational, enacted, and communal (Hecht, 1993; Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003) and serve as the loci of identity. Identity exists in an individual, in his/her relationships with others, in his/her communicative behavior and messages, and in the groups to which he/she belongs. These four aspects of identity are interrelated but may not be consistent with each other. In the process, or as a result of communication, discrepancies can arise between and among different layers of identity—for example, the discrepancy between the personal and the relational layers, or the discrepancy between the personal and the enacted layers. These discrepancies between different aspects of identity define the concept of “identity gap” in this study. Identity gaps, especially between the personal and the relational layers, and between the personal and the enacted layers, seem likely in the process, or as a result, of communication.

The personal layer of identity is an individual’s self-concept, self-view, or self-image (Hecht, 1993; Hecht et al., 1993). This layer is a personal aspect of identity and constituted “personal identity” in this study. The relational layer of identity develops under influence of interaction partners in communication. How an individual’s interaction partner views the individual is reflected in their communication. This
reflection is internalized as the individual’s identity in the relational layer. In this study, the term “ascribed relational identity” applies to this layer. The identity in the enacted layer is an individual’s expressed self in communication with others and called “enacted identity.”

An individual’s personal identity can be different from his/her ascribed relational identity. How an individual views him/herself may not be same as how others view the person. Accordingly, it is likely that one’s self-view is different from the individual’s perception of how others see him or her. This discrepancy represents the “personal-relational identity gap.”

An individual’s personal identity also can differ from his/her enacted identity. In other words, an individual’s expressed self in communication can be different from his/her self in his/her mind. The definition of “personal-enacted identity gap” is the discrepancy between an individual’s self-view and the same individual’s enactment of self in communication with others.

Identity gaps are results of communication. They almost always accompany communication. When communication occurs, some degrees of identity gaps are inevitable. An individual can detect how his/her communication partners view him/her through communication, and subsequently the personal-relational identity gap opens. The personal-enacted identity gap also arises in communication because a person cannot always express the same self as who he/she really is in communication.

Korean Americans’ identity problems involve gaps of the type noted. As relatively recent immigrants from an ethnically homogeneous society, Korean Americans
may experience difficulties in their interethnic relations (Min, 1995). In the interaction with other ethnic group members, Korean Americans may feel that there are large gaps between how they view themselves and how members of other ethnic groups view them. They may also feel a need to restrict expressing their real selves to avoid conflict with members of other ethnic group or may lack the ability to express themselves effectively in their interaction with those people.

A number of studies suggest that these gaps may contribute to depression although the influence has not been directly determined (Coyne, 1976; Gardner & Price, 1999; Higgins, 1987; Higgins, Klein, & Strauman, 1985; Hyland, 1987; Jack, 1991; Lewinsohn, 1974). This possible connection needs further investigation.

Situational Problems

As noted above, identity gaps are the result of communication. Communication is influenced by the social situations in which it occurs. Korean Americans are in a relatively situation in the United States as a relatively recent immigrant group. This can influence their interethnic interaction and subsequently the identity gaps they experience. Thus, another task of this study was to identify situational factors that can influence Korean Americans’ identity gaps. Following are the situational issues of Korean Americans’

*Intercultural Communication Competence*

Korean Americans may have problems in knowing how to communicate with members of other ethnic groups. That is, they may be lacking in intercultural communication competence, which, in turn, fosters the development of identity gaps. For
instance, Korean Americans perceive English as a major obstacle in their lives in the United States (Hurh & Kim, 1990; Kuo, 1984; Kuo & Tsai, 1986; Nah, 1993). They feel that their English proficiency is limited. This affects how they interact with members of other ethnic groups and may create identity gaps in interethnic interaction.

Korean Americans’ limited interethnic experiences prior to their immigration to the United States also may influence their interethnic communication competence. Korea is an ethnically homogeneous country. Most of Korean-born Korean Americans usually did not have many interethnic or intercultural experiences in Korea prior to immigration to the United States (Min, 1995). This lack of previous intercultural experience can adversely affect Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence, result in difficulties in their interethnic interaction in the United States, and produce identity gaps.

Atkins and Gim (1989) determined that Korean Americans’ levels of acculturation in the United States are lower than those of Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans. Korean Americans have less knowledge about main stream American culture, as well as other ethnic groups. Lack of knowledge about other ethnic groups’ cultural and communication practices can contribute to Korean Americans’ limited intercultural communication competence and affect their identity gaps in interethnic interaction.

**Middleperson Status**

Korean Americans’ social position as middleperson minority in American society may be another situational issue that influences Korean Americans’ identity gaps.

---

3 To avoid gendered terminology, “middleperson” replaced the original terminology, “middleman.”
in interethnic interaction. Due to the language barrier and exclusionary tendencies in mainstream American job markets for immigrants, Korean immigrants have difficulty in securing jobs in the United States (Min, 1990). As a result, a majority of Korean Americans are involved in middleperson occupations that intermediate dominant groups and other marginalized groups. A significant portion of Korean Americans runs small business in low-income minority group areas or are employed by the Korean-American-owned small business that distribute products manufactured by dominant groups to marginalized groups (Min, 1995). As a middleperson minority group, Korean Americans face both discrimination by dominant groups and rejection by other marginalized groups (Min, 1995). Such discrimination and rejection are likely to influence how Korean Americans interact with such groups and may contribute to identity gaps.

Perception of Racial Hierarchy

Korean Americans’ identity gaps are influenced not only by the characteristics of their situation but also by the atmosphere of American society. One of the most salient social-environmental characteristics in American society is the presence of racial hierarchy. In American society, African Americans often are perceived to be at the bottom while European Americans are perceived to be at the top, with all other groups of people positioned in-between (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997; Keith & Hearing, 1991; Kim, 1999; McDaniel, 1995; Telles & Murguia, 1990). People’s social positions, relations, and behavior are affected by this racial hierarchy.

Korean Americans are racially categorized as Asian and positioned lower than European Americans and higher than Latinos/as and African Americans (Kim, 1999).
According to the hierarchy, Korean Americans’ perception of the racial hierarchy may result in the formation of different attitudes and behavior toward different ethnic groups in interethnic interaction. Their varying forms of interethnic interaction resulting from racial hierarchy may be a source of interethnic relational problems and create identity gaps.

In summary, Korean Americans appear to have relatively high levels of depression. Such depression may be related to personal-relational and personal-enacted identity gaps that develop in their interethnic interaction. These gaps come about as a result of Korean Americans’ limited intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perceptions of racial hierarchy. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the situational factors and the identity gaps as contributing factors to Korean Americans’ levels of depression. For this purpose, first, the concept of the two types of identity gaps--personal-relational and personal-enacted identity gaps--was delineated as reflecting Korean Americans’ interethnic interaction. Second, the relationships between Korean Americans’ three situational factors of interethnic communication competence, middleperson status, and perception of racial hierarchy, and the two types of identity gaps, as well as the relationships between the two types of identity gaps and Korean Americans’ levels of depression were examined. Third, the mediation functions of the two types of identity gaps between the situational factors and the levels of depression were checked.

The following chapters (a) provide a review of pertinent scholarly literature and a hypothesized model based on the review of literature; (b) delineate procedures used to
test the hypothesized model; (c) report the results of statistical analyses applied in testing the hypothesized model; and (d) interpret and discuss the results.

Chapter 2 is a review of literature relevant to interethnic communication competence, middleperson minority, racial hierarchy in American society, identity and identity gaps, depression, and relationships between identity gaps and depression. It culminates with a model illustrating the hypothesized interconnections among the variables that the study subsequently tested.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF PREVIOUS SCHOLARLY LITERATURE

This study is an investigation of factors contributing to Korean Americans’ levels of depression. The study focuses on Korean Americans’ identity gaps emerging in their interethnic interaction and their situational issues. The major concepts examined in this chapter are depression, identity and identity gaps, and Korean Americans’ situational characteristics as they relate to Korean Americans’ identity gaps in interethnic interaction. First, the situational factors are discussed. This discussion includes Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence, their middleperson status, and their perceptions of racial hierarchy in American society, as well as their relationships to identity gaps. Second, characteristics of identity, theories of identity that focus on relationships between an individual and society, and identity gaps are examined. Third, concepts relating to depression are clarified by discussing classifications of depression, risk factors for depression, and psychological theories of depression. Fourth is a discussion of relationships between depression and identity gaps. Finally, growing from these discussions is a hypothesized model indicating the relationships among the situational and environmental factors, Korean Americans’ identity gaps in interethnic interaction, and their levels of depression.

Situational Factors

Korean Americans’ identity gaps in interethnic interaction seem to be influenced by the situational issues they face in American society. Korean Americans’ limited intercultural communication competence, social status as middle persons, and perceptions
of racial hierarchy in American society ostensibly are the factors that can influence their identity gaps in interethnic interaction.

*Korean Americans’ Intercultural Communication Competence*

Intercultural communication competence refers to “knowledge, motivation, and skills to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures” (Wiseman, 2002, p. 208). As suggested by this definition, criteria for evaluating intercultural communication include “effectiveness” and “appropriateness” (Hecht, 1978; Martin, 1993; Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Spitzberg & Hecht, 1984; Wiseman, 2002). Effective intercultural communication occurs when an individual achieves his/her goal in intercultural communication. Wiseman (2002) explains that one can attain a desired goal by controlling and manipulating his/her social environment. To control and manipulate social environment, an individual needs abilities to identify goals, assess necessary resources to gain the goals, predict his/her communication partner’s responses, select relevant communicative strategies, enact the strategies, and evaluate results of communication.

Appropriate intercultural communication is communicative behavior and messages that meet expectations in a given situation (Hecht, 1978; Martin, 1993; Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Spitzberg & Hecht, 1984; Wiseman, 2002). To be appropriate, an individual needs to demonstrate an understanding of the expectations for acceptable communicative behavior in a given situation. Thus, one has to be familiar with applicable communication rules and avoid violating them.
Knowledge, motivation, and skills all are the necessary conditions for competent intercultural communication (Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984). Knowledge refers to awareness of necessary information and actions for competent intercultural communication (Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Wiseman, 2002). According to Wiseman (2002), the necessary information and action include other-culture group members’ communication rules, contexts, and normative expectations controlling interactions. Lack of such knowledge may lead to misattributions, choosing inadequate communication strategies, transgressing rules of etiquette, or loosing face. Sensitivity to others’ responses and open-mindedness to others’ responses are necessary to obtain the knowledge.

Motivation involves feelings, intentions, needs, and desires to participate in intercultural communication (Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Wiseman, 2002). Anxiety, attraction, perceived social distance, ethnocentrism, prejudice, and stereotypes affect an individual’s motivation to communicate with people from different cultures. An individual’s negative feelings or ideas, such as prejudices, fears, dislikes, and anxieties concerning other cultures, may reduce the individual’s motivation to participate in intercultural communication. On the other hand, an individual’s positive feelings or ideas, such as interests, likes, confidence, and curiosity about other cultures may increase his/her motivation to engage in intercultural communication. Hence, efforts to remove negative ideas and gain positive ones toward other cultures are essential for increasing motivation for intercultural communication competence (Wiseman, 2002).
Skills refer to actual communicative behavior that is repeatable and goal-oriented, and regarded as appropriate and effective in intercultural interaction (Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Wiseman, 2002). Accidental performance of competent communicative behavior is not a reflection of skills. When an individual can repeat same kind of behavior appropriately and effectively for the same kind of purpose with the same outcome, the repeatable behavior is a skill. Skills also contribute to achieving communication goals. Skills without goals may be useless. To develop repeatable and goal-oriented skills, training may be necessary.

As portrayed, competent intercultural communication refers to appropriately and effectively enacted communicative behavior reflecting knowledge of communication in other cultures, motivation for intercultural communication, and possession of relevant skills. Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence, then, should be evaluated by how effectively and appropriately they interact with other ethnic group members. Also, it should be determined by whether they have enough knowledge about other ethnic groups, enough motivation to communicate with other ethnic group members, and enough skills to perform the communication with other ethnic group members competently.

There may be two factors that can influence Korean Americans’ communication competence with other ethnic group members. These two factors are English proficiency and levels of acculturation. Deficiencies in both seem to emanate from Korean Americans’ relatively recent immigration to the United States. Korean Americans are one of the most recent immigrant groups in the United States. Since the Immigration Act
1965, the number of Korean immigrants increased dramatically. The annual number of Koreans’ immigrating to the United States peaked in late 1980s and early 1990s. In the 1990 census, Korean Americans numbered 798,849 compared to 69,130 in the 1970 census. The number of Korean Americans reached 1,063,247 in the 2000 census. The recency of Korean Americans’ immigration is also indicated in the high percentage of Korean-born Korean Americans, which is 73% (Kim & Grant, 1996). The recency of Korean Americans’ immigration may account for their relatively limited English proficiency and low levels of acculturation to American culture in many instances.

For many immigrants from non English-speaking countries, English is one of the most challenging problems the immigrants confront in the United States (Kosmin, 1990; Nishimoto & Chau, 1988). Korean Americans are no exception. Their limited English proficiency is an obstacle in adapting to American society (Hurh & Kim, 1990; Kuo, 1984; Kou & Tsai, 1986; Nah, 1993). It can arouse fear and anxiety about communication and, thus, reduce motivation to communicate with other ethnic group members. With limited English proficiency, Korean Americans have more difficulties in developing adequate communication skills for interethnic communication. Without motivation and skills, Korean Americans cannot communicate effectively and appropriately with other ethnic group members.

The other factor that can influence Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence is Korean Americans’ levels of acculturation to American society. In Atkins and Gim’s (1989) study, a Korean American sample’s levels of acculturation to mainstream American culture was lower than those of other Asian
American groups, such as Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans. In addition, Kim (1993) notes that Korean Americans’ levels of acculturation to other minority groups in the United States may be lower than their level of acculturation to mainstream American culture because of Euro-centric cultural practices in American society. Stewart’s (1993) study indicates that Korean Americans and African Americans, for example, are not very much aware of each other’s culture. If Korean Americans are not familiar with other ethnic groups’ cultures and, thus, do not have knowledge about other ethnic groups’ communication rules and expectations governing interaction, they are not likely to be motivated to engage in interethnic communication. This serves as an obstacle for developing relevant communicative skills with other ethnic group members.

Korean Americans’ limited English proficiency and low levels of acculturation to cultures of other ethnic groups may contribute to incompetence in their interethnic communication. Korean Americans’ less competent communication with other ethnic group members can contribute to other ethnic group members’ misunderstanding Korean Americans. Other ethnic group members’ misunderstanding of Korean Americans can lead to differences between other ethnic group members’ views of Korean Americans and Korean Americans’ self-views. Thus, Korean Americans’ limited competence in interethnic communication may contribute to occurrence of gaps between their personal and relational identities. Korean Americans’ limited competence in interethnic communication also may influence Korean Americans’ self-expression in interethnic communication and, thus, create gaps between their personal and enacted identities.
Korean Americans’ Social Position as a Middleperson Minority

Another distinct characteristic of Korean Americans is their social position as a middleperson minority in American society. A middleperson minority has three referents (Zenner, 1991). First, a middleperson minority refers to an ethnic group whose members are engaged disproportionately in trade and finance. Second, a middleperson minority is a buffering group between dominant classes and subordinate classes. Third, an ethnic group whose significant numbers of members are self-employed petit bourgeois, such as small business owners or working in family-owned small business, is a middleperson minority. This third definition is especially useful for the studies of immigrants or ethnically based enterprises (Zenner, 1991).

Bonacich (1973) identified two characteristics of middleperson minorities. First, the society in which such groups reside is characterized by a “status gap,” or a marked division between dominant and marginalized groups. Middleperson minorities fall between dominant and marginalized groups in a society with status gaps and function as a buffer for dominant groups bearing marginalized groups’ hostility toward dominant groups. Second, these minorities experience a “hostile reaction of surrounding society to the cultural (including religious) and/or racial distinctiveness of these groups” (Bonacich, 1973, p. 583). Members of a middleperson minority group tend to be excluded from desirable jobs and forced to make a living in marginal areas. Such group members’ acquisition of a certain degree of wealth is explained as the results of their sustained efforts to escape or overcome the discriminatory environment. There are three possible
sources that arouse hostility of other group members, including both dominant and marginalized groups.

According to Bonacich (1973), middleperson minorities face other ethnic groups’ hostility because they compete with other groups for clientele, business, and labor. First, there is fundamental conflict of interest between a seller (merchant) and a buyer (customer). Since middleperson group members are usually in small businesses, mostly retail businesses, they usually sell products to other marginalized group members. Because of inherently conflictive merchant-customer relationships, a middleperson minority group can incur difficulties with other marginalized groups. As retail business owners, members of a middleperson minority group also buy products from dominant group wholesalers. This merchant-customer relationship also can lead to conflicts. These fundamental conflicts of merchant-customer relationships are sources of other groups’ hostility toward middleperson groups.

Second, middleperson groups, usually newly immigrated groups, have to compete with other groups for business. Other groups’ businesses usually predate the middleperson minorities’ businesses, and the other groups, therefore, tend to be threatened by middleperson groups’ newly established firms. The competition in business leads to conflicts with other groups and eventually other groups’ hostility.

Third, middleperson group members also can provide cheap and loyal labor and compete in these respects with other groups. This competition in the labor market may bring out other groups’ hostility. Middleperson groups buffer status gaps in society, but
they face hostility from other groups because of conflicts with other groups for clientele, business, and labor.

Korean Americans in American society tend to have these characteristics. They play the intermediate role of running small business in low-income minority group areas (Bonacich & Jung, 1982; Min, 1990; Waldinger, 1989). In a Los Angeles area study, 47.5% of Korean Americans were self-employed, and 27.6% were employed by Korean-American-owned businesses (Min, 1989). Although these numbers include a sizable proportion of Korean-American-owned businesses that are run for Korean American customers, most Korean-American-owned businesses serve other, low-income minority groups. Other studies also indicate that Korean Americans in other areas have similar employment patterns (Kim, 1981; Kim & Hurh, 1985; Min, 1992). In addition, socio-economical status places them between the dominant group, European Americans, and the marginalized groups, African Americans and Latinos/as. According to a report of U. S. Bureau of Census in 2000, Korean Americans' median family income ($41,994) lies between European Americans ($44,687), and African Americans ($29,423) or Latinos/as ($33,676). Korean Americans’ socioeconomical position reinforces their middleperson status in American society.

As a middleperson minority, Korean Americans may experience unfriendliness from both the dominant and the marginalized groups. According to Min (1995), middleperson groups that take intermediate roles between dominant groups and marginalized groups are usually subject to discrimination by dominant groups and rejection or hostility by other marginalized groups. In addition to overall prejudices and
discrimination toward new immigrant groups and Asian Americans by the dominant group, Korean Americans encounter more targeted discrimination. For example, Korean American retailers face unfair treatment by European American suppliers and landlords in respect to quality of merchandise, speed of delivery, price, and parking allocation, rent, and so on (Min, 1990).

Korean American retailers also encounter hostility and rejection from other minority groups, especially African Americans. Their ownerships of retail shops in low-income African American areas raise the typical merchant-customer conflicts between the two groups. The merchant-customer conflict may be more serious when customers and merchants are racially different, and the merchants are new immigrants and the customers are native-born (Weitzer, 1997). Korean American retailers in low-income African American neighborhood usually have relatively higher socioeconomic status than their African American customers. Low-income customers who contribute to middleperson merchants’ relatively higher economic status tend to be envious of the merchants’ economic well-being (Weitzer, 1997; Yook, Albert, & Ha, 1998). The envy may contribute to African Americans’ negative attitudes toward the new Asian immigrants, who do not even speak English well. Thus, many African Americans develop negative stereotypes of Korean Americans, describing them as materialistic, workaholics, interlopers, and money crazies who economically exploit the African American community (Weitzer, 1997). These negative stereotypes, in turn, may contribute to African Americans' unfriendliness toward Korean Americans.
Although there are few studies addressing the relationship between Korean-Americans and Latinos/as, the employer-employee relationship may provide a clue for how to approach to the former. Korean American retailers prefer to employ Latinos/as to African Americans because of lower wages and relatively less cultural distance (Park, 1995). As a result, Latino/a workers in Korean Americans small businesses are common. However, Latino/a employees often complain about harsh working conditions and impolite treatment in Korean American stores (Park, 1995). Latinos/as’ unpleasant experiences as employees at Korean-American-owned workplaces, in turn, can result in Latinos/as’ negative attitudes and unfriendliness toward Korean Americans.

As a middleperson minority, Korean Americans often confront discriminatory and rejecting attitudes as well as negative stereotypes. Because of these negative attitude and stereotypes, Korean Americans’ portrayals by other ethnic group members may be different from their own self-portrayals. Also, because of other ethnic group members’ unfriendly attitudes, Korean Americans may not feel comfortable in expressing their authentic selves in their interaction with members of other ethnic groups. Thus, Korean Americans’ middleperson minority status can influence the gaps between personal and relational identities, as well as personal and enacted identities in the interactions with members of other ethnic group.

*Korean Americans’ Perception of Racial Hierarchy in American Society*

In addition to the Korean Americans’ unique situational characteristics, the social atmosphere of the United States also can influence their interethnic interactions and subsequently the emergence of identity gaps in the interactions. The United States has
long history of racism, which is still widespread in both individual and institutional forms (McLemore & Romo, 1998). As a result, a racial hierarchy has formed in American society. People having African-like physical features and a dark skin color tend to be placed at the bottom of hierarchy, whereas those with Caucasian physical features tend to be at the top. All other groups may fall somewhere in-between (Bashi & McDaniel, 1997; Keith & Hering, 1991; Kim, 1999; McDaniel, 1995; Telles & Murguia, 1990). In this social atmosphere, new immigrants tend to be assigned to a racial category, such as Hispanic and Asian, placed in the American racial hierarchy, and forced to assimilate to an assigned racial category (McDaniel, 1995).

Asian Americans’ are racially positioned between European Americans and African Americans. This position is reinforced by racial triangulation vis-à-vis European Americans and African Americans (Kim, 1999). According to Kim (1999), racial triangulation occurs through “relative valorization” and “civic ostracism.” In the process of relative valorization, “dominant group A (Whites) valorize subordinate group B (Asian Americans) relative to subordinate group C (Blacks) on cultural and/or racial grounds in order to dominate both groups, but especially the latter” (p. 108). Civic ostracism is the process by which “dominant group A (Whites) constructs subordinate group B (Asian Americans) as immutably foreign and inassimilable with Whites on cultural and/or racial grounds in order to ostracize them from body politic and civic membership” (p. 108). Through triangulation, Asian Americans are placed in a better position than African Americans but are not allowed to cross the border separating them from European
Americans. Rather, triangulated Asian Americans seem to be used by European Americans to control African Americans.

An example of valorization of Asian Americans is “model minority” myth. Many European American opinion leaders refer to Asian Americans as a model minority, whose members have shown notable success in American society with their cultural value of diligence, family solidarity, respect for education, and self-sufficiency (Kim, 1999). However, the model minority myth exaggerates Asian Americans’ success, homogenizes diverse Asian American ethnic groups, and obscures discrimination against Asian Americans. Furthermore, the model minority myth implies criticism of and/or intention to control African Americans. European Americans’ attempts to attribute African Americans’ social ill-being to their own faults underlie the model minority myth. Thus, eventually, the model minority myth may serve to reduce African Americans’ complaints concerning social inequality and, thereby, contribute to justifying a European American dominant social system.

European Americans’ ostracism of Asian Americans is evident in the results of social distance studies, which measure peoples’ feelings of hostility toward different racial and ethnic groups. In these studies, Asian and Asian American groups are perceived as socially distant groups by Americans--mostly European Americans (Bogardus, 1967; Owen, Eisner, & McFaul, 1981). In the studies of social distance between Americans and other ethnic or racial groups in 1926, 1946, 1956, 1966, and 1977, all Asian and Asian-American groups consistently ranked between 20 and 30 among 30 ethnic groups. In particular, Koreans ranked 29th, 27th, 30th, 27th and 30th in the
surveys. These consistently low rankings indicate that European Americans do not feel close to Asians and Asian Americans and do not want to involve them broadly in their society. European Americans seem to strategically valorize Asian Americans to control other marginalized ethnic groups, but, at the same time, they also seem to try to ostracize Asian Americans from their social territory.

As a group whose racial position appears to lie between the dominant group and the other marginalized groups, Korean Americans can have relatively complex racial relations. Frustration and Aggression Theory (Dollard, Miller, Doob, Mowerer, & Sears, 1974) provides a clue concerning why this is. The basic idea of Frustration and Aggression Theory is that suppressed frustration of members of a group leads to aggression toward outgroup members, usually other minority group members (Berkowitz, 1965, 1989; Catalano, Novaco, & McConnell, 2002; Dollard et al., 1974). Applying this hypothesis to Korean Americans’ relationships with African Americans and Latinos/as, discriminated and marginalized low-income African Americans and Latinos/as’ frustration in European American dominant society may lead to the formation of negative attitudes and aggressive behavior toward Korean Americans, who are valorized over them, but are also politically weak. In turn, Korean Americans’ frustration resulting from dominant group’s ostracism may be expressed in negative and aggressive behavior in their interaction with African Americans and Latinos/as, who are positioned socio-economically lower than they are. Relationships between Korean Americans and African Americans or Latinos/as can be influenced by the European Americans’ discrimination. The dominant group’s discrimination and prejudice can be sources of problems, not only
in the relationships between the dominant group and the minority groups, but also in the relationships between the minority groups.

In racially hierarchical society, Korean Americans can be valorized, ostracized, frustrated, and aggressive. As a result, they can have problems in their interethnic relations. Their problems with both the dominant group and other minority groups can contribute to the identity gaps in their interethnic interaction. Korean Americans cannot expect appraisals that match their self-views from the ostracizing dominant group members and other aggressive minority groups' members. They also may not feel comfortable in presenting their authentic selves to members of groups with exclusive and/or unfriendly attitudes toward them. Hence, racial hierarchy in American society can influence Korean Americans’ identity gaps between personal and relational identities, as well as personal and enacted identities in their interethnic interaction.

**Identity and Identity Gaps**

Identity involves objectified, multiple aspects of self (Hogg, Terry, & White, 1995). That is, identity is reflective self-conceptions or self-images that derive from various contexts, such as culture, ethnicity, gender, age, occupation, and the like (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Identity, which is engaged in various contexts, emerges in various forms and levels and has a variety of characteristics. According to Hecht et al. (1993), identity has three paired characteristics: enduring and changing, content and relationship, and individual and social. Among these three pairs of characteristics of identity, the individual and social pair may be relatively more closely related to depression because they integrate individual or internal processes and social-relational or social-
environmental aspects of identity just as depression is caused by problems with both intrapersonal cognitive process and social relations.

Social Identity Theory and Identity Theory deal with the relationship between individual and social aspects of identity. Focusing on communication, the Communication Theory of Identity seems to integrate the perspectives of Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory in respect to individual-social relationships. By focusing on communication to characterize identity, one can detect identity gaps emerging in interaction. This section describes the characteristics of identity, the theories of identity addressing individual and social aspects of identity, and the identity gaps emerging in communication.

**Characteristics of Identity**

As mentioned above, Hecht (Hecht, 1993; Hecht et al. 1993; Hecht et al., 2003) has examined identity from a dialectical perspective and identified three pairs of characteristics relating to it. Identity is temporally enduring and, at the same time, constantly changing. Identity has content and also reflects an individual’s relationships. Identity belongs to an individual and, at the same time, is a social product.

*Enduring vs. Changing*

Turner (1968) pointed out the characteristic of constant change and temporal consistency of identity. Slugoski and Ginsburg (1989) call this “the paradox of personal identity” (p. 36). Hecht et al. (1993) explain that the enduring aspect of identity is the overall, central image of self. Specific identities manifested at specific times and in specific situations are the changing aspects of identity. An individual’s concept of self
changes as a function of time and situation. Yet, an overall consistent self still exists while integrating or penetrating ever-changing temporal and situational self-concepts. For example, an individual’s self-concepts when she/he is 10 years old, when she/he is 30 years old, and when she/he is 70 years old may be different. However, the individual is recognizable as a same person, regardless of age. There is continuity among the selves of 10, 30, and 70 years old while contents of self-concepts are varying across the ages. The different self-concepts at different ages are the changing aspect of identity. The continuity of selves that tie different selves into one consistent self is the enduring part of identity. These two aspects of identity seem to be contradictory but not mutually exclusive. They dialectically coexist in identity.

Content vs. Relationship

Identity has both content (meaning) and relationship aspects. According to Watzlawick, Beavin, and Jackson (1967), messages imply both meanings and relational considerations. For example, when a person says “I am a teacher” to a new acquaintance, the message involves the meaning of a teacher (content)--a person who instructs others--and also implicates the person’s relationships with his/her students as a teacher, such as his/her authority or responsibilities related to the specific students to whom s/he is speaking. In this example, the meaning of a teacher tends to be consistent, regardless of the situation, whereas the teacher’s relationships with students vary as a function of the situation. An individual’s identity, according to Hecht et al. (1993), is enacted through messages s/he uses in communication. Thus, messages reflect a communicator’s identity. Hence, identity also has content and relational dimensions. In the example above, when a
person thinks that s/he is a teacher, this person’s identity as a teacher involves the usual meaning of teacher, as well as the relationships with his/her students.

**Individual vs. Social**

Individual and social characteristics are the third pair of characteristics of identity that Hecht et al. (1993) identified. An individual lives as a member of social groups and cannot be separated from the social environment. At the same time, an individual is a unique unit in a social group that is distinguishable from other group members. An individual is characterized by collective features of a group or category to which he/she belongs and, at the same time, by idiosyncratic, specific personal attributes (Deschamps & Devos, 1998). In short, a person’s identity can be divided into the person’s social relations and individual attributes (Hecht et al., 1993).

Social aspects of identity or social identity are a part of self, which is determined by social ecological positions (Sarbin & Allen, 1968). People who are in similar social ecological positions, with common backgrounds, or in the same group have similar social identities. An individual perceives him/herself as similar to people in the same group and different from other group members (Deschamps & Devos, 1998; Turner, 1987). Thus, social identity is based on ingroup similarities and intergroup differentiation that develop through ingroup and intergroup interaction.

On the other hand, more personal, idiosyncratic, and specific attributes of an individual constitute the personal aspect of identity or personal identity. The unique characteristics that make the individual different from others reflect personal identity. Personal identity refers to “the fact that the individual perceives himself as identical
himself; in other words, he is the same in time and in space, but that is also what specifies him and marks him out from others” (Deschamps & Devos, 1998, p. 3). Personal identity, then, entails an individual’s internal consistency and differences from others.

Since social identity refers to similarities to others, and personal identity refers to differences from the same others, social identity and personal identity seem to be in opposition. This opposing relationship of social identity and personal identity can be represented as a continuum with two opposing poles in Social Identity Theory (Turner, 1987). According to this theory, the two identities coexist but are negatively dependent. Thus, the more one identity is salient, the less the other identity is.

Deschamps and Devos (1998) posit another perspective from which to explain the relationship between personal identity and social identity. They understand personal identity and social identity as orthogonal dimensions. Social identity and personal identity are independent of each other. The existence of one identity does not affect existence of the other identity. From this perspective, the relationship between personal and social identities is of four types. First, both identities are strong in an individual. Second, neither of the two identities is strong. Third, social identity is strong, but personal identity is not. Fourth, personal identity is strong, but social identity is not.

Identity reflects an individual’s social-environmental characteristics and intrapersonal attributes. Identity may be formed, maintained, and changed by social-environmental factors, intrapersonal factors, or combinations of these two factors. This characteristic of identity seems to be similar to a characteristic of depression, in that depression is also initiated, maintained, and changed by social relations, internal
cognitive attributes, or combinations of these two (Beck, 1967; Coyne, 1976; Lewinsohn, 1974; Lewinsohn et al., 1985). Hence, relationships among identity, an individual, and society may provide clues for investigating contributing factors to depression.

**Individual, Society, and Identity**

An individual and society are inseparable and interdependent (Meltzer & Petras, 1972). An individual and society are mutually interactive and reflective, change constantly by the mutual interaction, and, thus, should be understood in the context of each other (Schlenker, 1985). The mutual interaction between an individual and society may be reflected in identity. An individual’s social environments can be internalized as the individual’s identity. The individual’s identity, in turn, can affect the individual’s social behavior and subsequently his/her social environments. Thus, identity can be regarded as a pivotal point interrelating individual with society. Identity Theory, Social Identity Theory, and the Communication Theory of Identity approach relationships among identity, an individual, and society from this viewpoint, but from somewhat different angles. Identity Theory pays attention to social roles. Social Identity Theory focuses on group memberships. The Communication Theory of Identity emphasizes communication as the place where individual and social environment interact.

**Identity Theory**

The idea of Identity Theory originates in the symbolic interactionist concept that “Society shapes self shapes social behavior” (Stryker & Burke, 2000, p. 285). In Identity Theory, the “role” an individual occupies in social life replaces the “society” in the above statement. Identity theorists explain the relationship between society and individuals on
the basis of roles. An individual has multiple roles. These roles are internalized and form role identities. Among an individual’s multiple role identities, some are enacted in social interaction on the basis of their salience and the individual’s commitment to them. Thus, in Identity Theory, roles shape identities. Identities, in turn, shape social behavior (role behavior). The cognitive aspects of the relationship between role identities and role behavior are explained by self-verification process. The basic concepts of Identity Theory--role identity, salience and commitment, and self-verification--receive more detailed explanation below.

A role is the central concept in Identity Theory. A role refers to “the functions or parts a person performs when occupying a particular position within a particular social context” (Schlenker, 1985, p. 18). People live in various kinds of relatively small networks of social relations and play some roles to stay in and to maintain the networks (Stryker & Burke, 2000). A network consists of individuals’ roles, and an individual’s roles in a network reflect parts of the network. Individuals’ roles in a network are interdependent and so determined in relation with others’ roles. Hence, roles have inherently social aspects. Because of social characteristics, roles also accompany social expectations attached to positions individuals occupy in their social relations. The internalized social expectations attached to an individual’s roles are his/her identities (Stryker & Burke, 2000). In Identity Theory, society is internalized as an individual’s identities through socially structured roles.

For the activation of identities, in other words, social behavior based on identities, identity salience serves a key function. Internalized role expectations are acted out as
social behavior by one's selecting and enacting role identities. The selection of the role identity to be enacted among various internalized role identities depends on salience of identities in various contexts. Identity salience refers to “the probability that an identity will be invoked across a variety of situations, or alternatively persons in a given situation” (Stryker & Burke, 2000, p. 286). The probability of identity activation is organized hierarchically, based on the degree of self-relevance of a particular identity to a situation. Some role identities are relatively more self-relevant to a particular situation than others. Relatively more self-relevant identities become more salient identities. In this salience hierarchy, the top-ranked role identity is most likely to be activated in a given situation (Hogg et al., 1995; Stryker & Burke, 2000; Stets & Burke, 2000). An individual unfolds particular kinds of internalized role identities toward society on the basis of identity salience. That is, an individual determines what social behavior to enact according to the relative salience of identities.

An individual’s identity salience is influenced by his or her commitment to the role related to a particular identity. Commitment refers to the “degree to which the individual’s relationships to particular others are dependent on being a given kind of person” (Stryker & Statham, 1985, p. 345). Commitment reflects an individual’s relationship with others and more specifically particular others’ expectation on an individual’s role performance in a given situation (Hogg et al., 1995).

There are two kinds of commitment (Stryker & Serpe, 1982, 1994). First is qualitative commitment, which is tied to the importance and depth of an individual’s relationship with others. The more important an individual’s relationship with particular
others, the more the individual is committed to the roles that are related to particular others. The other kind of commitment is the number of persons with whom an individual has relationships regarding particular roles. The larger number of people who are related to an individual’s specific role, the more the individual is committed the role. Both kinds of commitment contribute to identity salience. The more an individual is committed to particular roles, the more the role identities become salient to the individual (Hogg et al., 1995; Stryker & Burke, 2000). An individual’s identity salience is determined by the individual’s commitment to specific roles, which reflects the individual’s social relationships with others in social networks. Identity commitment determines what kind of identity is salient. Identity salience determines what kind of identity is enacted.

The next topic that Identity theorists deal with is the mechanism by which identity is acted out as social behavior. This mechanism is explained as a self-verification process. Burke (1991) identified four components to explain self-verification process of activation of identity. First, identity standard is a set of socially prescribed meanings an individual has to define his/her role identity in a situation. Second, self-relevant meaning is in individual’s own perception of meaning of his/her role identity in a situation. Third, a comparator is the mechanism that compares the personally perceived self-relevant meaning with the identity standard. Fourth, the individual’s behavior is function of the difference between self-relevant perception and the identity standard. In the self-verification process, the purpose of behavior is to reduce differences between self-relevant meaning of identity and the identity standard.
When an individual feels that his/her role identities in a given situation are apart from the identity standard of the situation, the individual tends to behave to change his/her actual role identities toward the identity standard. Self-verification between self-relevant meaning and the identity standard is the internal cognitive process to activate role identities to social behavior. Self-verification can be accomplished by changing the situation, seeking or creating new situations, or making or taking new roles (Stets & Burke, 2000; Stryker & Burke, 2000).

Although the focus of Identity Theory is the reciprocal link between self and society, identity theorists’ approaches to the link tends to be more individual-based than social group-based (Hogg et al., 1995). In Identity Theory, social role identities are defined on the basis of roles in relatively small networks, such as family, school, and workplace rather than in relatively big social group, such as gender, ethnicity, and class (Stets & Burke, 2000). Intragroup differentiation, individual’s unique roles, and interpersonal relations in a small social group are well addressed to explain individual-society relation. However, an individual’s roles in his/her relations with the relatively large social group and intergroup relations are deemphasized in Identity Theory (Hogg et al., 1995). Thus, the individual-society link seems to be approached from the more individual side rather than the society side in Identity Theory. This theory does not articulate how macro level society is connected to identity. Group membership and intergroup relations, as well as their relations with identity, receive more attention in Social Identity Theory.
“Social category” is the key concept in Social Identity Theory (Hogg, 1992, 1993; Hogg & Abrams 1988; Turner, 1991; Turner et al., 1987). Social categories, such as ethnicity, gender, and political affiliation, are parts of a structured society. Individuals belong to various social categories and form identities based on memberships in social categories. Society is internalized by individuals in the form of social identities on the basis of social categories. Social identities, in turn, connect individuals to society through group memberships influencing individuals’ beliefs, attitudes, and behavior in their relationships with members of other social groups. The process of forming social identity involves self-categorization, depersonalization, and comparison processes. Salience of a category and immediate contextual factors influence the activation of social identity.

Categorization is the first step in forming social identities. An individual categorizes social groups into ingroups and outgroups through the cognitive process of self-categorization (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Turner et al., 1987). Self-categorization accentuates the perceived similarities between self and other ingroup members and the perceived differences between self and outgroup members. This accentuation applies to attributes of social groups, such as beliefs, attitudes, values, affective reactions, behavioral norms, styles of communication, and any other properties thought to be related to the differentiation between ingroup and outgroup (Stets & Burke, 2000). As a result, ingroup members are regarded as having similar attributes, and outgroup members are
believed to have their own unique attributes. Self-categorization clarifies the boundary between ingroups and outgroups.

The function of self-categorization is to divide social groups. After the categorization, individuals identify themselves to their ingroups through a process of depersonalization (Stets & Burke, 2000; Turner et al., 1987). Depersonalization is a person’s cognitive representation of a social group on the basis of prototypes (Hogg et al., 1995). A prototype refers to “a subjective representation of the defining attributes (e.g., beliefs, attitudes, behavior) of social category” (Hogg et al., 1995, p. 261). Members of the same social group tend to have shared prototypes because they are located in similar social contexts and have similar information (Hogg et al., 1995). By sharing prototypes of a group with other ingroup members, an individual locates him/herself in the group and identifies him/herself as a group member rather than a unique individual. That is, an individual depersonalizes him/herself through of shared group prototypes. As a result of depersonalization, an individual’s social identities reflect the characteristics of social groups to which the person belongs. Social structure is internalized as social identities through self-categorization and depersonalization.

In addition to categorization and identification by depersonalization, another important feature of Social Identity Theory is ingroup bias in comparison to outgroup (Turner et al., 1987). After categorization of ingroups and outgroups, and identification as an ingroup member, an individual tends to compare the prototypes of the ingroup with those of the outgroup and evaluate more positively those of the ingroup (Hogg & Hardie, 1992; Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992). Social Identity Theory posits that the purpose of
categorizing groups as ingroups and outgroups is to have positive feeling about ingroup (Brown, 2000). The motivation of this ingroup favoritism is self-esteem (Oakes & Turner, 1987; Rubin & Hewston, 1998). An individual who perceives that he/she belongs to valuable groups feels more positively about him/herself. This ingroup bias also can influence intergroup relations.

An individual’s social identity, that is, an individual’s internalized social characteristics, is activated to influence the individual’s social behavior. Activation of social identity has two steps (Hogg et al., 1995). First, activation of an overall group identity is determined by salience of the group. Second, activation of specific aspects of the overall group identity is influenced by immediate contextual factors.

Salience is based on accessibility and fit (Oakes, 1987). Accessibility is the readiness and availability of a given category. Oakes (1987) uses the taxi category as an example. This category is accessible when a person is in hurry, and a taxi stands nearby. Fit refers to whether a category is appropriate to involve in a perceived situation. If a social category is accessible and adequate for an individual to identify in a given situation, the category becomes salient, and the individual’s social identity related to the salient social category is activated in that situation. In the activation of social identity, an individual’s concrete social behavior relating to his/her social identity is determined by immediate contextual factors of the individual’s salient social group (Hogg et al., 1995). An individual acts out his or her social identity on the basis of prototypes of a salient social group. Among various prototypes of a social group, some specific ones, that is, particular aspects of a social identity, are selected for enactment on the basis of
immediate and concrete factors of a given situation. In the two steps of social identity activation, immediate responses to the immediate contextual factors tend to be dynamic and ever changing, and the salience of an overall group identity tends to be relatively enduring.

Social Identity Theory connects the individual and society by focusing on social groups. This theory also provides some clues to explain intergroup relations, such as ingroup favoritism. However, Social Identity Theory seems to overlook individuals’ roles and relations in a group (Stets & Burke, 2000). The basic concepts of Social Identity Theory, such as categorization, depersonalization, prototypes, and salience, are seen as being formed or conducted without individuals’ interaction with other ingroup members. Once groups are categorized, sources of those concepts are regarded as being attached to the groups. Possible interpersonal processes in a group to reach agreement concerning common prototypes, to cultivate ingroup similarities, or to gain salience of a category are not examined. In Social Identity Theory, the basic unit in which individual-society relation is examined is a social group. Thus, Social Identity Theory seems to emphasize social aspects more than individual aspects, whereas Identity Theory pays more attention to individual aspects in the society-individual relation.

The third perspective linking individuals and society is the Communication Theory of Identity. In this theory, society and individuals interact with each other through communication. Communication is the pivotal point connecting society and individuals.
The Communication Theory of Identity

The Communication Theory of Identity (Hecht, 1993; Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003) also seems to view identity as the connecting point between society and individuals. However, in it identity is seen as being directly related to communication. The role of identity in connecting individuals and society, in fact, is based on communication. Social relations are internalized by individuals as identities through communication. Individuals’ identities, in turn, are acted out as social behavior through communication. Identity reflects social relations through communication. Social behavior is a function of identity in communication. Because of its direct relation to identity, communication is the pivotal point connecting society and individual.

As for the relationship between communication and identity, Hecht et al. (1993, 2003) posit two ways through which social interaction (communication) is internalized as identity. First, symbolic meanings of social phenomena are created and exchanged through social interaction. Identity is formed when some relevant symbolic meanings are attached to and organized in an individual in various situations through social interaction. Social interaction is internalized as identity through the formation of symbolic meanings and identification of the symbolic meanings to an individual. Second, when people place themselves in socially recognizable categories, they confirm or validate whether these categories are relevant to them through social interaction. Thus, identity is formed and reformed by categorization through social interaction.

Identity, in turn, is manifested in social interaction through the expectations and motivations (Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003). Specific identities entail specific
expectations, which influence the person’s behavior in communication. Identity also influences social interaction by the motivation to gain and maintain self-esteem. A person’s endeavor to maintain his/her identities consistently also influences the person’s behavior in social interaction. Hence, identity is externalized to social interaction through expectations attached to identities, and motivations for self-esteem and self-consistency.

In view of the close association between identity and communication, Hecht et al. (1993, 2003) posit various loci of identity integrating the perspectives of an individual (self), society, and social interaction as the loci of identity. American culture tends to conceptualize the individual as a separated entity (Carbaugh, 1989). Self and subsequently identity reside in an individual as the cognitive schema by which one understands and interprets the social world (Markus & Sentis, 1982). However, social interaction is also a locus of identity because identity is social process existing in the social world between and among people. Thus, identity also resides in social interaction (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; Pearce, 1989). Hecht et al. (1993; 2003) embrace both positions of the individual and social interaction as loci of identity. This idea of multiple loci of identity is further refined in four layers of identity in the Communication Theory of Identity.

Hecht (1993) identified four layers of identity: personal, enacted, relational, and communal. The four layers refer to the four loci where identity resides. Identity resides in a person, communication, a relationship, and/or a group. The four identities located in the four layers represent different aspects of an individual’s identity. These four aspects
of an individual’s identity sometimes match each other but sometimes are contradictory. However, the four aspects of identity cannot exist in isolation from each other. They are interpenetrating. Following are the basic notions of the four layers and relationships among them noted by Hecht (Hecht 1993; Hecht et al., 1993).

**Personal layer.** The personal layer refers to the individual as a locus of identity. Identity is stored in a personal layer as self-concept, self-image, self-cognitions, feelings about self, and/or spiritual sense of self-being. Identity as a personal layer provides “understanding how individuals define themselves in general as well as in particular situations” (Hecht et al., 1993, pp. 166-167).

**Enactment layer.** Identity is enacted in communication via messages. Thus, communication is the locus of identity in the enactment layer.

**Relational layer.** In this layer, a relationship is the locus of identity. Identity is a mutual product, jointly negotiated and mutually formed in relationships through communication. The relational layer has three levels. First, an individual constitutes his/her identities in terms of other people through social interaction. How other people view an individual influences the person’s formation of an identity. An individual shapes how to enact his/her identity partially in response to his/her interaction partners. This type of relational identity is called “ascribed relational identity” in this study. Second, an individual identifies him/herself through his/her relationships with others, such as marital partners, coworkers, and friends. Third, a relationship itself is a unit of identity. Thus, a couple as a unit, for instance, can establish an identity.
**Communal layer.** A group is also a place where identity exists. Group members usually share common characteristics and have collective memories. Members of a group establish common group identities on the basis of common characteristics and history. The common characteristics of a group function to form contents of the identities of a group.

**Interpenetration of layers.** The four layers of identity are not separate from each other. They are interpenetrated. While they can function independently of each other, they can also work together two at a time, three at a time, or all four at a time. In some situations, each or some of the layers may be contradictory or exclusive of each other. In other situations, some or all of layers are integrated. With the separation and/or integration, that is, interpenetration, the four layers of identity shows various aspects of identity in various situations.

As such, identity resides in an individual, communication, a relationship, and a social group. The perspectives on the loci of identity are integrated as the four layers of identity in the Communication Theory of Identity. The four layers of identity provide clues to explain how the individual and the society are integrated.

The integration of the individual and society occurs through communication (Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003). The personal aspect of identity (individual) is formed by attaching meanings to self. The attached meaning is created, maintained, and changed by communication in a social environment. The personal aspect of identity, in turn, is socialized by enactment of the identity through communication. Communication
functions as a passage between society and individual, through which society is internalized to the individual, and the individual’s attributes are externalized to society.

This theory helps explain the relationship between society and the individual more comprehensively than Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory do. Identity Theory stresses the individual aspects in linking the individual and society. Social Identity Theory focuses on the social aspects as the connecting point between the individual and society overlooking individual aspects. The Communication Theory of Identity concerns how communication connects society and the individual. Both society and an individual seem to be well reflected in the four layers of identity formed and interpenetrated by communication.

*Identity Gaps*

The Communication Theory of Identity provides a good explanation for the interrelations between the individual and society in its focus on communication. This theory also hints of potential discrepancies among the various aspects of identity occurring in communication. The personal, the relational, and the enacted layers of identity are aspects of an individual’s identity, but can be different from each other. The differences between and among the four layers of identity constitute identity gaps. Theoretically, the number of possible identity gaps is 11 (six gaps between any two of the four frames, three gaps among any three of them, and one gap among all four frames). Identity gaps are almost an inevitable result of communication and social relations. Because communication is not perfect, people are rarely transparent or perfectly consistent. In addition, two people rarely share the same experiential domain nor have
the exact same interpretation of social life. Thus, when people come together and communication occurs, identity gaps are unavoidable. One might posit that gaps always accompany communication and are present to some degree in all relationships. The issue is the degree and type of gap, as well as the implications of these gaps for social relations.

While identity gaps can exist between and among any of the identity frames, this study focused on two specific gaps. Traditionally, identity has been conceptualized as an individual’s personal properties with little consideration of its communicative aspects (Hecht, 1993; Collier, 1996). This study was concerned with comparing the traditional, personal concept of identity with communication-based concepts of identity. The personal identity in the Communication Theory of Identity parallels the traditional concept of identity. The ascribed relational identity and the enacted identity result from interpersonal interaction and communicative behavior. Thus, the focus of this study was on the two kinds of gaps between the personal and the ascribed relational identities and the personal and the enacted identities. The communal identity was not considered in this study since it operates on a collective level of analysis and, thus would require a study with collective-level observation. Similar concepts to the identity gaps between personal and relational identities, and personal and enacted identities appear in various studies.

**Personal-Relational Identity Gap**

The “personal-relational identity gap” refers to a discrepancy between an individual’s personal identity and ascribed relational identity, that is, a discrepancy between how an individual views him/herself and his/her perception of how others view
him/her. It is certainly not unusual for an individual’s self-view to differ from the ways in which others see him or her.

The idea that an individual’s identity includes how others see the person originated in the work of Charles Horton Cooley. Cooley (1902) thought that “persons are not separable and mutually exclusive…they interpenetrate one another…” (p. 90). In view of the idea of people’s interdependence, Cooley (1902) developed the conception of the “looking glass self.” This metaphor suggests that people see themselves in the mirror of others’ eyes. An individual’s perception of how others view him/her forms the individual’s identity. The idea of looking glass self was developed further in the work of George Herbert Mead.

Mead (1934) divided self into “I” and “me.” “I” is the part of self that is an acting subject. “I” tends to be impulsive, creative, and spontaneous and is generally free from social rules and restrictions. “I” is a source of individuality. On the other hand, “me” tends to be analytical and evaluative and is influenced by social rules and expectations. Social rules and expectations can be internalized to self through others’ attitudes and responses. The internalized social factors constitute the social part of self, “me.” That is, others’ attitudes toward an individual are incorporated into “me.”

Mead (1934) explained the process of incorporating others’ attitudes and responses into the “me” in terms of the concept of “taking the role of the other”:

The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group,
or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs… He becomes an object to himself only by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment or context of experience and behavior in which both they and he are involved. (1934, p. 140)

Whereas Cooley’s “looking glass self” passively reflects others’ attitudes concerning the self, Mead’s “taking the role of the other” suggests actively internalizing others’ attitudes (Scheibe, 1985). With taking of others’ attitudes, Mead’s “me” can comprise the social and relational aspects of self and stands in contrast to the personal aspects of self, “I.” The concepts of “I” and “me” seem to correspond to Hecht’s personal identity and relational identity, respectively.

Influenced by symbolic interactionist tradition, Self-Verification Theory also has advanced the idea that self has two aspects: the target’s self-concepts or self-views and others’ appraisals (Giesler & Swann, 1999; McNulty & Swann, 1994; Swann, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1996). The target’s self view refers to how an individual views him/herself. Others’ appraisals are how others view the individual (McNulty & Swann, 1994; Swann 1987). Self-view forms in three ways (Swann, 1985). First, an individual perceives how others react to him/her and then internalizes reactions to self-views. Second, an individual observes his/her own behavior and then develops his/her self-view on the basis of the observed behavior. Third, an individual develops a self-view by comparing his/her performance with those of others.
A self-view formed in any of these three ways is not static. A self-view changes constantly in response to others’ appraisals. As soon as an individual forms a self-view, he/she encounters other kinds of appraisals (Swann, 1985). Based on the relations between the self-view and the new appraisals of others, an individual develops new self-concepts. This process of mutual influence between one’s self-views and others’ appraisals is ongoing and is called identity negotiation (Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003; McNulty & Swann, 1994).

Self-Verification Theory acknowledges the discrepancy between self-view and the others’ appraisals. The basic idea of Self-Verification Theory is that an individual seeks others’ appraisals that are consistent with his/her self-views (Swann, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1996, 1997). This self-confirmatory tendency applies not only to positive feedback but also negative feedback. An individual with negative self-views prefers others’ negative appraisals (Swann, Hixon, & La Ronde, 1992).

In line with the tendency of self-confirmatory appraisal seeking, people also tend to choose interaction partners who view them as they view themselves (Swann, Wenzlaff, & Tafarodi, 1992). According to Swann (1983, 1985, 1997), the reason why people seek feedback and interaction partners who confirm their self-views is that they want to maintain their perception of prediction and control. As such, Self-Verification Theory posits that self is composed of self-view and the reflected others’ appraisals, which are an individual’s perception of others’ appraisals.

Discrepancies between self-views and others’ appraisals exist, according to Self-Verification Theory. People prefer smaller gaps between the two parts of self to maintain
the perception of prediction and control. People also tend to behave to reduce the gaps in interactions with others (McNulty & Swann, 1994). In Self-Verification Theory, the concepts of self-view and the other’s appraisal are consistent with Hecht’s personal and relational identities.

Control Theory (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Hyland, 1987; Powers, 1973) and Identity Theory (Burke, 1991) also imply the features of personal and relational identities in the structure of self. For Control Theory, “reference criterion” and “perceptual input” are involved in self (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Hyland, 1987). In Identity Theory, these two concepts are called “identity standard” and “self-relevant meaning,” respectively (Burke, 1991). A reference criterion is a goal or purpose stored in an individual and constitutes a standard with which an individual compares his/her perceptual input (Hyland 1987). The perceptual input is an individual’s perception of an environment and can be the part of self that is from outside or others (Hyland 1987). The identity standard in Identity Theory functions the same as the reference criterion and includes a set of meanings held by an individual that define his/her role identity (Burke, 1991). Self-relevant meaning is the situationally perceived meaning of an individual’s role identity. Self-relevant meaning involves others’ view of an individual’s role performance and, thus, can be the part of self ascribed from outside or others.

The basic idea of Control Theory is that an individual behaves to reduce discrepancies between reference criteria and perceptual inputs (Carver & Scheier, 1982). The discrepancies between the two are called “error.” A consistent error is called prolonged control mismatch (Hyland, 1987). The motivation underlying an individual’s
behavior is to avoid or diminish prolonged control mismatches. An individual can change both perceptual inputs and reference criteria, as well as “error sensitivity”—“the signal amplification between the detected error and the amount of behavior generated in response to that error” (p. 111)—, to reduce prolonged control mismatches. Identity Theory also views attempts to reduce the difference between identity standards and self-relevant meanings as a motivation for behavior. An individual can try to alter the situation or environment and, thus, perceived self-relevant meanings to reduce the difference. As such, both Control Theory and Identity Theory indicate that self is composed of self-view and the perception of other’s views. The difference of the two parts of self and attempts to control the difference are seen as a motive for an individual’s behavior.

Self-Discrepancy Theory (Higgins, 1987) posits six types of self, including personal identity-related and relational identity-related types. The basic idea of Self-Discrepancy Theory is that different types of discrepancies among the six types of self are related to different kinds of emotional vulnerability. In the process of developing this basic theoretical idea, Higgins (1987) clarifies the six different aspects of self based on the two dimensions: domains and standpoints. The domains of self include the actual self, the ideal self, and the ought self. The standpoints of self include the self as viewed by a person him/herself and the self viewed by others. The dimension of standpoints of self corresponds to the personal and the relational identities.

The actual self is “your representation of the attributes that someone (yourself or another) believes you actually possesses” (p. 320). The ideal self is “your representation
of the attributes that someone (yourself or another) would like you, ideally, to possess (i.e., a representation of someone’s hopes, aspirations, or wishes for you)” (pp. 320-321). The ought self is “your representation of the attributes that someone (yourself or another) believes you should or ought to possess (i.e., a representation of someone’s sense of your duty, obligations, or responsibilities)” (p. 321).

Each domain is divided into two types of self by the standpoints of a person’s own and those of others. Thus, there are a person’s actual, ideal, and ought selves, which derive from a person’s own view of him/herself, and a person’s actual, ideal, and ought selves based on others’ views of the person. In Self-Discrepancy Theory, the self viewed by a person him/herself (personal identity) and the self viewed by others (relational identity) each have three subtypes, respectively.

Anthropologist Jenkins (1994) also divides identity into self-image and public-image. Self-image refers to how an individual see him/herself and the way that an individual would like to be seen by others. Public image is an individual’s perception of how others see him/her. The individualized aspect of self or the self-image, and the socialized aspect of self or the public image parallel Hecht’s personal identity and relational identity, respectively. Self-image and public image are different sides of a coin. These two different aspects of self interact with each other. Social identity is constituted, maintained, and changed by the interaction between self-image and public image.

Collier (1996) divides identity into the categories of “avowal” and “ascription.” Avowal refers to how an individual views and presents him/herself. It seems to be a presented self-concept in communication. Thus, avowal involves Hecht’s notion of
personal identity. Ascription is the identity imposed or attributed by others in communication. Communicated stereotypes to an individual are examples of the ascription. Ascription forms in one’s relationships with others, and is similar to the Hecht’s notion of ascribed relational identity. Collier (1996) indicates that the avowal and the ascription tend to be different. Ability to reduce the difference between the avowal and the ascription in intercultural interaction is intercultural communication competence.

Originating with Cooley and Mead, the idea that others’ views of an individual are internalized and form a part of self appears in various theories. By internalizing others’ views, self has the two aspects of how an individual views him/herself and the individual’s perception of how others view him/her. As noted above, many theories recognize these two aspects of identity, as well as gaps between the two. However, the concept of the personal-relational identity gap further develops and clarifies the ideas in aforementioned theories in various senses.

Mead and Cooley did not clearly separate identity into two parts (personal and relational identities). They attended to neither the nature of relationships between the two identity layers (i.e., the degree of difference between the two) nor the negotiation of the differences when they occur. In addition, they did not consider the implications and outcomes of the gaps or differences. Self-Verification Theory and Control Theory do note potential differences between a person’s self-concepts and others’ appraisals but do not consider others’ appraisals to be internalized as a part of self. Thus, it is not evident whether differences between self-concepts and others’ appraisals in these theories refer to
differences between two aspects of an individual’s identity or between identity and an external faculty (appraisal). Self-Discrepancy Theory conceptualizes self-concepts and others’ appraisals as different aspects of a self. However, this theory does not note the dynamic nature of the discrepancy and deemphasized the roles of communication in creating and negotiating them. In light of these factors, the conceptualization of personal-relational identity gap begins with the assumption that others’ appraisals are internalized and form a part of identity and then focuses on the discrepancies between self-concepts and internalized others’ appraisals that are created and negotiated through communication.

**Personal-Enacted Identity Gap**

An individual’s personal identity also can differ from his or her enacted identity. In other words, an individual’s expressed identities in communication can be different from his/her self-views. One can, for instance, see him/herself as open-minded but cut off discussion of differing opinions in certain situations. The enacted identity (cutting off discussion) in this case differs from the self-image (open mindedness). There can be a variety of reasons for this discrepancy, including impression management, dishonesty, shyness, and intimidation. Regardless of the motivation, discrepancies between an individual’s self-views and identities expressed in communication define the “personal-enacted identity gap.”

Ideas related to the difference between the personal and the enacted identities appear in self-presentation or impression management theories. The concepts of front stage and back stage in Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical approach to self-presentation, in
particular, correspond to the concepts of personal and enacted identities. In addition to the front stage and back stage, Petronio’s (1991, 2000) Communication Boundary Theory and Jack’s (1991) Silencing the Self Theory involve the expressed or disclosed part of self and the unexpressed or hidden part of self.

Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical perspective explains how people present themselves to various audience in everyday interaction. According to Goffman (1959), people try to enact performances to present a positive image of themselves in interaction with others in order to obtain benefits. The place where self-presentation occurs is the front stage. Others observe people’s behavior in the front stage. In contrast, the back stage is a private space where no others’ eyes observe people’s behavior. In the back stage, there is no strategic presentation of self to impress others. The self performed in the front stage is the self strategically designed and projected in the social life. The self in the back stage exists in private space. Thus, the self in the front stage and the self in the back stage correspond to the enacted identity and the personal identity, respectively.

Communication Boundary Management Theory (Petronio, 1991, 2000) also implies the existence of the expressed self and the unexpressed self, as well as differences between these two selves. According to the theory, people control the disclosure of private information to avoid possible risk to damage self-concept and relationships with others. People establish a metaphorical boundary to reduce the vulnerability resulting from self-disclosure and to protect self by means of a set of rules to control the boundary. Whether to reveal or conceal private information is determined by the boundary structures and the rule-based management system.
Boundary structures consist of ownership, control, permeability, and levels (Petronio, 2000). People own private information and exercise rights of ownership over the information. That is, people control others’ access to private information. Permeability, on the other hand, allows others’ access to private information. Some aspects of an individual’s self are accessible and, thus, revealed to others as a result of permeability. The degree of balance between control and permeability determines the level of boundary for openness or closedness of self. These components of boundary structure are regulated by the rule-based management system, which entails boundary rule formation, boundary rule usage, boundary rule coordination, and boundary rule turbulence. Whether to reveal or conceal, when to reveal or conceal, to whom to reveal or conceal, where to reveal or conceal private information, and how to balance revelation and concealment are subject to regulation by these rule-based management system. Whether to enact self, how to enact self, when to enact self, and how much enact self are determined in the boundary structures as related to the rule-based management system. Communication Boundary Management Theory posits the existence of an enacted self a concealed self, as well as differences between the two selves, and explains the mechanism of how to regulate enactment of self.

Silencing the Self Theory (Jack, 1991) focuses on involuntary suppression of presenting real self rather than active presentation or control of self. According to this theory, women tend to silence their real desired and feelings to satisfy their male partners’ needs or social expectation in their communication with men partners. As a result, a woman can have divided selves: authentic and socially expected. Jack (1991)
reported that some women attempt to display female goodness, which includes being
caring and nurturing. This female goodness is prescribed by social expectations for
women’s roles and is a source of a woman’s divided self. The social expectations are
reflected in a woman’s self-concept, but not always consistent with her own desires and
feelings, which comprise characteristics of her authentic self. In social relations, women
tend to present socially expected selves by silencing their real selves to avoid relational
conflicts and to fulfill cultural prescriptions concerning what they should be. In this
divided self, the expressed, socially expected self of a woman corresponds to the enacted
identity, and a woman’s suppressed authentic identity parallels the personal identity.

While the concept of personal-enacted identity gap is related to these other
approaches, it differs in important ways. The Dramaturgical Theory and the
Communication Boundary Management Theory focuses on intentionally or actively
manipulated ways of expressing self for impression management and private information
control. These two theories are concerned not with the implications for identity but,
instead, how people manage impression and private information. Conversely, Silencing
the Self Theory focuses on passive and less intentional ways of expressing self
overlooking actively manipulated ways of expressing self. The treatment of enacted
identity in the Communication Theory of Identity involves both active and passive
expressions. Accordingly, the personal-enacted identity gap refers to discrepancies
between expressed and unexpressed selves occurring in communication. While the above
theories provide support for the proposition concerning the identity gaps and are quite
complementary in many respects, they do not cover the same terrain as the view of these
gaps in the Communication Theory of Identity nor do they consider the range of gaps posited by the Communication Theory of Identity.

The identity gaps are conceptualized as arising in communication. Various theories entail concepts similar to the notion of identity gaps. Some of these theories associate identity gap-related concepts with depression. Before one can appreciate relationships between identity gaps and depression, he/she needs some understanding of depression.

Depression

Depression is often referred to as the common cold of psychopathology (Charney & Weissman, 1988; Gilbert, 1992). This analogy indicates that depression, while prevalent, is not easy to define. The purpose of this section is to overview and conceptualize depression. For this purpose, first, the classification of depression is examined on the basis of the latest version of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorder (DSM-IV-TR) and the tradition of dichotomous approaches to its classification of depression, because it reflects heterogeneous aspects of depression. Second, the risk factors for depression are discussed. These include demographic, biological and genetic, and social factors. Third, major psychological theories of depression are overviewed. Cognitive theories of depression, which emphasize intrapersonal structure as the source of depression, and behavioral theories, which focus on social environment and interpersonal relationships as the source of depression, are of primary interest.
The Classifications of Depression

Even though no natural classes of depression exist, and clear-cut delineation of classes of depression may not be possible, clinicians and researchers have traditionally divided depression into subtypes (Kaelber, Moul, & Farmer, 1995). The purpose of classification is to help one diagnose, treat, and prevent depression effectively (Beckham, Leber, & Youll, 1995). Depression is usually classified in terms of diagnostic criteria, which are categorical descriptions of clusters of symptoms presumed to appear in a particular kind of depression.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III, 1980; DSM-III-R, 1987; DSM-IV, 1994; DSM-IV-TR, 2000) developed by American Psychiatric Association is among the widely accepted diagnostic tools used by clinicians. The most recent version is DSM-IV-TR (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), which provides comprehensive criteria for diagnosis and classification of depression.

Besides the classification system in the DSM, various other classifications and a variety of subtypes of depression have been identified. Among these, the dichotomous approaches to classification of depression have been notable (Beckam et al., 1995). Neurotic-psychotic, exogenous (reactive)-endogenous, unipolar-bipolar, and primary-secondary depressions are usual divisions of depression in the tradition of dichotomous classification. The classification system of DSM and the traditional dichotomous classification have common subtypes and classification criteria as well as different ones. Hence, examining the dichotomous tradition of classification is also necessary to complement conceptualizing depression.
The Classification of Depression in DSM-IV-TR

Depression is covered in the Mood Disorder section in DSM-IV-TR. Mood Disorders are fall into four categories: Depressive Disorders, Bipolar Disorders, two disorders based on etiology, and Mood Disorder not otherwise specified. Depressive Disorders are further divided into Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthmic Disorder, and Depressive Disorder Not Otherwise Specified. Bipolar Disorders include Bipolar I Disorder, Bipolar II Disorder, Cyclothymic Disorder, and Bipolar Disorder Not Otherwise Specified. Two disorders based on etiology are Mood Disorder Due to a General Medical Condition and the Substance-Induced Mood Disorder. Table 2.1 summarizes these types and subtype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1. Classification of Depression in DSM-IV-TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depressive Disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Depressive Disorder</strong> is characterized by one or more Major Depressive Episodes (i.e., at least 2 weeks of depressive mood or loss of interest accompanied by at least four additional symptoms of depression).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dysthmic disorder</strong> is characterized by at least 2 years of depressed mood for more days than not, accompanied by additional depressive symptoms that do not meet criteria for a Major Depressive Episode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depressive Disorder Not Otherwise Specified</strong> is included for coding disorders with depressive features that do not meet criteria for Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthmic Disorder, Adjustment Disorder With Depressed Mood, or Adjustment Disorder With Mixed Anxiety and Depressed Mood (or depressive symptoms about which there is inadequate or contradictory information).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bipolar Disorders

Bipolar I Disorder is characterized by one or more Manic or Mixed Episodes, usually accompanied by Major Depressive Episodes.

Bipolar II Disorder is characterized one or more Major Depressive Episodes accompanied by at least one Hypomanic Episode.

Cyclothymic Disorder is characterized by at least 2 years of numerous periods of hypomanic symptoms that do not meet criteria for a Manic Episode and numerous periods of depressive symptoms that do not meet criteria for a Major Depressive Episodes.

Bipolar Disorder Not Otherwise Specified is included for coding disorders with bipolar features that do not meet criteria for any of the specific Bipolar Disorders (or bipolar symptoms about which there is inadequate or contradictory information).

Two Disorders based on Etiology

Mood Disorder Due to a General Medical Condition is characterized by a prominent and persistent disturbance in mood that is judged to be a direct physiological consequence of a general medical condition.

Substance Induced Mood Disorder is characterized by a prominent and persistent disturbance in mood that is judged to be direct physiological consequence of a drug of abuse, a medication, another somatic treatment for depression, or toxin exposure.

Mood Disorder Not Otherwise Specified

Mood Disorder Not Otherwise Specified is included for coding disorders with mood symptom that do not meet the criteria for any specific Mood Disorder and in which it is difficult to choose between Depressive Disorder Not Otherwise Specified and Bipolar Disorder Not Otherwise Specified (e.g., acute agitation).

The Dichotomous Classification of Depression

Dichotomous divisions of neurotic-psychotic, endogenous-exogenous, primary-secondary, and unipolar-bipolar are frequently appearing classifications of depression.

Neurotic-psychotic depressions. The neurotic-psychotic distinction of depression is one of the widely used dichotomies. Psychotic depression generally refers to endogenous depression or severe depression (Beckam et al., 1995). Psychotic depression is divided into mood congruent psychotic and mood incongruent psychotic (Gilbert, 1992). Mood congruent psychotic depression includes hallucinations or delusions of guilt, poverty, or disease. Mood incongruent psychotic depression includes persecutory delusions or thought insertions. DSM-IV-TR involves psychotic depression symptoms in its major depressive disorders category. On the other hand, neurotic depression does not include delusions or hallucinations. Neurotic depression is a milder, less serious depression compared to psychotic depression (Beckam et al., 1995; Gilbert, 1992). Neurotic depression is not endogenous depression and tends to occur from reactions to life events and premorbid personality (Gilbert, 1992). Neurotic depressives are younger, have less melancholia, and less memory deficits (Winkour, Black, & Nasrallah, 1987) and are less likely to be admitted and readmitted to hospitals (Kiloh, Andrews, & Neilson, 1988). Symptoms of neurotic depression are low-self esteem, self-criticism, loss of libido, emptiness, insomnia, crying, appetite loss, weight loss, tiredness, and mood worse in the morning (Parker, Blignault, & Manicavasager, 1988). Neurotic depression does not appear in DSM-IV-TR.
Exogenous (reactive)-endogenous depressions. The exogenous (reactive)-endogenous distinction is another dichotomy of depression that has a long history even though results of studies involving this distinction have not clearly shown either bipolarity or orthogonality (Beckam et al., 1995). Endogenous depression presumably has genetic causes and is not a result of preexisting situational or environmental events. On the other hand, reactive depression ostensibly occurs in reaction to preexisting stressful situational or environmental events (Beckam et al., 1995). According to symptom-based studies of endogenous depression, psychomotor retardation, severe depressed mood, lack of reactivity, lack of precipitant, delusion/paranoid features, and guilt are usual symptoms of endogenous depression (Nelson & Charney, 1981; Parker, Hadzi-Pavlovic, & Boyce, 1989). However, it is not clear what the distinctive symptoms for reactive depression are. Prusoff, Weismann, Klerman, and Rounsaville (1980) determined that reactive depressives were less likely to have symptoms of endogenous depression. Since unclearness of symptoms for reactive depression and lack of evidence of orthogonal differences between reactive and endogenous depressions, the distinction between endogenous and non-endogenous, rather than the distinction between endogenous and reactive, is more frequently in evidence.

Primary-secondary depression. Primary depression is a pure form of depression that is not influenced by prior physical or psychiatric disorders (Gilbert, 1992). Primary depression can be either unipolar or bipolar in nature. Unipolar primary depression involves “pure depressive disease” and “depressive spectrum disease” (Gilbert, 1992). Secondary depression is a form of depression that is influenced by other prior psychiatric
disorders, such as anxiety, neurosis, alcoholism, and personality disorder (Gilbert, 1992). Secondary depressives tend to have less severe symptoms, have their first episode at a relatively young age, and have more psychiatric illness histories in their families (Weissman et al., 1977). Secondary depression has characteristics in common with neurotic depression, in that it emphasizes the nonprimacy affective processes and instability of the personality prior to the onset of depression (Beckham et al., 1995). The primary-secondary distinction tends to be used for research purposes rather than in clinical practice (Beckham et al., 1995).

**Unipolar-bipolar depression.** Whether manic periods exist or not is the differentiating criterion of unipolar-bipolar depression. Bipolar depression entails manic periods that include clear elation or excessive irritation, heightened energy and activity, expansive self-esteem, talkativeness and/or racing thoughts, decreased need of sleep, and impulsive behavior (Beckham et al., 1995). Unipolar depression does not involve such manic periods. Thus, the difference between the two depressions is distinctive.

In addition to this definitive difference, unipolar and bipolar forms of depression have differences in various areas. Bipolar depression is the product of stronger genetic influences than is unipolar depression (Perris, 1966; Winkour, Coryell, Endicott, & Akiskal, 1993). Women are more likely to have unipolar depression than men have by the ratio of approximately 2:1 (Weissman & Klermann, 1977). On the other hand, no difference appears to exist between men and women in the number of bipolar depressives (Perris, 1966). The age of onset of bipolar depression is much younger than the age of onset of unipolar depression (Perris, 1966). As for differences in symptomatology,
bipolar depressives are more likely to have hypersomnia than insomnia, compared to
unipolar depressives (Akiskal et al., 1983). Unipolar depressives are more likely to have
loss of appetite (Casper et al., 1985) and loss of weight (Gurpegui, Casanova, & Cervera,
1985). In *DSM-IV-TR*, the major depressive disorder mostly covers the characteristics of
unipolar depression. *DSM-IV-TR* deals with bipolar depression in detail and subdivides it
into Bipolar I and Bipolar II categories.

*Risk Factors of Depression*

Although the causes of depression have not been definitively identified, research
has specified certain conditions that increase the probability of one’s developing
depression. These conditions are called risk factors for depression. A risk factor for
depression is a specific characteristic or condition that seemingly increases the likelihood
of the present or future occurrence of depression (Charney & Weissman, 1988).
Numerous factors have been proposed as risk factors. These include demographic factors,
biological and genetic factors, and social factors.

*Demographic Risk Factors*

*Gender.* Women are more susceptible to depression than man are. It is
consistently the case that depression is more prevalent among women than among men
(Kessler, McGonagle, Swartz, Blazer, & Nelson, 1993; Kessler et al., 1994; National
Institute of Mental Health, 1994; Paykel, 1991; Weissman, Bruce, Leaf, Florio, & Holzer,
1991). The range of women-to-men ratios of prevalence of depression is 1.5:1 to 2:1
(Kaelber et al., 1995).
**Age.** Age affects depression. In the ECA (Epidemiologic Catchment Area) study, the prevalence of major depression based on age groups was 5.0% for age 18-29, 7.5% for age 30-44, 4.0% for age 45-64, and 1.4% for age 65 or older (Weisman et al., 1991). The prevalence of depression in younger adult groups appears to be higher than it is in elderly group. The prevalence of major depression peaks in 30 to 40 year old people (see Table 2.2).

**Table 2.2.** Prevalence of Depression by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Age 18-22</th>
<th>Age 30-44</th>
<th>Age 45-64</th>
<th>Age 65 or over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Weisman, Bruce, Florio, & Holzer (1991)

**Social Class.** Social class relates to depression. Brown and Harris (1978) reported that working class women were much more likely to have been in treatment for depression than were middle class women. Weismann and Meyer (1978) also discovered that the rates of depression among people in lower social classes were higher than among those in higher social classes. These findings have been replicated in other studies (Munoz, 1988).

**Marital Status.** Marital status also appears to be a factor that affects depression. Hirschfeld and Cross (1981) reported that married men exhibited the lowest rate of depression, followed by married women, single widowed women, single widowed or divorced men, and separated or divorced women.
Genetic and Biological Factors


Biological factors. Biological factors have received considerable attention as causes of depression in various studies. Some of these studies have indicated an association between depression and biological factors. For instance, Siever and Davis (1985) posit that the transmission of nerve impulses as mediated by the catecholamine system is related to depression in research they conducted. Sacher (1982) suggested that depression is related to hormonal regulatory systems.

Social factors

Life stressors. Two reviews of literature concerning relationships between depression and life stressors led the authors to conclude that stressful life events are moderately correlated to levels of depressive symptoms (Hirshfeld & Cross, 1981; Mueller, 1980). Infeld (1977) analyzed the influence of “current social stress,” such as marital, parental, occupational, financial, and neighborhood stressors, on depression. He observed that marital stressors, followed by parental and occupational stressors, had high correlations with depression. Early life events, such as early loss of parent by death, also can be risk factors. Paykel’s (1982) review showed that people with depressive symptoms had higher rate of early parental loss than people without depressive symptoms.
Social support. The absence of social support is a risk factor for depression. Brown and Harris’s (1978) study showed an inverse correlation between social support and depression. Their study revealed that the influence of social support on depression is clearer when stressful life events occur. That is, the absence of social support is much more predictive of the occurrence of depression when one is experiencing stressful life events.

Psychological Theories of Depression

Various theories approach depression in various ways. Among them, cognitive theories and behavioral theories are most frequently in evidence. Cognitive theories focus on intrapersonal aspects of depression, and behavioral theories deals with interpersonal aspects. These two contrasting but complementary perspectives provide a good basis for understanding the complicated nature of depression.

Cognitive Theories

All cognitive theories assume the existence of enduring cognitive structures or patterns. These mental templates process all external events into meaningful internal representations. The types of cognitive patterns or structures vary with the individual and can influence depression. Individuals whose cognitive structures are systematically biased in a negative direction are more likely to develop depression. With this common idea of enduring cognitive structures, cognitive theories of depression have several ramifications. Learned Helplessness Theory, Hopelessness theory, and Beck’s Cognitive Model of Depression are prominent among them.
Learned Helplessness Theory of Depression. According to Learned Helplessness Theory (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978), depression occurs when an individual feels helplessness, the belief that he/she cannot influence the achievement of his/her goal. An individual who believes that a highly desired goal is very unlikely to be achievable and that an aversive outcome is likely to occur is more apt to develop depression. Helplessness results from an individual’s negative attributional style. An individual who has symptoms of helplessness tends to attribute causes of negative external events to internal sources or self rather than to external sources. This negative attributional style originates in a maladaptive cognitive structure. Thus, a maladaptive cognitive structure is the source of helplessness and then depression.

Hopelessness Theory of Depression. Hopelessness Theory (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989) is the revised version of Learned Helplessness Theory. Hopelessness Theory also focuses on the negative attributional tendencies that contribute to depression. An additional emphasis in Hopelessness Theory is the presence of life stressors in the occurrence of hopelessness. Hopelessness is not only affected by the maladaptive cognitive structure, one’s negative attributional style, but also by external life stressors, such as loss of a significant other, loss of a job, and unhappy relationships. According to the theory, when an individual who has a negative attributional style encounters life stressors, he/she develops a sense of hopelessness and eventually becomes depressed. Even though Hopelessness Theory acknowledges the role of external stressors in the occurrence of depression, the maladaptive cognitive style still appears the major source
of depression. This maladaptive cognitive structure is called a “schema” in Beck’s cognitive model of depression.

Beck’s Cognitive Model of Depression. “Schema,” the basic structural component of cognitive organization, is the central concept in Beck’s (1967) Cognitive Model of Depression. An individual recognizes the external world by identifying, interpreting, categorizing, and evaluating external events and experiences by means of a schema. Schemata vary across individuals. Nevertheless, a schema of an individual has automatic, repetitive, unintended, and not readily controllable characteristics.

Early life experiences influence an individual’s formation of schema (Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979). People who have negative childhood experiences tend to form negative schemata. Negative schemata remain covert and may not activate symptoms of depression until one encounters negative life events. An individual who has a negative cognitive schema starts to develop depression triggered by negative external events.

Beck (1967) explains how people with the negative schemata develop depression in two ways. First, they tend to see the world, self, and the future negatively. These negative views lead to depression. Second, people with negative schemata may experience cognitive distortions. They develop depression by interpreting all failures and negative events as their own fault and believe that the fault originates in stable and fundamental problems of their own. This negative distortion of cognition invokes depression.

In a recent extension of his theory, Beck (1983, 1991) posited two types of cognitive schema content related to depression: “sociotropy” and “autonomy.” Each type
of schema content tends to be more sensitive than the other to particular types of stressors. A person with a sociotropic schema tends to value closeness, acceptance, dependency, and sharing. Individuals who have sociotropic schemata are sensitive to sociotropic stressors, such as social rejection and social deprivation. When individuals encounter sociotropic stressors, they are more apt to experience depression. Individuals who have sociotropic trauma, such as early loss of parents, are likely to develop sociotropic schemata. On the other hand, a person with an autonomy schema tends to value independent functioning, mobility, choice, and achievement. Such individuals are sensitive to autonomous stressors and are more apt to develop depression when they confront them. Childhood experiences with autonomy-related stressors, such as excessively high standards imposed by parents, tend to lead to the development of autonomy schema.

Matching a schema type and relevant stressors explain why some people develop depression and others do not among the people facing same kind of stressors (Sacco & Beck, 1995). Individuals having sociotropic schema contents are sensitive to social stressors and develop depression by virtue of social stressors, whereas autonomous stressors tend not to lead individuals with sociotropy schema to depression. Conversely, individuals with autonomous schemata are sensitive to and develop depression in the face of autonomy-based stressors. Social stressors tend not to affect occurrence of depression of individuals with autonomy-based schema contents.

Although cognitive theories of depression focus on the intrapersonal development of depression based on the schema, they do not completely ignore the social-
environmental and interpersonal influences on depression (Beck, 1988, 1991). As noted above, both Hopelessness Theory and Beck’s theory acknowledge external stressors, which include interpersonal aspects, as sources of depression. In the extended version of his theory, Beck (1983, 1991) elaborates the role of external stressors in depression. According to Beck (1991), interpersonal loss or threats to autonomy can precipitate reactive depression. Negative attributional styles in cognitive theories may mediate between external and interpersonal events and depression (Sacco & Beck, 1995). This interpretation implies that both environmental and interpersonal aspects play important roles on depression. However, the focus of cognitive theories of depression is still on intrapersonal processes. Full-scale attention to interpersonal aspects of depression is more evident in behavioral theories of depression.

**Behavioral Theories of Depression**

Behavioral theories of depression emphasize the interpersonal context and social environment in which an individual is imbedded as contributing factors. Behavioral theories of depression view an individual’s problems as stemming from interpersonal relationships or social-environmental stimuli and the individual’s depression as the response to them. This behavioral approach to depression originated in Skinner’s idea that depression results from weakening of behavior due to the disruption of positive reinforcement from social environment (Lewinsohn & Gotlib, 1995). From this conception, Coyne (1976) focused on excessive reassurance-seeking in interpersonal relations as a contributing factor to depression. Lewinsohn (1974) focused on a low rate of response-contingent positive reinforcement and lack of social skill.
Coyne’s Excessive Reassurance-Seeking Theory. Coyne (1976) conceptualized depression as a response to disruption in the provision of support and validation from the interpersonal environment. In other words, depression occurs in response to the disruption of one’s interpersonal relations with his/her significant others resulting from his/her excessive reassurance-seeking. An individual with depressive symptoms seeks validation and reassurance from significant others when negative life events occur. In this process, the depressed person faces an interpersonal dilemma. He/she receives some feedback from significant others but doubts whether the feedback is honest or merely a pretense. This doubt makes the individual seek clearer reassurance from significant others. Excessive demands for reassurance annoy and frustrate significant others. Significant others begin to provide mixed feedback, such as positive verbal comments, but negative nonverbal signals. This mixed feedback, in turn, exacerbates the individual’s reassurance-seeking tendencies, which further impair interpersonal relations with the significant others. The impaired relations eventually affect the individual’s depressive state. This process is called a “vicious cycle” and continually intensifies the depressive state. Coyne’s theory has received support in a number of studies (Gotlib & Robinson, 1982; Stephen, Hokanson, & Welker, 1987; Kennedy, Spence, & Hensley, 1989).

Lewinsohn’s Lack of Positive Reinforcement Theory. Lewinsohn (1974) also views depression as related to an individual’s interpersonal behavioral interactions. According to Lewinsohn, a low rate of response-contingent positive reinforcement in an individual’s interpersonal interaction can contribute to depression. Lewinsohn suggested
three predisposing factors that account for a low rate of response-contingent positive
reinforcement rates. The first factor is an individual’s lack of social. Lack of social skill
prevents one from eliciting positive responses from others and limits his or her ability to
cope with aversive situations in interpersonal interaction. The second factor contributing
to a low rate positive reinforcement is lack of possible reinforcers in an individual’s
social environment. The lack of possible reinforcers usually results from the loss of
significant others, impoverishment, or a surplus of aversive experiences. Third, a low
rate of reinforcement may be the product of an individual’s sensitivity to positive or
negative experiences. A person who is more sensitive to negative events tends to engage
in more negative activities, and, thereby, experiences a low rate of positive reinforcement.
Lewinsohn’s theory has support in other studies of depression in adults and children
(Gotlib & Robinson, 1982; Wierzbicki & McCabe, 1988).

Lewinsohn’s Integrating Model. About a decade after Lewinsohn introduced the
preceding theory of depression, he and his colleagues developed a new model of the
etiology and maintenance of depression that included cognitive factors (Lewisnsohn,
Hoberman, Teri, & Hautzinger, 1985). In this model, depression is initiated and
maintained by both environmental and dispositional factors. Situational factors function
as “triggers” of depression, and cognitive factors function as “moderators” of the effects
of environment. Lewinsohn et al. (1985) explained the occurrence and maintenance of
depression as a chain of events. The chain begins with antecedent risk factors, such as
behavioral stressors at the macro level (e.g., negative life events) and micro level (e.g.,
daily hassles). These stressors disrupt an individual’s established behavioral patterns.
The disrupted pattern damages the individual’s personal relationships, which results in a reduced rate of positive reinforcement. As a result of the low rate of positive reinforcement, the individual’s self-awareness increases. This increased self-awareness makes the individual’s sense of failure salient. The individual’s sensitivity to failure leads to depression. The depressed individual, in turn, becomes more sensitive to the antecedent factors, such as stressors.

In this chain of etiology and maintenance of depression, cognitive factors, such as personality, influence what occurs at each stage. Individual differences in the responses to same environmental stimuli can be explained by the cognitive factors, which vary with the individual. In Lewinsohn et al.’s (1985) model, cognitive factors complement behavioral factors in explaining the etiology and maintenance of depression.

In the behavioral theories of depression, major contributing factors to depression are interpersonal problems that arise in given social environments. In view of the emphasis on interpersonal aspects of depression, behavioral theories clearly imply possible communicative influences (Segrin, 1992; Segrin, 2001; Segrin & Abramson 1994; Segrin & Flora, 1998). This communicative aspect of depression further implies that depression may be related to identity gaps, which also emerge in communication.

Identity Gaps and Depression

Among the theories mentioned in the previous section, Self-Discrepancy Theory, Control Theory, and Self-Verification Theory explain the relationships between depression and the personal-relational identity gap. The relationship between depression and the personal-enacted identity gap is explicated by Silencing the Self Theory and
Involuntary Subordination Theory. In the following section, how these theories relate the two types of identity gaps to depression is the focus of interest.

*Depression and Personal Relational Identity Gap*

As noted in the previous section, Self-Discrepancy Theory (Higgins, 1987) divides self into six categories on the basis of the three domains of self (actual, ideal, and ought) and the two standpoints on self (own and others’). These six selves are: actual self from an individual’s own standpoint (actual/own); actual self from other’s standpoint (actual/other); ideal self from an individual’s own standpoint (ideal/own); ideal self from other’s standpoint (ideal/other); ought self from an individual’s own standpoint (ought/own); and ought self from other’s standpoint (ought/other). Self-Discrepancy Theory posits that self-discrepancies between combinations of any two kinds of self relate to different kinds of emotional discomfort. This theory especially focuses on the relationships between specific forms of emotional discomfort and four types of discrepancy: actual/own versus ideal/own; actual/own versus ideal/other; actual/own versus ought/other; and actual/own versus ought/own. Among these, discrepancies between actual/own versus ideal/other and actual/own versus ought/other correspond to the gap between personal and relational identities.

According to Higgins, Klein, and Strauman (1985), the discrepancy between actual/own versus ideal/others is associated with feeling lack of pride, feeling lonely, feeling blue, feeling no interest in things, and a lack of feeling sure of self and one’s goals. All of these emotions arouse symptoms of depression. Thus, the discrepancy between self involving an individual’s own ideas of self and self as reflecting others’
expectations of an individual’s ideal attributes is related to depression. The discrepancy between actual/own and ought/other also relates to feelings of fear, threat, and restlessness. These emotions can signal depression, but in indirect ways. According to Higgins, Klein, and Strauman (1985), self-discrepancy between actual/own and ideal/other is generally related to dejection-related emotions, and self-discrepancy between actual/own and ought/other tends to be associated with agitation-related emotions. These findings have support in a number of later studies (Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1997; Houston, 1990; Scott & O’Hara, 1993; Strauman, 1990; Strauman & Higgins, 1987). In short, then, the actual/own versus ideal/other discrepancy is more likely to be related to depression than actual/own versus ought/other discrepancy.

Self-Discrepancy Theory also posits that the greater the magnitude and the accessibility of a type of self-discrepancy are, the more the person with the discrepancy experiences the emotional discomfort associated with the self-discrepancy (Higgins, Bond, Klein, & Strauman, 1986). Accordingly, the greater the magnitude of the self-discrepancy between actual/own and ideal/other a person sees, the more intensely the person experiences depressive symptoms. Also, the more accessibility to the actual/own versus ideal/other self-discrepancy a person has, the greater is the possibility of his/her developing depressive symptoms.

In a previous section, it was noted that Control Theory (Carver & Scheier, 1982) divided self in terms of one’s reference criterion and perceptual input, which roughly correspond to personal and relational identities. Given this division, Hyland (1987) claims that a discrepancy between reference criterion and perceptual input is a sufficient
condition for depression. The discrepancy and the degree to which an individual perceives the discrepancy are called “error” and “error sensitivity,” respectively. An error lasting for long term is called “prolonged control mismatch,” whereas a short-term error is “transient mismatch.” A transient mismatch develops into a prolonged control mismatch if it is not solved within a relatively short period of time.

A prolonged control mismatch can be prevented by a self-protection mechanism, which includes attempts to reduce errors (Hyland 1987). There are three kinds of self-protection mechanisms. First, one can reduce errors by redefining perceptual input. Second, one can reduce the significance of an error by reducing error sensitivity. In other words, if one does not regard an error as serious, the error will lose its significance. Third, one can reduce an error by changing a reference criterion. When these self-protection mechanisms fail to adjust a transient mismatch, the mismatch turns to a prolonged mismatch and eventually leads to depression. Thus, from the view of the Control Theory interpretation of depression, the discrepancy between personal and relational identities is a source of depression. Depression is especially likely when a person fails to reduce the discrepancy and thus the discrepancy is prolonged.

Self-Verification Theory (Swann, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1996, 1997), combined with theories of depression based on interpersonal relations, such as those of Lewinsohn (1974) and Coyne (1976), also suggests that depression is related to the personal-relational identity gap. For Coyne (1976), a risk factor in depression is an individual’s excessive reassurance-seeking in interpersonal relations. An individual creates a negative relational environment by excessively seeking assurance. Eventually, one who fails to
receive enough positive reassurance from others tends to develop depression. In Lewinson’s (1974) theory, an individual may develop depression when he or she cannot receive response-contingent positive reinforcement from others because the person does not have sufficient behavioral skills to create the positive reinforcement. For both Coyne and Lewinsohn, depression arises when an individual receives negative feedback or appraisals in the interaction with others.

Applying Self-Verification Theory to Coyne’s and Lewinsohn’s interpersonal theories of depression, a risk factor for depression may not be so much the others’ negative feedback per se, but instead the difference between a self-view and others’ feedback. Self-Verification Theory posits that people prefer others’ appraisals that confirm their own self-views. Thus, people who have positive self-views seek others’ positive appraisals, and those who have negative self-views look for negative appraisals. In Coyne’s and Lewinsohn’s theories, an individual’s attempts to reassure or reinforce his/her behavior or self-view by others imply that an individual with a positive self-view seeks self-confirming positive feedback from others. When an individual with a positive self-view fails to reassure or reinforce his/her behavior or self-view by others, he/she may develop depression. Hence, Coyne’s and Lewinsohn’s risk factors for depression seem to be discrepancies between self-views and others’ appraisals.

However, Coyne’s and Lewinsohn’s theories focus only on the discrepancy between a positive self-view and others’ negative appraisals. In Self-Verification Theory, people with negative self-views prefer negative feedback. Thus, those with negative self-views may try to reassure or reinforce their negative self-views. When people fail to
receive reassurance or reinforce for their negative self-views in their interpersonal relations, they also may experience depression. Accordingly, if one combines Self-Verification Theory and Coyne’s and Lewinson’s theories of depression, not only positively self-viewed people’s failing to receive positive feedback from others but also negatively self-viewed people’s failing to receive negative feedback from others can be relevant risk factors in the development of depression. In other words, whether it is positive or negative, if there is a gap between a person’s self-views and others’ appraisals, the person may develop depression.

In the studies above, a possible influence of personal-relational identity gaps on depression was indicated by the influences of the discrepancies between actual/own self and ideal/other self, one’s reference criteria and perceptual inputs, and one’s self-views and others’ appraisals on depression. A possible influence of the personal-enacted identity gap on depression is also suggested by other studies.

**Depression and Personal-Enacted Identity Gap**

An individual can choose or be forced to suppress expressing his/her authentic self in communication, which, thereby, can create a gap between suppressed authentic self and expressed inauthentic self. This identity gap between the enacted self and the authentic self may relate to depression. Silencing the Self Theory and Involuntary Subordination Theory help explain this relationship.

Silencing the Self Theory (Jack, 1991) explains the relationship between depression and the gap between suppressed authentic self and expressed inauthentic self. In a longitudinal study of depressed women, Jack (1991) determined that women’s
silencing the real self is a risk factor of depression. Self-silencing refers to “removing critical aspects of self from dialogue for specific relational purpose” (Jack, 1999, p. 225). Women often silence their real selves, especially in regard to such negative emotions as anger, demands, or oppositional feeling, to meet social expectations concerning femininity and maintain their relationships with their male partners. They often face the choice of either isolation or subordination in the relationships with their male partners (Jack, 1999). If a woman acts on her own need, she may lose her relationship with her partner and be isolated. If she silences her voice to meet culturally defined standards of femininity, she can lose her self. This situation may lead to feelings of hopelessness and eventually to depression (Jack, 1999).

In this kind of situation, a woman tends to choose silencing herself because she fears negative consequences (e.g., violence, gender discrimination, poverty, retaliation, and divorce) from expressing her own needs, such as opposition, anger, assertion, aggression, or selfishness. This silencing fosters depression (Jack, 1999). This conclusion has further support in the findings of other studies (Duarte & Thompson, 1999; Gratch, Bassett, & Attra, 1994; Page, Stevens, & Galvin, 1997).

In this theory, silencing the self is enacting inauthentic self, suppressing authentic self in a woman’s social relationships. A woman’s silencing herself opens gaps between her silenced authentic self and enacted inauthentic self. Accordingly, positive relationships between depression and self-silencing implicate positive relationships between depression and the personal-enacted identity gaps.
Involuntary Subordination Theory also indicates that depression may relate to the gap between personal and the enacted identities even though this theory does not directly address self or identity issues. One can involuntarily subordinate him or herself to others, usually more powerful people, to survive when the individual loses in social competition with others or such a loss is likely. Gardner and Price (1999) contend that involuntary subordination strategies serve as means for an individual to survive in social competitions, especially, those involving losses. More specifically, the functions of the involuntary subordinate strategy are:

- to inhibit aggressive (and potentially costly) behavior toward rivals and superiors (but not toward inferiors);
- to create a subjective self-view of incapacity (which encourages the inhibition of aggressive behavior);
- to communicate to rivals and superiors a “no-threat” signal (which discourage aggression from others);
- to communicate to allies an “out of action--can’t help you” signal (which encourage them to fend themselves); and to promote self-acceptance of a subordinate rank. (Joiner, Coyne, & Blalock, 1999, p. 8)

Although these functions of involuntary subordination strategies may help people survive, they possibly contribute to depression in the process (Gardner & Price, 1999; Sloman, Price, Gilbert, & Gardner, 1994). People who cannot reciprocate rivals’ or superiors’ attacks or insults tend to use involuntary subordinating strategies. Non-
reciprocated attacks and insults of involuntarily subordinating people, however, may result in loss of self-esteem and later depression (Gardner & Price, 1999).

The theory suggests that depression also may be triggered by anger and frustration (Sloman, Price, Gilbert, & Gardner, 1994). When a person loses important resources in social competition and notes many punitive and putting down signals, he or she can develop anger and frustration. A person also becomes angry and frustrated when he or she cannot identify any alternative to being in a losing situation. Such anger and frustration trigger involuntary subordinating strategies. Application of them inhibits a person’s further challenges, explorations, and hopes. This inhibition can have devastating effects on mood, energy, and confidence. Finally, when the feeling of devastation and lack of confidence are prolonged, they are apt to lead to depression.

In this theory, involuntary subordination implies the enactment of the inauthentic self suppressing the authentic self in the relationships with others. As with self-silencing, involuntary subordination entails the discrepancy between an individual’s real self and enacted self. If depression relates to involuntary subordination, which implies that depression also relates to discrepancies between a person’s real self and enacted self (involuntarily subordinated self), that is, identity gaps between personal and enacted identities.

As noted, self-silencing and involuntary subordination imply identity gaps between personal identities and enacted identities. Self-silencing and involuntary subordination also appear to influence the occurrence and maintenance of depression. Thus, it is likely that the personal-enacted identity gap can influence depression.
In this chapter, the literature relating Korean Americans’ situational and environmental characteristics, identity and identity gap, depression, and relationships between depression and identity gaps were reviewed. In light of this review, hypotheses and a hypothesized model based on the hypotheses involving series of relationships from situational and environmental characteristics of Korean Americans to the two types of identity gaps to level of depression are posited.

Hypotheses and Hypothesized model

Hypotheses that derive from previous research and theories posit that for Korean Americans’ situational factors contribute to gaps between personal and enacted identities, as well as to gaps between personal and relational identities, arising in their interethnic interaction. Moreover, these identity gaps are at the base of their experienced levels of depression. Below are hypotheses and explanations of the bases for the hypotheses and a hypothesized model that combines all hypotheses.

First, Korean Americans’ limited intercultural communication competence contributes to the emergence of the two types of identity gaps in interethnic interaction. Intercultural communication competence refers to knowledge, motivation, and skills to interact effectively and appropriately with members of other cultures (Spitzberg, 2000; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Wiseman, 2002). Korean Americans tend to have limited skills in their communication with other ethnic groups stemming from limited English proficiency (Hurh & Kim, 1990; Kuo, 1984; Kuo & Tsai, 1986; Nah, 1993). They also tend to lack knowledge about other ethnic groups’ cultures because of their comparatively low levels of acculturation (Atkins & Gim, 1989; Kim, 1993; Stewart,
1993). Due to lack of intercultural communication skills and knowledge, Korean Americans may have problems in presenting their authentic selves in interethnic communication. Hence, their intercultural communication competence may lead to gaps between personal and enacted identities in interethnic interaction. This suggests the following hypothesis:

H1a: Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence influence their personal-enacted identity gaps arising in interethnic interaction.

Korean Americans’ lack of intercultural communication competence may result in misunderstandings in interethnic communication. Such misunderstandings can lead to other ethnic group members’ misportraying Korean Americans. Such misportrayals, in turn, can be communicated to Korean Americans and result in differences between how they view themselves and their perceptions of how other ethnic group members view them. It is in this way that their intercultural communication competence contributes to creating gaps between personal identity and ascribed relational identity in their interethnic communication. From this, another hypothesis follows:

H1b: Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence influences their personal-relational identity gaps arising in interethnic interaction.
Korean Americans’ middleperson minority status can contribute to emergence of the two types of identity gaps in interethnic interaction. As representatives of a middleperson minority, Korean Americans tend to experience discrimination by European Americans and rejection by African Americans and Latinos/as (Min, 1995). Because of these unfriendly attitudes of other ethnic groups, Korean Americans may restrict expressing their authentic selves to avoid possible problems in interethnic interaction. Accordingly, differences between expressed selves and authentic selves can surface. Korean Americans’ middleperson status influences the emergence of identity gaps between personal and enacted identities in their interethnic communication in this way. Hence, below is the third hypothesis:

H2a: Korean Americans’ middleperson status influences their personal-enacted identity gaps arising in interethnic interaction.

Other ethnic groups’ unfriendly attitudes also can result in Korean Americans’ development of identity gaps between personal and relational identities in interethnic communication. Such groups often develop stereotypes toward Korean Americans on the basis of their discriminatory or rejecting attitudes. For example, African Americans reportedly stereotype Korean Americans as money crazy, interlopers, materialistic, and workaholic (Weitzer, 1997). It is likely that discrepancies exist between other ethnic groups’ stereotypes toward Korean Americans and Korean Americans’ own self-portrayals. These discrepancies can be perceived by Korean Americans in their
interethnic interaction. Hence, Korean Americans may have identity gaps between personal and ascribed relational identities in interethnic communication stemming from their middle person status. Below is the hypothesis arising from this reasoning:

H2b: Korean Americans’ middleperson status influences their personal-relational identity gaps arising in interethnic interaction.

Korean Americans’ perceptions of racial hierarchy can influence the identity gaps they feel in interethnic interaction. Korean Americans fall between European Americans, and African Americans and Latinos/as in the current racial hierarchy in the United States. Their perception of their position in the racial hierarchy can result in the formation of different attitudes toward different racial groups and, thus, express themselves in different ways according to interaction partners’ races. These differently expressed selves are likely to be different from their authentic selves. That is, the perception of racial hierarchy may influence Korean Americans’ enactment of selves and subsequently create gaps between personal and enacted identities. Thus:

H3a: Korean Americans perception of racial hierarchy in American society influences their personal-enacted identity gaps arising in interethnic interaction.
Korean Americans’ attitudes and behavior toward other minority groups based on their perception of racial hierarchy also can contribute to other ethnic groups’ portraying Korean Americans differently from Korean Americans’ own portrayals. If Korean Americans treat African Americans and Latinos/as as inferior groups on the basis on their perceptions of racial hierarchy, this may result in African Americans’ and Latinos/as’ reciprocal negative views of Korean Americans, which may be different from Korean Americans’ own views of themselves. Similarly, if Korean Americans treat European Americans as a superior group, that may result in European Americans’ valorizing Korean Americans as a model minority and/or ostracizing them as an inferior group. Other minority groups’ negative attitudes and the dominant group’s valorizing and/or ostracizing attitude may lead to inaccurate stereotypes toward Korean Americans. Korean Americans’ perceiving the inaccurate stereotypes in interethnic interaction can lead to gaps between personal and ascribed relational identities. Hence, the following hypothesis emerges:

H3b: Korean Americans perception of racial hierarchy in American society influences their personal-relational identity gaps arising in interethnic interaction.

Identity gaps have important implications for mental health. On the basis of the review of literature above, the relationships between the two types of identity gaps and levels of depression are hypothesized. Gaps between personal identity and enacted
identity may influence Korean Americans’ levels of depression. Studies growing from Silencing the Self Theory (Duarte & Thompson, 1999; Gratch, Bassett, & Attrra, 1994; Jack, 1991, 1999; Page, Stevens, & Galvin, 1997) and Involuntary Subordination Theory (Gardner & Price, 1999; Sloman, Price, Gilbert, & Gardner, 1994) reveal that expressing inauthentic self and/or suppressing authentic self can lead to depression. That is, a gap between personal identity (suppressed authentic self) and enacted identity (expressed inauthentic self) in Korean Americans’ interethnic interaction is likely to contribute to their depressive symptoms. Consequently:

H4a: Korean Americans personal-enacted identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction influence their levels of depression.

Korean Americans’ identity gaps between the personal identity and the ascribed relational identity also may influence their levels of depression. Studies deriving from Self-Discrepancy Theory suggest that a discrepancy between an individual’s actual self and his/her ideal self imposed by others are accompanied by depressive symptoms (Higgins, 1987; Higgins, Klein, & Strauman, 1985; Higgins, Shah, & Friedman, 1999; Houston, 1990; Scott & O’Hara, 1993; Straumann, 1990; Straumann & Higgins, 1987). Control Theory posits that a mismatch between inner identity standard (reference criteria) and identity given in a situation (perceptual input) leads to depression (Carver & Scheir, 1982; Hyland, 1987). Self-Verification Theory (Swann, 1983, 1985, 1997, 1999), combined with Lewinsohn’s (1974) and Coyne’s (1976) theories of depression, indicates
that difference between a self-view and others’ feedback can be a source of depression. All these theories imply or, otherwise, suggest that differences between an individual’s own self-views and others’ views of the individual results in depression. Hence, Korean Americans’ identity gap between personal and ascribed relational identities in interethnic interaction can be a contributing factor in their experience of depressive symptoms. In light of this:

H4b: Korean Americans’ personal-relational identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction influences their levels of depression.

Combining all these hypotheses, it appears that Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perception of racial hierarchy all influence the extent to which they experience personal-enacted identity gaps and personal-relational identity gaps, and that these two types of identity gap, in turn, contribute to Korean Americans’ level of depression. Therefore, the hypothesized model (see Figure 2.1) is formulated involving all the aforementioned hypothesized relationships. The model predicts that a set of situational variables including Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perception of racial hierarchy influence the two types of identity gaps (the personal-enacted gap and the personal-relational gap), which, in turn, influence Korean Americans’ levels of depression. This study examines the appropriateness of the overall model and tests the individual hypotheses implied in the model.
The hypothesized model implicates the possibility that the two types of identity gaps mediate the influence of the three situational variables on the levels of depression. In addition to testing the hypothesized model and the relationships indicated in the model, the mediation functions of the two types of identity gaps between the three situational characteristics of Korean Americans and their levels of depression were examined.

**Figure 2.1. Hypothesized Model**

A variable functions as a mediator when it meets the following conditions: (a) variations in an independent variable significantly account for variations in a presumed mediator, (b) variations in a mediator significantly account for variations in a dependent variable, and (c) when paths from an independent variable to a mediator and from this
mediator to a dependent variable are controlled, the original effects of the independent variable on the dependent variables significantly shrinks (Barron & Kenny, 1996: Mackinnon & Dwyer, 1993).

The hypothesized relationships between the three situational factors and the two types of identity gaps and the identity gaps and the levels of depression meet the first and second conditions and, thus, provide a rationale for the two types of identity gaps to be a mediator between the situational variables and levels of depression. The third condition is an empirical rather than theoretical criterion. Although a theoretical rationale for the third condition is not provided, meeting the first two conditions constitutes a reasonable rationale to establish the following hypotheses concerning the mediation effects of the two types of identity gaps:

H5a: Korean Americans’ personal-enacted identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction mediate the influence of Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence on their levels of depression.

H5b: Korean Americans’ personal-enacted identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction mediate the influence of their middleperson status on their levels of depression.

H5c: Korean Americans’ personal-enacted identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction mediate the influence of their
perception of racial hierarchy on their levels of depression.

H6a: Korean Americans’ personal-relational identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction mediate the influence of their intercultural communication competence on their levels of depression.

H6b: Korean Americans’ personal-relational identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction mediate the influence of their middleperson status on their levels of depression.

H6c: Korean Americans’ personal-relational identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction mediate the influence of their perception of racial hierarchy on their levels of depression.

The next chapter describes the methods used to test the hypothesized model and the hypotheses, including sampling, data collection, measurement of variables, and data analyses.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

This study used survey research methods to test the hypotheses and the hypothesized model suggested in the previous chapter for the following reasons. First, this study used a relatively large sample. A survey research method is appropriate for a study dealing with a relatively large sample (Babbie, 1998). Second, this study was intended to objectively examine the relationships between the possible contributing factors and Korean Americans’ levels of depression. Doing this required standardized instruments to measure variables and objective analyses of the data acquired. Again, a survey research method is appropriate for using standardized measures and doing systematic analyses (Fowler, 2000). As survey research, this study involved sampling, obtaining appropriate measures of the variables, collecting data, and analyzing the data. These topics provide the organizational framework for this chapter.

Sample

The sample for this study was recruited from Korean American ethnic churches in New York City area. There are two major Korean American residential areas in the metropolitan New York City area. One is the Flushing area in the borough of Queens in New York City, and the other is the Fort Lee area in New Jersey. Many Korean American ethnic churches are located in these two areas. A convenient sample was obtained from these two areas. Four churches, two from each area, were chosen. The researcher’s acquaintances introduced him to a minister of a church in Fort Lee. After collecting data from members of congregation of the church, he asked the minister to
introduce him to another church. The third and the fourth churches were selected in the same way.

Convenience sampling was used for the following reasons. First, since a sampling frame involving all Korean American population did not exist, probability sampling was not possible. Instead, Korean American ethnic churches were used as an alternative because more than 75% of Korean Americans go to church (Hurh & Kim, 1984; Min, 1995). Second, convenience sampling procedure allowed for efficiency and ease in data collection that probability sampling often preclude. Although the sample for this study was not representative, considering high percentage of Korean Americans’ church-going, it appeared to be appropriate. In addition, many Korean Americans, especially recently immigrated ones, tend to go to church not only for the religious purpose but also for social purposes, such as seeking social support or establishing social networks (Min, 1995). This tendency could reduce possible biases stemming from the religion in this sample and contribute to increased representativeness.

The four churches were selected by the referral or the recommendation of the researcher’s acquaintances or church ministers as a way to increase the response rate. The church ministers’ and staffs’ cooperation was essential for data collection. Without other ministers’ or church members’ referrals or recommendations, obtaining cooperation from the churches would have been difficult. Without cooperation, collecting significant amount of data would have not been possible.

A total of 419 individuals from the four churches participated in the survey. Of these, 42 did not fall into Korean American category (e.g., Korean students in U. S.)
universities or Korean resident staffs of Korean companies in the U. S.) and were not included in the analyses. Hence, the final sample totaled 377 participants. Fifty two percent were males and 48% were female. The range of median age was 40-49. Sixty percent were married, 28% were single, nine percent were divorced, and three percent were widowed. Median annual income ranged from $30,000 to $50,000. Forty nine percent of the participants were college graduates. Ninety seven percent were Korean born, first generation immigrants and 57% had lived in the U. S. more than 10 years. For 38% of the participants, Latino/as were the ethnic group, with which they came in contact most frequently. European Americans were the most frequently contacted ethnic group for 37% of the participants. African Americans were most frequently contacted by 25% of the participants.

Measures

The six variables of interest were measured by means of self-report questionnaires. The variables included “level of depression,” “personal-enacted identity gap,” “personal-relational identity gap,” “intercultural communication competence,” “middleperson status,” and “perception of racial hierarchy.” Self-report, which is a defining characteristic of survey research, is especially appropriate for measuring affect or perception (McCroscky, 1997). Level of depression, identity gaps, and perceptions of racial hierarchy all relate to a person’s affect or perception. As for intercultural communication competence, because a person’s perceived competence was the focus of interest, self-report again seemed relevant. Middleperson status also can be evident in responses to simple self-report questions concerning a person’s occupation. The
questionnaire used in this study consisted of close-ended questions because they facilitate answers and, thus, maximize response rate. Close-ended questions also facilitated statistical analyses of the data.

Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence was measured by means of Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman’s (1978) intercultural effectiveness questionnaire. Middleperson status was determined by simple questions reflecting its operational definition. The scales for measuring perceptions of racial hierarchy, personal-enacted identity gap, and personal-relational identity gap were newly developed for this study. Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale developed by Radloff (1977) was the measure of Korean Americans’ levels of depression. Operational definitions and the scales relating to the six variables are the subject of the discussion that follows.

Intercultural Communication Competence

This study focused on an individual’s perceived ability to deal with communication and interpersonal relationships in intercultural interaction. Hammer et al.’s (1978) intercultural effectiveness questionnaire taps one’s communicative skills and knowledge appropriate for intercultural interactions (communication factor), abilities to establish and maintain interpersonal relationships with other culture group members (relationship factor), and abilities to deal with psychological stress in an unfamiliar culture (stress factor).

The questionnaire, which consists of 18 personal ability items comprising three factors, is one of the two most common instruments for empirically assessing
intercultural competence (Spitzberg & Kube, 1988). Evidence in support of the validity and reliability of Hammer et al.’s (1978) original questionnaire received was presented originally in Gudykunst and Hammer’s (1984) study and then again in Hammer’s (1987) replication of his original study with a larger sample. Hammer, Nishida, and Jezek (1986) determined that the questionnaire was appropriate for white North American, Mexican, and Japanese samples.

However, Hammer et al’s (1978) questionnaire does not specifically apply to intercultural communication but rather to intercultural effectiveness in general. In addition to communicative and interpersonal abilities, it includes the stress factor that measures individual’s abilities to deal with psychological stress in unfamiliar environments. These psychological abilities are not directly related to communicative competence, at least as conceptualized in this study. Thus, assessing them was not necessary as the study focused on Korean American’s communicative and interpersonal abilities in interethnic interaction. Accordingly, among the 18 original items, 8 items relating to the stress factor were eliminated. The result was a 10-item scale involving communication (4 items) and relationship (6 items) factors. In this study, the Cronbach’s alpha reliability for this 10-item scale was .87. Two sample items of this questionnaire appear below:

Respond to the following statements based on your experience in communication with members of another ethnic group with which you interact most in every day life. (1=very difficult; 7=very easy)
1. To effectively deal with communication misunderstanding

2. To maintain interpersonal satisfying relationships with others

Middleperson Status

As discussed in the previous chapter, a majority of Korean Americans operate retail stores in low-income other minority groups areas or are employed in such stores (Kim, 1981; Kim & Hurh, 1985; Min, 1990; 1992). This employment pattern of Korean Americans is consistent with a definition of middleperson minority (Min, 1995; Zenner, 1992). Thus, a Korean American who runs a retail store in a predominantly African American or Latino/a areas, or a Korean-American worker employed in that kind of store qualified as a middleperson in the study. On the basis of this definition, two questions served to assess a Korean American’s middleperson status. An affirmative answer for the questions scored 1, and a negative answer scored 0. Summing the scores of the two questions constitutes the middleperson status score, with higher scores indicating more middleperson status. That is, a participant who both owned and worked at a store in an African American or Latino/a area (N = 122, 33%) received the highest scores and were considered to have the most middleperson status. A participant who worked at a Korean-owned store but did not own a store (N = 46, 12%), or a participant who owned a store but usually did not work at a store (N = 22, 6%) might were regarded as having the next highest degree of middleperson status. These two types of participants were considered to have same level of middleperson status because criteria for determining which type
was more middleperson-like were not clear. A Korean American who neither owned nor worked at a store (N = 184, 49%) was classified as a non-middleperson.

1. Do you work at a Korean-American-owned store in an African American or Latino/a area?

2. Do you own a retail store in an African American or Latino/a area?

Perception of Racial Hierarchy

This study addressed Korean Americans’ perceptions of racial hierarchy among European Americans, African Americans, Latinos/as, and Asian Americans. Assessing perceptions of racial hierarchy required the development of a new scale, as no scale currently appeared to be applicable. The reliability and construct validity of the new scale were estimated through the test of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) and factor analysis.

Eight items were generated for the scale. For each item, each of the four racial groups of European Americans, African Americans, Latinos/as, and Asian Americans was rated on a 7-point scale (1=very low; 7=very high). Below are the 8 items:

1. What is the income level of a typical or average member of each of the following groups?

2. What is the education level of a typical or average member of each group?

3. What is the quality of the job a typical or average member of each group has?

4. How do you perceive the intellectual ability of a typical or average member of each group?
5. How much discrimination does a typical or average member of each group experiences in society?

6. Rate the overall social status of each group in American society.

7. How much amount of opportunities does a typical or average member of each group have in society in order to improve his/her life?

8. Rate the overall power each group has in American society.

To obtain a score of perception of a racial hierarchy, the variance of a respondent’s answers across the four racial groups was calculated for each item. Then, the variances of the eight items were summed. This total variance of each respondent represented his/her perception of the degree of overall racial hierarchy, not his/her perception of the position of any one group in the hierarchy, with greater variance indicated greater perception of racial hierarchy.

A factor analysis was conducted with variances of racial hierarchy to identify items that validly measure the variable. A Principal Component Analysis extraction method was utilized to obtain factors by use of SPSS. One factor was obtained with the eigenvalue 1.0 or greater (see Table 3.1). According to Comrey and Lees’ (1992) suggestion, applying .45 as the cut-off point, all 8 items were retained in the factor (see Table 3.2).

Internal consistency reliability of the eight items was indexed by Cronbach’s alpha. The alpha coefficient of the items was .89. Thus, the eight items loading on the first factor constituted the scale that appeared to provide valid and reliable measure of the perception of racial hierarchy.
Table 3.1. Total Variance Explained in a Factor Analysis for the Racial Hierarchy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.650</td>
<td>58.128</td>
<td>58.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>10.793</td>
<td>69.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>9.011</td>
<td>78.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>5.703</td>
<td>83.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>4.893</td>
<td>88.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>4.477</td>
<td>93.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>3.899</td>
<td>97.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>2.951</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 3.2. Factor Loadings for the Racial Hierarchy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Personal-Enacted Identity Gaps

Personal-enacted identity gap refers to a discrepancy between an individual’s self views and his/her expressed self in interaction with others. To measure this gap, a scale with 11 items developed by Jung and Hecht (in press) was translated into Korean and used. Each item was rated on a 7-point scale in the Likert format (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree). Validity and the reliability evidence for the scale was presented in Jung and Hecht’s (in press). However, since that study was conducted with a European
American sample, reliability and validity were re-estimated for the Korean American sample in this study. The 11 items of the scale appear below:

1. When I communicate with my communication partners, they get to know “real me.”

2. I feel that I can communicate with my communication partners in a way that is consistent with who I really am.

3. I feel that I can be myself when communicating with my communication partners.

*4. I express myself in a certain way that is not real me when communicating with my communication partners.

*5. I do not reveal important aspects of myself in communication with my communication partners.

*6. When communicating with my communication partners, I often lose sense of who I am.

*7. I do not express real me when, I think, it is different from my communication partners’ expectation.

*8. I sometimes mislead my communication partners about who I really am.

*9. There is a difference between real me and the impression I give my communication partners about me.

10. I speak truthfully to my communication partners about myself.

11. I freely express real me in communication with my communication partners.

Note. Items with an asterisk were eliminated

A factor analysis was conducted with the above 11 items utilizing a Principal Component Analysis extraction method and Varimax rotation. Two factors with
eigenvalues 1.0 or greater emerged (see Table 3.3). In line with Comrey and Lee’s (1992) suggestion, items with loadings of .45 and greater for one factor and loadings smaller than .45 for the other factor were retained in the former factor. As a result, items 1, 2, 3, 10 and 11 fell into factor 1. Factor 2 included items 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 (see Table 3.4). The coefficient of inter-factor correlation was .21.

The two factors did not appear to be substantively distinct. The six items in the factor two were negatively worded or implied negative meanings. Except for the differences in the wording, no substantively interpretable differences separating the two factors were evident. According to Converse and Presser (1986), items with negative wording or meanings that ask about the degree of agreement often lead to response errors. Hence, the six items might be products of the response errors. Since the results indicated possibilities of response errors on the items in the second factor, and a parsimonious scale is desirable, the six items in the second factor were eliminated. Accordingly, the remaining five items constituted the scale for measuring the personal-relational identity gaps. Cronbach’s alpha for the five-item scale was .79.
Table 3.3. Total Variance Explained in a Factor Analysis for the Personal-Enacted Identity Gap Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.628</td>
<td>32.982</td>
<td>32.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>16.647</td>
<td>49.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>8.927</td>
<td>58.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>7.738</td>
<td>66.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>6.870</td>
<td>73.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>5.987</td>
<td>79.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>5.547</td>
<td>84.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>5.329</td>
<td>90.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>3.830</td>
<td>93.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>97.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 3.4. Factor Loadings for the Two-Factor Solution of the Personal-Enacted Identity Gap Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
  Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization


Personal-Relational Identity Gap

The personal-relational identity gap is a discrepancy between an individual’s self-view and the individual’s perception of other’s view of him/her, that is, a discrepancy between how an individual views him or herself and the individual’s perception of how others view him/her. To measure personal-relational identity gap, the 12-item scale developed by Jung and Hecht (in press) for European Americans was modified and used. The negativity or affirmativity of the wording of the items was adjusted for better results in translating into the Korean version of the scale. As with the personal-enacted scale, the validity and the reliability of this scale was re-examined with the present sample. Each item was rated a 7-point scale in the Likert format (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree). Following are the 12 items:

1. I feel that my communication partners do not see me as I see myself.

*2. I am same as the way my communication partners would see me.

*3. I agree with how my communication partners would describe me.

4. I feel that my communication partners have wrong images of me.

*5. I feel that my communication partners have correct information about me.

6. I feel that my communication partners portray me not based on information provided by myself but information from other sources.

7. I feel that my communication partners stereotype me.

8. I feel that my communication partners do not realize that I have been changing and still portray me based on my past images.

9. I feel that my communication partners do not know who I used to be when
they portray me.

10. When my communication partners talk about me, I often wonder if they talk about me or someone else.

11. I feel that there are differences between who I think I am and who my communication partners think I am.

12. My communication partners do not like the things about me that I like about myself.

Note. The item with an asterisk was eliminated.

In a factor analysis using a Principal Component Analysis extraction method with Varimax rotation, two factors were retained with eigenvalues 1.0 or greater (see Table 3.5). With the same criteria for item-inclusion used above, items 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 comprised factor 1. Items 2, 3, and 5 loaded on factor 2 (see Table 3.6). The coefficient of inter-factor correlation was .26. However, all three items in the second factor were reversed in scoring. Except for the differences in scoring, no substantive differences existed between the two factors. Again, response errors were possible on the three reversed items in scoring. Because of these possible response errors and for a parsimony purpose, the three items in the factor two were eliminated. Thus, the personal-relational identity gaps were measured by the remaining nine items. Cronbach’s alpha for the nine-item scale was .82.
Table 3.5. Total Variance Explained in a Factor Analysis for the Personal-Relational Identity Gap Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>33.123</td>
<td>33.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>12.914</td>
<td>46.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>7.725</td>
<td>53.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>7.547</td>
<td>61.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>6.682</td>
<td>67.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>5.776</td>
<td>73.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>5.594</td>
<td>79.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>4.779</td>
<td>84.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>4.540</td>
<td>88.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>92.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>3.874</td>
<td>96.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>3.560</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 3.6. Factor Loadings for the Two-Factor Solution of the Personal-Enacted Identity Gap Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization
In addition, since the personal-enacted and personal-relational identity gap scales addressed similar kind of cognitive structures related to identity and communication they might not be truly separable constructs resulting in overlap between the items. Moreover, there was a possibility that some items might measure the other construct better rather than the construct they were originally supposed to measure. To clarify these questions a single Principle Components Factor Analysis was conducted which combined items in both scales. In this analysis, all nine items in the scale for the personal-relational identity gap loaded on the first factor at the cut-off point .45 (see Table 3.7), while all five items in the scale for the personal-enacted identity gap loaded on a second factor, with no cross-loading. The coefficient of inter-factor correlation between the two scales was .10. These results showed that the two scales are clearly separated and, thus, the personal-enacted and personal-relational identity gaps are distinguishable empirically.

Table 3.7. Factor Loadings for the Combined items of the Two Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Personal-Relational Factor</th>
<th>Personal-Enacted Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Depression

In this study, level of depression referred to the degree to which an individual feels depressive mood or symptoms. Apart from clinical diagnosis of depression, which focuses on depression as a disease, depression involves moods and symptoms that everyone has to some degree (Munoz, 1987). For the purpose of determining a respondent’s level of depression, a check-list of depressive symptoms is commonly used (Munoz, 1988). The Center for Epidemiological Study Depression Scale (CES-D) was one of the most frequently used check-list for measuring level of depression and selected for this study. CES-D, developed by Radloff (1977), consists of 20 items tapping four separate, correlated factors: Depressive Affect, Somatic Symptoms, Well-Being, and Interpersonal Relations. Depressive Affect includes the following items: blues, depressed, failure, fearful, lonely, cry, and sad. Good, hopeful, happy, and enjoy represent the Well-Being factor. Somatic Symptoms include poor appetite, loss of concentration, sleep problem, less talk, feeling of too much effort, and cannot get going. Interpersonal Relations include the perception of unfriendliness and dislike.

CES-D had been used in the three previous studies comparing Korean Americans’ levels of depression with those of other ethnic groups (see Hurh & Kim, 1990; Kuo, 1984; Lin et al., 1992). Thus, the reliability and validity of this scale with Korean American population had been previously established. In addition, CES-D also had been
proved to be valid and reliable for Mexican Americans (Liang, Tran, Krause, & Markides, 1989), European Americans and Canadians (Hertzog, Alstine, Usala, Hultsch, & Dixon, 1990), Japanese (McCallum, Mackinnon, Simons, & Simons, 1995), Australians (McCallum et al., 1995), and elderly people of Indonesia, North Korea, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and Thailand (Mackinnon, McCallum, Andrews, & Andeerson, 1998). Hence, it appeared to be appropriate as a measure of depressive symptomatology across cultures, as well as for assessing Korean Americans’ levels of depression in particular. Cronbach’s alpha of the scale was .91 in this study.

Below are examples of questions comprising the scale. The answers ranged from 1=hardly ever (less than one day) to 4=almost always (5-7 days).

During the past week, how often did you have the following feelings?

1) I felt that I could not stop myself from feeling unhappy even with help from my family or friends.
2) I enjoyed life.
3) I felt that everything I did was an effort.

The survey instrument used in this study included measures of 1) an ethnic group Korean Americans contact most frequently (1 item); 2) personal-relational identity gap (12 items); 3) personal-enacted identity gap (11 items); 4) a simplified version of Hammer et al.’s intercultural effectiveness questionnaire (10 items); 5) perception of
racial hierarchy (8 items); 6) CES-D (20 items); 7) questions determining middleperson status (2 items); and 8) demographic factors (8 items). It consisted of a total of 72 items.

The questionnaire was translated into Korean which was the first language of most respondents. As for CES-D, the translated version to Korean from Hurh and Kim’s (1990) study was used. The other scales were converted to Korean by means of the usual translation and back-translation process (Van De Vijver & Hambleton, 1996). The researcher translated the scales to Korean. A bilingual person fluent in both Korean and English retranslated the Korean version to English. Then, the original English version and the retranslated English version were compared to check for differences between the two. When differences appeared, the Korean-translation version was adjusted and elaborated to reduce the differences. This process was repeated until no significant differences existed between the original English version and the retranslated English version. After the translation process, the tentative Korean version of questionnaire was checked by 10 Korean Americans who live in New York City area. On the basis of their comments, the wording of the questionnaire were adjusted and finalized. The English version of questionnaire, as well as the Korean version appear, in Appendix A and B, respectively.

Data Collection

A paper and pencil survey method was used to collect data from members of the four Korean American ethnic churches. For the data collection, agreement and cooperation of the churches, especially cooperation of the ministers of the churches, were essential. Hence, the researcher contacted each minister of each church a week before
each data collection day with a recommendation from a person who knew the minister. At the first meeting with each minister, the researcher explained the purposes and procedures of the study and asked for cooperation for the data collection. A day before data collection, the researcher met with the minister of the church again to assure cooperation and reminded him of the data collection procedure and his role.

Data were collected immediately following Sunday worship services at the churches. At the end of a worship service, the minister who led the service asked those in attendance to participate in the survey. The researcher explained the study briefly in two to three minutes. Then, the survey questionnaire was administered to the members of congregation. The participants completed the approximately 30-minute-long questionnaire on site. While they were completing the questionnaire, the researcher reminded them not to omit any items. Upon completion, the participants turned the questionnaire in and left. Each church had two sessions of worship services on Sunday, usually in the morning and evening. Thus, the same data collection procedure was repeated in each service in the all four churches.

Data Analysis

Prior to statistical analyses, the data were cleaned by checking missing data and normality of distributions. Then, since this study tested a model with a series of directional relationships, path analysis techniques were used. Path analysis was developed by Sewall Wright (1934) to study direct and indirect effects of variables hypothesized as possible causes of variables treated as effects. However, path modeling
is not a method for identifying causes or proving causation. Causation can never been
proved by any kind of statistical technique (Bollen, 1989). In Wright’s (1934) words:

the method of path coefficients is not intended to accomplish impossible task of
deducing causal relations from the values of the correlation coefficients. It is
intended to combine the quantitative information given by the correlations with
such qualitative information as may be at hand on causal relations to give
qualitative interpretation. (p. 193)

The meaning of cause in path diagram is the assumption that a change in the
variable at the tail of the arrow will lead to a corresponding change in the variable at the
head of arrow (Loehlin, 1998). Path analysis is an attempt to determine whether the
causal inferences of a researcher are consistent with the data. A path model that is
consistent with the data reveals that the causal assumptions in the model are not
contradicted and may be valid (Bollen, 1989). Although path analysis does not deal with
causality strictly, it can suggest whether the directions of arrows in a path model makes
sense in a particular set of data.

The hypothesized model in this study consisted of three exogenous variables--variables that predict other variables but are not predicted by any other variables in a path
model--and three endogenous variables--variables that are predicted by other variables.
These six variables were connected by 8 unidirectional paths (one-headed arrows), which
indicated possible causal relations among the variables. Three disturbances on the three
endogenous variables, which indicate variances of the endogenous variables that are not explained by the exogenous variables, were added to the model. Since there were no feedback loops or reciprocal paths and no correlations between disturbances, the specified model was recursive.

After specifying the model, identifiability of the model was assessed. According to Kline (1998), “[A] model is said to be identified if it is theoretically possible to calculate a unique estimate of every one of its parameters” (p. 108). A basic requirement of identification is that a number of parameters in the model should not exceed the number of observations of the model. Observations are variances and covariances among the observed variables (Kline, 1998). The number of observations can be computed as follow:

\[
\text{Number of observations} = \frac{v(v+1)}{2},
\]

where \(v\) is a number of observed variables. Parameters include variances of exogenous variables, disturbances of endogenous variables, correlations (bi-directional arcs), and direct effects on endogenous variables (unidirectional paths). When the number of parameters exceeds the number of observations, a model is under-identified. If the number of parameters and observations are same, a model is just-identified. When the number of observations exceeds the number of parameters, a model is over-identified. The number of observations of the tested model was 21. The number of parameters of the model was 14 (3 variances for exogenous variables, 3 variances for disturbances, and
8 unidirectional paths). Thus, the model was over-identified, and its fit, therefore, needed to be checked.

The model was estimated by means of EQS, a computer program designed to test structural equation models. Overall goodness of fit of the model was indicated by model fit indices, such as chi-square ($\chi^2$), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) in EQS printouts. In addition to determining the overall model fit, an effort was made to determine whether the model fit could improve by adding or omitting parameters on the basis of results of LM test and Wald Test, respectively. Considering the LM and Wald statistics, a statistically improved alternative model was determined. The significance of improvement of model fit for this alternative model was checked by $\chi^2$ difference between the two models.

For the test of mediating effects of the two types of identity gaps, the direct effects from the three exogenous variables to level of depression were added to compare them with the indirect effects of the exogenous variables on level of depression via the two types of identity gaps (see Figure 3.1). The three additional direct effects were also theoretically plausible because, according to the behavioristic perspective on depression, environmental and situational factors affect depression directly (Ferster, 1966; Hammen, 1991; Skinner, 1953). This model was tested and adjusted on the basis of LM and Wald statistics. The adjusted model from this model and the adjusted model from the hypothesized model were compared. Then, an optimal and parsimonious model for the data of this study was identified.
After testing the overall model fits and identifying an optimal model, the mediation effects of the two types of identity gaps between the three exogenous variables and level of depression were examined. Significance tests of the mediation effects were conducted by means of the Sobel test on the basis of the alternative model with the three direct effects (Sobel, 1982). The Sobel test provides a significance level of mediation effects by calculating a $z$ score by use of standard errors and unstandardized regression coefficients between an independent variables and a mediator and a mediator and a dependent variable. All six cases of possible mediation of the two types of identity gaps were checked by this significance test.

Then, direct, indirect, and total effects of a variable on level of depression were calculated on the basis of the standardized path coefficients of the model with the three direct effects. In this way, the amount of each direct, indirect, and total effects became apparent. Effects of various combinations of paths on the endogenous variables could be compared. Especially, portions of mediation effects of the identity gaps between the exogenous variables and level of depression could be determined by calculating and comparing the direct effects and the indirect effects.

In this chapter, the sample, the scales, data collection procedure, and the ways of data analyses were discussed. The next chapter, Chapter 4, presents the results of these analyses.
Figure 3.1. Model with Three Direct Effects
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The tests of the hypothesized and alternative models, as well as the hypotheses included in the models, are reported in this chapter. First, the chapter describes how missing data and multivariate normality issues were treated. Second, goodness of fit of the hypothesized and the alternative models and path parameters in the models are presented. Then, an optimal and parsimonious model is suggested by adjusting the hypothesized and the alternative model with the tree direct effects. Third, the mediation effects of the two types of identity gaps between the three situational variables and level of depression are tested, and its results are reported. The decomposition of the effects of the alternative model with the three direct effects are included as well.

Adjustment of Missing Data and Multivariate Normality

At least one missing value in 87 analyzed items was detected in 72 out of 377 cases. In short, 19% of cases involved at least one missing value. This proportion was too high to delete listwise all the cases involving missing values. Accordingly, the missing values were imputed on the basis of expectation maximization (EM) algorithm. Compared to other imputation methods, EM method has the merit of avoiding over-fitting values, which produce solutions that looks better than they actually are, and, thus, yielding realistic estimates of variance (Tabachnik, 1996). The analyses of this study were of the data adjusted for missing values by EM imputation.

Univariate and multivariate normality was checked by examining the kurtosis and skewness of the six variables analyzed in this study--level of depression, personal-
enacted identity gap, personal-relational identity gap, intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perception of racial hierarchy--, and Mardia’s test of multivariate skewness and kurtosis, respectively. The scores of skewness and kurtosis of the six distributions appear in Table 4.1. Among those distributions, the distribution of perception of racial hierarchy showed moderately positive skewness and kurtosis. That of middleperson status was also moderately skewed in the positive direction. Square-root transformation yielded better skewness and kurtosis scores for the perception of racial hierarchy scale (.15 and .05, compared to original 1.06 and 1.55, respectively). However, no type of transformation significantly adjusted the distribution of middleperson status, and, thus, the original distribution was retained for analyses. The Mardia’s coefficient, which indicates multivariate normality, was 2.26 before the transformation. It improved to -.09 with the transformation and represented excellent evidence of multivariate normality of the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DEP</th>
<th>PEGAP</th>
<th>PRGAP</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>MID</th>
<th>RH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>-.471</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.282</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Fit

The hypothesized model (see Figure 4.1) was estimated and tested by means of EQS employing maximum likelihood estimation (ML) method. The means, standard deviations, and correlations of the six variables in the model appear in Table 4.2. The indices of goodness of fit for this model indicated poor fit ($\chi^2 = 27.16, \text{df} = 7, p = .00; \chi^2/\text{df} = 3.88; \text{NFI} = .88; \text{CFI} = .90; \text{GFI} = .98; \text{RMSEA} = .09$). Wald statistics revealed that the path coefficients from middleperson status to personal-enacted identity gap and from perception of racial hierarchy to personal-enacted identity gap were not significant ($\beta = .08, p > .05$ and $\beta = -.07, p > .05$ respectively). Hence, these two paths were removed from the hypothesized model. LM statistics suggested the addition of two paths from middleperson status to level of depression and from perception of racial hierarchy to level of depression ($\beta = .11, p < .05; \beta = .16, p < .01$, respectively). Since the direct effects from both middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy to level of depression were theoretically plausible, these two paths appeared to be meaningful additions to the model. With these changes, the first alternative model was set (see Figure 4.2).

Table 4.2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations of the Variables in the Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DEP</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PEGAP</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PRGAP</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ICC</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MID</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RH</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1. Hypothesized Model with Path Coefficients

Note. All parameter estimates are standardized. * = p < .05, ** = P < .01.

The second alternative model (see Figure 4.3), which shows the direct effects from the three exogenous variables to level of depression, appeared to be a very good fit ($\chi^2 = 8.84, p = .07, df = 4; \text{NFI} = .960; \text{CFI} = .98; \text{GFI} = .99; \text{RMSEA} = .06$). However, the paths from intercultural communication to level of depression, from middleperson status to personal-enacted identity gap, and from perception of racial hierarchy to
personal-enacted identity gap were not significant (see Figure 4.3), and, subsequently, it was decided to drop them from the model. The adjusted model with the removal of those three paths was exactly same as the first alternative model (see Figure 4.2), which was modified from the hypothesized model. Thus, the first alternative model was potentially an optimal and parsimonious model with the data of this study, and its model fit was tested to determine it.

![Diagram](image-url)

**Figure 4.2.** First Alternative Model (Final Model)

*Note.* All parameter estimates are standardized. * = \(p < .05\), ** = \(P < .01\).
Figure 4.3. Second Alternative Model with Three Direct Effects

Note. All parameter estimates are standardized. * = p < .05, ** = P < .01.

The test of the first alternative model (see Figure 4.2) yielded the following goodness of fit indices: $X^2 = 16.20, df = 7, p = .02; X^2/df = 2.31; NFI = .93; CFI = .96; GFI = .99; RMSEA = .06$). Among these fit indices, the significant $X^2$ score seems not to indicate good fit of the model. However, since a $X^2$ score is sensitive to sample size, a $X^2$ estimation with a large sample size, such as the one used in this study, usually leads to a significant result even though a difference between observed and model-implied
covariances are very small (Kline, 1998). Accordingly, the significance level of .05 is a too conservative criterion to judge a model fit and is not meaningful with a large sample. The alternative way to judge a model fit with $X^2$ score is to divide $X^2$ score by the degrees of freedom ($X^2/\text{df}$). If $X^2/\text{df}$ score of a model is less than 3, a model fit is acceptable (Kline, 1998). The $X^2/\text{df}$ score of the adjusted model was 2.31. This score and the other goodness of fit indices showed that the model fits well. Also, $X^2$ difference between this model (see Figure 4.2) and the second alternative model with the three direct effects (see Figure 4.3) was not significant ($\Delta X^2 = 7.353$, df = 3, $p > .05$). This result means that there was no significant difference between the first alternative model and the second alternative model with the three direct effects in terms of a model fit. That is, even after the removal of the three paths from the second alternative model with the three direct effects, the first alternative model was not significantly worse than the second alternative model with non significant $X^2$ score ($X^2 = 8.84$, $p = .07$). This result also indicated a good fit of the first alternative model. Thus, the first alternative model was set as the final model, which is a parsimonious and optimal model with the data of this study. Hypotheses H1a, H1b, H2a, H2b, H3a, H3b, H4a and H4b were checked on the basis of this model.

In the final model (see Figure 4.2), intercultural communication competence significantly predicted both personal-enacted identity gap and personal-relational identity gap ($\beta = -.35, p < .01; \beta = -.26, p < .01$, respectively), which supported H1a and H1b. Middleperson status did not predict personal-enacted identity gap significantly but did predict personal-relational identity gap ($\beta = .13, p < .05$). H2a was not supported, but
H2b was. There was no significant effect from perception of racial hierarchy to personal-enacted identity gap, but perception of racial hierarchy did predict personal-relational identity gap ($\beta = .15, p < .01$). Thus, H3a was not supported, but H3b was. Both personal-enacted and personal-relational identity gap significantly predicted level of depression ($\beta = .41, p < .01; \beta = .17, p < .01$, respectively), supporting both H4a and H4b. In addition, the direct effects of middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy on level of depression were significant ($\beta = .11, p < .05; \beta = .16, p < .01$, respectively).

**Mediation Effects**

The mediation effects of personal-enacted identity gap and personal-relational identity gap were checked using the second alternative model with the three direct effects rather than the final model, because, despite the non-significant coefficients, the three eliminated paths in the second alternative model still had some effects on the endogenous variables, and thus, could influence the mediation effects (see Figure 4.3). The significance of the mediation effects was determined by means of the Sobel test (1982). No significant direct effects of intercultural communication competence on level of depression emerged. Both paths from intercultural communication competence to personal-enacted identity gap and from this gap to level of depression were significant. This indicated that personal-enacted identity gap significantly mediated the effects of intercultural communication competence on level of depression. The Sobel test reinforced the significance of the mediation effect ($z = -5.39, p < .01$). However, since there were no significant effects from middleperson status to personal-enacted identity gap and from perception of racial hierarchy to personal-enacted identity gap, the
mediation effects of the personal-enacted identity gap between middleperson status and level of depression and perception of racial hierarchy and level of depression were not significant. Again, the Sobel test confirmed that the personal-enacted identity gap did not significantly mediate effects of middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy on level of depression ($z = 1.65, p > .05; z = -1.46, p > .05$, respectively). Thus, H5a received support, but H5b and H5c did not.

As for the mediation effects of personal-relational identity gap, with the non-significant direct effects from intercultural communication competence to level of depression and the significant effects from intercultural communication competence to the identity gap and from the identity gap to level of depression (see Figure 4.2), this identity gap significantly mediated the effects of intercultural communication competence on level of depression. This significant mediation effects were reinforced by the Sobel test ($z = -2.69, p < .01$). Although significant direct effects existed both from middleperson status to level of depression and from perception of racial hierarchy to level of depression, the Sobel test revealed that personal-relational identity gap significantly mediated the effects of middleperson status on level of depression ($z = 2.02, p < .05$) and those of perception of racial hierarchy on depression ($z = 2.16, p < .05$). Thus, the personal-relational identity gap significantly mediated the effects of all three exogenous variables on level of depression, supporting H6a, H6b, and H6c.

In sum, personal-enacted identity gap significantly mediated the effects of only one situational variable, intercultural communication competence, on level of depression. However, personal-relational identity gap significantly mediated the effects of all three
situational variables of intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perception of racial hierarchy on level of depression.

After the significance of the mediation effects was determined, the portion of the mediation effects of the total effect of each exogenous variable on level of depression was checked by examining the direct, indirect, and total effects of variables on level of depression (see Table 4.3). The total effect of intercultural communication competence on level of depression was -.24. The indirect effects of intercultural communication competence on level of depression via the personal-enacted identity gap and the personal-relational identity gap were -.13 and -.04, respectively. The portion of the total mediated effects was 71% (54% via personal-enacted identity gap and 17% via personal-relational identity gap). The total effect of middleperson status was .15. The total indirect effects were .05 (.03 via personal-enacted identity gap and .02 via personal-relational identity gap) or 33% of total effects. Twenty percent and 13% of the total effects were mediated by personal-enacted identity gap and personal-relational identity gap, respectively. The total effects of perception of racial hierarchy were .21, and .05 of it was the mediated effects (.03 via personal-enacted identity gap and .02 via personal-relational identity gap). Thus, 24% of total effect was mediated. Personal-enacted identity gap mediated 14% of the total effects of perception of racial hierarchy on level of depression and personal-relational identity gap mediated 10% of the total effects.

In addition, the decomposition of the effects revealed the relative magnitude of the effects of the variables on level of depression (see Table 4.3). Personal-enacted identity gap revealed the strongest effects on level of depression (.39, 34% of overall
effects) followed by intercultural communication competence (-.24, 21% of overall effects), perception of racial hierarchy (.21, 19% of overall effects), and middleperson status (.15, 13% of overall effects), and personal-relational identity gap (.15, 13% of overall effects).

Table 4.3. Decomposition of Standardized Effects of the Model with Three Direct Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Variables</th>
<th>Endogenous Variables</th>
<th>PEGAP</th>
<th>PRGAP</th>
<th>DEP</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PEGAP</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PRGAP</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MID</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PEGAP</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PRGAP</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PEGAP</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PRGAP</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEGAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PEGAP</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects via PRGAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRGAP</td>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Effects via PEGAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Effects via PRGAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Effects</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to extend the Communication Theory of Identity through the introduction of a new theoretical construct, identity gaps, and to test theoretical models that reveal their influence on Korean Americans’ levels of depression. Korean Americans were an appropriate population to examine the utility of identity gaps. Not only do Korean Americans face unique situational issues, which make their identity gaps more visible in interethnic interaction, but they also experience high levels of depression, which facilitates an assessment of the heuristic value of the new theoretical construct.

The Communication Theory of Identity postulates identity as a layered product of communication and social interaction that is constantly negotiated and evolving. Four layers--personal, enacted, relational, and communal identity--are theorized. The concept of identity gaps was derived from these four layers of identity by examining the discrepancies between and among them. These identity gaps were conceptualized as cognitive structures resulting from communication. Among various possible identity gaps, this study focused on the two kinds of identity gaps: the personal-enacted identity gap and the personal-relational identity gap. These identity gaps provide a means to utilize the Communication Theory of Identity in predicting outcomes of interaction such as mental health status, as well as link the theory to situational factors.

This theorizing and a review of scholarly literature led to examination of a model that predicted that Korean American’s intercultural communication competence, middle
person status, and perceptions of racial hierarchy would influence their personal-enacted and their personal-relational identity gaps, and, in turn, these identity gaps would influence their levels of depression. It was reasoned that being in a middleperson position, caught between different interest groups, in a racially hierarchical society and without the communicative competence to negotiate this problematic situation would lead to disconnects between the personal and the relational identities, as well as between the personal and the enacted identities. Also, a number of related theories provided the rationale for the possible influence of the identity gaps on level of depression.

The results of this study support most of the predictions. The prediction that the two types of identity gaps would influence level of depression was supported. The hypothesized mediation effects of the two types of identity gaps between the three situational variables and level of depression also received support, although not for every variable. Overall, the results of this study support the theoretical extension and the theoretical model, with some modifications, held up well to empirical testing.

The process and results of testing the models suggested some theoretical and practical implications of this study. This chapter discusses these implications. First, the theoretical implications of the concept of identity gap are discussed. Second, the underlying meaning of the relationships between the situational factors and the two types of identity gaps, and between the identity gaps and depression are explained. Third, the interpretation of findings concerning the mediation effects is presented. Fourth, the plausibility of causal relations of the paths in the final model is argued. Finally, the
significance and the limitations of this study and the future studies that will clarify and extend the findings of this study are discussed.

Theoretical Implications of the Concept of Identity Gap

The personal-enacted and the personal-relational identity gaps were the key concepts in this study. As communicative concepts, these identity gaps have at least two important theoretical implications. First, although communicative perspectives on identity claim that communication and identity are directly related (Collier & Thomas, 1988; Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003; Mokros, 2003), the nature of the direct relationships has not been well specified. Identity gaps can provide a way to delineate the mechanism of the direct relationships between communication and identity.

Communication influences the formation of identity via identity gaps. In turn, identity gaps influence communication. Identity gaps emerge in communication. One can detect how others think of him/her in communication. Comparison of one’s self-view and the detected others’ views of the person results in the personal-relational identity gap. Expression of one’s identity also occurs in communication, sometimes as a means for “trying out” new identities or new versions of more established identities. The difference between one’s identity expressed in communication and his/her real self constitutes the personal-enacted identity gap. Previous research suggests that when discrepancies between the situational self and the inner identity standards are experienced, people typically attempt to reduce them (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Hyland, 1987; Stets & Burke, 2000; Swann, 1983, 1985, 1987, 1996, 1997). Discrepancies between an individual’s authentic self and expressed self may also require adjustment because of
possible aversive psychological outcomes (Jack, 1999; Gardner & Price, 1999; Sloman, Price, Gilbert, & Gardner, 1994). Hence, people experiencing identity gaps in communication typically attempt to reduce or otherwise adjust the gaps, that is, negotiate identity gaps. One way to negotiate identity gaps is to modify one’s identity and form a new one. Thus, communication contributes to the occurrence of identity gaps, which produces a negotiation process, which, in turn, influences the formation of a new identity. Therefore, communication influences identity via identity gaps.

Identity gaps are not only influenced by communication but also influence communication. An identity that an individual has at a certain time is an antecedent to the occurrence of identity gaps. Because an individual maintains an identity when communicating, he/she can compare this identity with identities ascribed by others and expressed in communication and, subsequently, comes to have identity gaps. The magnitude and content of identity gaps partially depend on what kind of identity one has at the time of communication. Once an identity gap occurs, it tends to undergo negotiation. The negotiation of identity gaps involves changing one’s communicative behavior and messages. For example, when a man has “tough guy” identity and faces gaps with this identity, that is, thinks that he did not express himself in tough enough way in communication and/or others do not see him as a tough guy, he may try to reduce these gaps by changing his communicative behavior and messages to reflect a tougher manner. In brief, one’s identity contributes to the emergence of identity gaps. Identity gaps change one’s ways of communicating in attempts to negotiate the gaps. Therefore, identity influences communication via identity gaps.
These analyses suggest a reciprocal relationship between communication and identity. Communication contributes to the formation of identity via negotiation of identity gaps, and identity influences communicative behavior in the process of negotiating identity gaps. This is a mechanism that explains how identity and communication are linked. In this linkage, identity gaps function as a pivotal point that integrates communication and identity.

As for the second theoretical implication of identity gaps, identity tends to be understood as having dynamic and ever-changing characteristic (Collier & Thomas, 1988; Hecht et al., 1993; Hecht et al., 2003; McCall & Simmons, 1978; Ting-Toomey, 1999). Identity gaps can provide an explanation of the fluid nature of identity. As mentioned above, an individual forms his/her identity at a certain time in the process of identity gap negotiation. The identity formed in this process is involved in the formation of another identity gap in a new situation and at another time. The new identity gap is negotiated again, which results in another new identity. The identity gap negotiation contributes to modification of identities and formation of new identities. This process of modification and formation of identity keeps repeating, and, thus, identity keeps changing. Therefore, identity gaps and their negotiation are a source of the constant change of identity.

The concept of identity gap is important, in that it can explain some of the ways in which communication and identity are interrelated, as well as the mechanisms by which identities change. In addition to these theoretical implications, when applied to practical
areas such as depression and situational factors, identity gaps have more specific implications.

Identity Gaps and Situational Factors

Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence, middleperson status, and perception of racial hierarchy were anticipated to affect the two types of identity gaps. Among the three situational variables, intercultural communication competence, a communication input variable, had significant effects on both personal-relational and personal-enacted identity gaps. Along with results of Jung and Hecht’s (in press) study, which revealed high correlations between the two types of identity gaps and communication outcomes, the close relationships between the communication input variable and the two types of identity gaps supported the conceptualization of identity gaps as having communicative aspects.

The effect of intercultural communication competence on the personal-enacted identity gap was greater than its effect on the personal-relational identity gap. That may be the case because these gaps represent somewhat different types of cognitive structures. The personal-enacted identity gap arises relatively instantaneously from communication. The personal-enacted identity gap directly implicates communicative behavior because the enacted identity itself is communicative behavior. Thus, the gap tends to arise immediately in response to communicative behavior. Also, since both self-concept and communicative behavior are one’s own properties, and the comparison process of two properties of one’s own may be relatively simple and immediate. As a result of these two
qualities, the personal-enacted identity gap is a relatively instantaneous and behaviorally grounded cognitive structure.

On the other hand, the personal-relational identity gap tends to emerge from a relatively more analytical and speculative process of cognition, compared to the personal-enacted identity gap. One needs to compare his/her self-concept with others’ attitudes toward him/her in the formation of this gap. This requires one’s detection and interpretation of another’s view of him/her. Accordingly, this comparison tends not to occur instantaneously from communication, but more from the process of one’s analyses and speculation concerning others’ communicative behavior and messages to determine how others view one. Therefore, the aforementioned result of this study indicates that the communication input variable has more direct association with the more behaviorally grounded cognitive structure, which occurs instantaneously from communication, than with the speculative result of communication.

Middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy had significant effects on the personal-relational identity gap, but not on the personal-enacted identity gap. Since the latter identity gap occurs in a relatively instantaneous fashion from specific communicative behavior, it seems to be more influenced by specific situations of communication rather than conceptual and general situations. Korean Americans’ middle person status and perceptions of racial hierarchy themselves seem not to constitute specific and immediate situations of individual cases of Korean Americans’ interethnic communication. Rather, they seem to provide general and conceptual background for Korean Americans’ interethnic communication. Perhaps this is the reason why they did
not show a direct influence on the personal-enacted identity gap, which is more sensitive to specific situations. On the other hand, both situational variables significantly predicted the personal-relational identity gap. The personal-relational identity gap tends to form via relatively speculative and analytical processes. The speculation process may contribute to involving the general and conceptual situations of communication in the formation of the personal-relational identity gap.

In the relationships between the situational issues and the two types of identity gaps, intercultural communication competence appears to have stronger effects on both the personal-enacted and the personal-relational identity gaps than middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy do. Thus, Korean Americans’ improving intercultural communication competence may be an effective way to reduce identity gaps arising in their interethnic interaction.

Identity Gaps and Level of Depression

Identity gaps were conceptualized as cognitive structures. They form through the internal process by which an individual compares his/her own view of him/herself with others’ views of him/her and his/her self expressed in communication. Compared to the cognitive structures that have previously shown to relate to depression, these cognitive structures have unique characteristics. Although identity gaps are cognitive structures, they also well reflect behavioral and environmental stimuli. Cognitive theories of depression postulate enduring cognitive structures as sources of depression. In Learned Helplessness Theory (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978) and Hopelessness Theory (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989), a negative or distorted attributional style is the
cognitive structure that contributes to developing depression. People who have negative attributional styles attribute causes of negative external events to internal sources or self and eventually develop depression. An individual’s attributional style is an enduring, personality-like structure.

A schema is the enduring cognitive structure in Beck’s (1967) theory of depression. A schema is a mental template by which an individual recognizes the external world. People with negative schemata tend to view the world, self, and the future negatively, interpret all failure and negative events as their own fault, and believe that the fault originates in stable and fundamental problems of their own. As a result of these functions of a negative schema, people with negative ones develop depression. A schema has automatic, repetitive, unintended, and not readily controllable characteristics (Beck, 1967). That is, it a stable cognitive structure, that does not change according to situations and environment.

In contrast, behavioral theories of depression focus on social and interpersonal environment and behavior as sources of depression, deemphasizing function of internal structures. According to Lewinsohn (1974), a person’s lack of social skills that cannot elicit positive interpersonal responses lead to insufficient positive reinforcement from others. Depression is a response to the low rate positive reinforcement in interpersonal relations. For Coyne (1976), depression is a result of disruptions in the social field of an individual, which is caused by the person’s excessive reassurance seeking in interpersonal relations. These behavioral risk factors of depression are neither stable nor enduring but tend to be ever-changing as interpersonal environment and situations change.
The focus of previous cognitive theories of depression is enduring, personality-like cognitive structures, with less attention paid to the influence of social and interpersonal situations. Conversely, behavioral theories of depression focus on ever-changing interpersonal situations and environments without appreciating the function of cognitive process in developing and maintaining depression. The concept of identity gap helps to integrate these two perspectives. Although identity gaps are cognitive structures formed through internal processes, unlike negative attributional styles and schema they are not stable, enduring structures free of situational and environmental influences on depression. The personal-enacted identity gap forms directly in response to communicative behavior, which is sensitive to communicative situations. The personal-relational identity gap forms on the basis of interpersonal relations and environmental factors that can include social and interpersonal stimuli. Identity gaps reflect the influence of constantly changing behavioral factors on depression without devaluing the functions of cognitive processes in developing and maintaining depression.

According to the results of this study, the behavioral cognitive structures (the two types of identity gaps) had significant effects on level of depression. More specifically, Korean Americans’ personal-enacted identity gap showed stronger effects on levels of depression than their personal-relational identity gaps did. In interethnic interaction, Korean Americans are likely to suppress their real selves as a consequence of their limited English proficiency and the racially sensitive social atmosphere in which they often interact. Their involuntary suppression of their real selves seems to leave more
serious psychological residues in them than other ethnic group members’ inaccurate portraying themselves does.

Another implication can be inferred from the results. The personal-enacted identity gap tends to occur more directly from communicative behavior and, thus, is more likely to be based on specific cases of communication, whereas the personal-relational identity gap tends to be more speculative and general situation-based. This suggests that the specific situation-based and behaviorally grounded cognitive structure has stronger effects on depression than the speculative and general situation-based cognitive structure does.

This may be the case because, for the personal-relational identity gap, psychological adjustment of the gap, such as psychological disengagement, can be involved in the speculative process leading to the formation of the gap. For example, in the speculative process of forming the personal-relational identity gap, one can adjust the gap by regarding others’ appraisals as being unimportant or incorrect when they are not consistent with his/her own (see Major & Schmader, 1998; Major, Spencer, Schmader, Wolfe, & Crocker, 1998; Schmader, Major, & Gramzow, 2001). This adjustment may reduce the negative psychological outcome. However, in the process of forming the personal-enacted identity gap, there seems to be less chance of psychological adjustment in light of its relatively instantaneous occurrence. The personal-enacted identity gap seems to lead to negative outcomes with less psychological filtering. Differences in psychological adjustment between the two types of identity gaps may account for their different effects on levels of depression.
Mediation, Direct, and Total Effects

To determine whether behavioral factors influence level of depression via cognitive processes, the mediation effects of identity gaps between the three situational variables and levels of depression were examined. Among the three situational variables, Korean Americans’ intercultural communication competence did not have a significant direct effect on levels of depression (see Figure 4.3). Rather, its effects were mediated by the two types of identity gaps. This result suggests that the behavioral competence does not influence an individual’s psychological status directly but does affect it after being internalized in a form of cognitive structures. Also, the relatively more behaviorally grounded cognitive structure (personal-enacted identity gap) showed greater mediation effects than the relatively more speculative one (personal-relational identity gap), because the communication input variable may have more direct relationships to the more instantaneously arising identity gap from communicative behavior, and the identity gap with less chances for the psychological adjustment may have stronger effects on level of depression.

The effects of middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy on levels of depression were mediated by the personal-relational identity gap, but not by the personal-enacted identity gap. That is, the two situational stimuli influenced levels of depression via the speculative cognitive structure but not via the relatively instantaneous one. The personal-relational identity gap can have significant mediation effects for both situational variables because the speculative process involved in forming the gap could make it possible to imply the situational issues. However, since the other identity gap
forms relative instantaneously from specific communication situations and behavior, and the two situational factors are relatively general and conceptual rather than specific, the two situational variables may not be involved in the gap and, thus, are not mediated in their effects on levels of depression by the gap.

The personal-relational identity gap mediated the effects of all three situational variables on levels of depression probably because of its speculative nature, but the less speculative identity gap mediated only the effects of intercultural communication competence. Therefore, the more speculative cognitive process seems to mediate effects of environmental stimuli on the psychological status better than the less speculative cognitive process does. Intercultural communication competence did not have significant direct effects on levels of depression, but it did show strong mediated effects on level of depression via both identity gaps—the mediated effects accounted for 71% of total effect.

In the meantime, there were two direct links between the situational variables and levels of depression. Korean Americans’ middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy had significant direct effects on the levels depression. The significant effects of perception of racial hierarchy on levels of depression were consistent with Fernando’s (1984) and Burke’s (1984) claims that racism is a contributing factor to depression. The significant effects of middleperson status on levels of depression added to previous findings concerning influence of social class on depression (Brown & Harris, 1978; Wiseman & Meyer, 1978).

Comparison of total effects of the exogenous variables on Korean Americans’ levels of depression in the second alternative model with the three direct effects (see
Figure 4.3) suggests ways to reduce levels of depression. Korean Americans’ personal-enacted identity gap had the strongest effects on their level of depression followed by total effects of their intercultural communication competence, perception of racial hierarchy, middleperson status, and the personal-relational identity gap. Since both identity gaps of Korean Americans’ showed strong direct and some significant mediated effects on Korean Americans’ levels of depression, reducing identity gaps in interethnic interaction may help to reduce their levels of depression. Korean Americans’ improving intercultural communication competence appeared to be an effective way to reduce the two types of identity gaps and, hence, levels of depression. Korean Americans’ being less sensitive to the racialized social atmosphere or more ideally change of the racialized social atmosphere itself may help them reduce their levels of depression. Moving out of the middleperson status may also contribute to reduced levels of depression.

Causality

Path analysis was used in this study to determine an optimal model for the data and suggest causal directions among the relationships of the variables. In social science where statistical proof of causality is very difficult, path analysis is a good statistical tool for checking the plausibility of causal relations, especially when causal relations theoretically make sense. Path analysis provides a means of determining whether causal inferences are consistent with data (Bollen, 1989). A path model that is consistent with data suggests that the causal assumptions in the model are not contradictory and may be valid. Although path modeling is not a method for identifying causes or proving causality, quantitative information implied in a path model is a good source for
qualitative interpretation of causal relations (Wright, 1934). Thus, path analysis can add plausibility to causal assumptions.

The good fit and the significant path coefficients in the final model (see Figure 4.2) of this study provide good sources for causal interpretations, especially when the paths in the model have theoretical plausibility for causality. According to cognitive theories of depression, cognitive structures, such as schemata and attributional styles (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989; Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Beck, 1967), are immediate risk factors of depression. Therefore, the two types of identity gaps, which are cognitive structures, would precede and influence levels of depression, and, thus, the direction from the two types of identity gaps to the level of depression in the final model are plausibly causal relations.

The basic assumption of behavioral perspective on depression is that social situations or environment directly cause depression (Coyne, 1976; Ferster, 1966; Hammen, 1991; Lewinsohn, 1974; Skinner, 1953). Especially social class, which is a similar kind of social situation to middleperson status, appears to be a cause of depression (Brown & Harris, 1978; Weidman & Meyer, 1978). Also, since it would not make sense that a person’s level of depression determines an individual’s middle person status, the causal direction from middleperson status to level of depression is appropriate. Racial hierarchy is a similar concept to racism, a known contributing factor to depression (A. Burke, 1984; Fernando, 1984). Accordingly, it is plausible to regard perception of racial hierarchy as a direct contributing factor to levels of depression.
Intercultural communication competence is an input variable that is antecedent to and influences communication outcomes. The two types of identity gap result from communication. Therefore, intercultural communication competence contributes to producing the two types of identity gaps. Both significant paths from intercultural communication competence to personal-enacted and the personal-relational identity gap in the final model suggest a possible causal link.

Although cognitive structures, such as schemata and attributional styles, are personality-like structures, in the formation stage, they are influenced by external factors, such as early life experience (Beck, Rush, Shaw, & Emery, 1979) and life stressors (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989). Hence, it is possible that an external factor, such as middleperson status, contributes to the formation of the personal-relational identity gap. If so, the significant effects of middleperson status on the personal-relational identity gap in the model may be causal in nature. The perception of racial hierarchy is not an external source per se, but it is directly related to the external source, the racial hierarchy in society. To be involved in the formation of the speculative identity gap, racial hierarchy may need to be internalized by an individual, for example, as perception of racial hierarchy. Then, the individual’s internalized racial hierarchy can contribute to the formation of the personal-relational identity gap. In addition, it may be more reasonable to view that the general situational issues contribute to forming cognitive structures rather than that cognitive structures result in the general situational factors, such as middleperson status and racial hierarchy. Thus, the significant path from perception of
racial hierarchy to the personal-relational identity gap in the model suggests another possible causal relation.

Overall, all paths in the final model (see Figure 4.2) were significant. All directions of the paths in the model seemed to be theoretically plausible. Future research is needed to confirm the cause relations.

In summary, Korean Americans’ levels of depression were directly affected by both types of identity gap and the two situational variables of middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy (see Figure 4.2). The personal-relational identity gap was influenced by all three situational variables and mediated effects of these variables on level of depression. The personal-enacted identity gap was significantly affected only by intercultural communication competence and had mediation effects only between this variable and level of depression. The personal-enacted identity gap arises in relatively instantaneous fashion from communicative behavior and involves less speculative and analytic processes in its formation, whereas formation of the personal-relational identity gap is relatively more speculative and analytic. Thus, middleperson status and perception of racial hierarchy, which represent relatively conceptual and less specific situations, did not have significant effects on the personal-enacted identity gap but did on the personal-relational identity gap. Intercultural communication competence, which influences communicative behavior and outcomes directly, showed strong effects on both gaps. Although path analysis conducted in this study cannot prove the causality of the relationships indicated in the model, the good model fit and the significant coefficients of the paths and the theoretical plausibility of causal relations suggest that the assumed
causal relations are appropriate. Longitudinal research would strengthen these claims and allow us to examine the reciprocal relationship between identity gaps and communication.

Conclusions: Significance, Limitations, and Future Studies

This study introduced the theoretical construct of identity gaps and tested their effects on level of depression, as well as their functions of mediating the effects of the situational variables on levels of depression in Korean Americans’ interethnic interaction. As a result, new information about contributing factors to Korean Americans’ levels of depression surfaced. The relationships among Korean Americans’ situational variables and personal-enacted and the personal-relational identity gaps were delineated. Possible causal relations among the variables were also posited.

The conceptualization of identity gaps and the empirical results of this study suggest a number of conclusions and contributions. First, as examined above, the concept of identity gap is theoretically significant, in that it can provide an explanation of the dynamic nature of identity and can help specify the nature of the close relationship between communication and identity, which was posited but not explained in previous communicative perspectives on identity. Second, it was examined that the concept of identity gap involves both cognitive and behavioral characteristics in relation to depression. Thus, it can contribute to integrating cognitive and behavioral approaches to depression. Third, a growing body of research examined the association of interpersonal relations with depression (Coyne, 1976; Hammen, 1991; Joiner, Coyne, & Blalock, 1999; Lewinsohn, 1974). On the basis of these interpersonal theories of depression, Segrin and his colleagues (Segrin, 1992; Segrin, 2001; Segrin & Abramson, 1994; Segrin & Flora,
1998) addressed the relationships between some aspects of communication (e.g., language use, low motivation to communication, low social expressivity, paralinguistic behavior, speech content, responsiveness to communication, and politeness in communication) and depression. However, studies dealing with overall effects of communication on depression are rare. This study revealed that communication could influence depression via identity gaps. Fourth, the study delineated the mediating function of the cognitive structures (the two types of identity gaps), between the behavioral stimuli (the situational factors) and depression. The results suggest that effects of situational stimuli on level of depression can be mediated by such cognitive structures. Fifth, even though intergroup relations and interaction are likely contributing factors to depression, studies of depression involving intergroup interaction are seldom found. This study identified interethnic communication as a possible source of depression. Finally, by describing new contributing factors to levels of Korean Americans’ depression, these findings may eventually open ways to reduce their levels of depression.

This study also had some limitations. First, the sample used in this study may not be representative of the Korean American population. The participants were recruited from four Korean American ethnic churches in two major Korean American residential areas in the New York City metropolitan area. Not only was the sampling from church members, who may not be representative of the general Korean American population, since there were only four churches and they were not selected randomly, the sample may not adequately represent Korean American population. Although these concerns are
partially allayed because 75% of Korean Americans are church goers and the churches were not selected in demographically extreme areas, one notable bias of this sample is that the proportion of Korean-born Korean Americans was significantly higher in this sample than the proportion reported on the basis of the overall Korean American population (Kim & Grant, 1996)--97% and 73%, respectively. This seems to be the case because the location of the churches where the subjects were recruited was in a kind of Korean American ethnic enclaves in New York City area. Hence, the sample could have underrepresented descendants of Korean Americans who are better assimilated to American societies and, thus, do not attend Korean American ethnic churches. Due to the high proportion of the first generation of Korean Americans in the sample, the findings of this study would better apply to first generation of Korean immigrants rather than Korean Americans in general.

In addition, there was an issue in measurement of the two types of identity gaps. Despite a pilot study (Jung & Hecht, in press), the scales measuring the two types of identity gaps could be improved. In the factor analyses with 11 items for the personal-enacted identity gap and 12 items for the personal-relational identity gap, which were generated by Jung and Hecht (in press) and translated to Korean for this study, two factors for each scale emerged. However, the division of factors for both scales indicated the possibility of response errors. The six items in the second factor of the scale for the personal-enacted identity gap were negatively worded or implied negative meanings. All

---


4 Despite the high proportion of the Korean-born participants in this study, the label “Korean Americans” rather than “Korean immigrants” was used because 57% of the participants had lived in the U. S. for more than 10 years and most of them were legally U. S citizens.
three items in the second factor of the personal-relational identity gap scale were reversed in scoring. The results might have occurred because items with negative wording or meanings or reversed scoring tend to cause confusion when respondents were asked to choose agreement or disagreement with the items and lead to response errors (Converse & Presser, 1986). Due to the possibility of response errors, the items in the second factors of both scales were eliminated in this study.

This kind of response error was not clear with an American sample and the English version of the scales (Jung & Hecht, in press). There might be a few possible reasons of this difference, for example, a difference in sample size, education level, culture, ethnicity of the samples, problems in translation of the scales, or a characteristic of Korean language itself. Whatever the reason is, however, there is always a possibility of response errors with negatively worded or reversed scoring items with agreement-disagreement responses. Thus, the negatively worded and reversed scoring items in the scales need to be reworded for more accurate measurement of identity gaps.

In addition, trait-like measures of the identity gaps were used in this study. These gaps, like other aspects of identity, have both enduring and changing qualities (Hecht et al. 2003). Future measurement should address these two qualities of identity, comparing the relative contributions of state and trait approaches to measurement.

The concept of identity gaps developed in this study can be refined in studies using greater variety of methods. Also, the findings of this study can contribute to expanding knowledge about identity, communication, social behavior, and mental health. A communication input variable, intercultural communication competence, showed
strong association with both types of identity gap. In addition to this variable, examining identity gaps in relation with various other communication variables may further clarify communicative characteristics of identity gaps. For example, studying identity gaps in relation to various communication input variables, as well as various communication outcome variables, may illuminate the functions and positions of identity gaps in communication. Identity gaps also need to be studied with dyadic data because they occur in both parties to communication. Examining relationships between both parties’ identity gaps may provide clues to explain the process by which the gaps occur and are negotiated. The results of this study suggest that large identity gaps have negative psychological consequences. Thus, developing strategies or models for reducing identity gaps may add strong practical value and theoretical power. In addition to their association with mental health issues, identity gaps may also have associations with behavioral issues, such as drug abuse and violence. According to Jang and Johnson (2003), general strain, which shares some common characteristics with the personal-relational identity gap, relates to violent behavior and drug abuse. Thus, studying identity gaps relating it with behavioral issues may result in practically useful outcomes.

Motivated by Korean Americans’ relatively higher level of depression compared to other ethnic groups in the U. S., this study was an attempt to delineate contributing factors to Korean Americans’ levels of depression by focusing on Korean Americans’ interethnic interaction. To this end, the concept of identity gap was proposed as the cognitive structure by which Korean Americans’ internalize interethnic interaction and situational issues. Utilizing this newly developed concept, this study revealed how
Korean Americans’ interethnic interaction and identity issues was predictive of their levels of depression, and Korean Americans’ unique situational characteristics were predictive of their interethnic communication and identity, and their levels of depression. Also, this study showed how the communicative aspects of identity function as mediators between the situational factors and mental health. This study has provided new information concerning contributing factors to depression, relationships between communication and identity, and functions of cognitive structures between behavioral stimuli and mental health. The findings not only have theoretical and practical significance by themselves, but also provide leads to developing further studies in various ways and areas.
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1. Among White Americans, Black Americans, and Hispanic Americans, which racial
group do you contact most frequently in your every day life?

1) White Americans  
2) African Americans 
3) Hispanic Americans

Please, think about your communication, in general, with members of the racial
group you contact most frequently in everyday life. Then, indicate the degree to
which you feel about each of the following statements. (1=strongly disagree; 
7=strongly agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel the other group members do not see me as I see myself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am same as the way the other group members would see me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I agree with how the other group members would describe me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel the other group members have wrong images of me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel the other group members have correct information about me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel the other group members portray me not based on information provided by myself but information from other sources.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel the other group members stereotype me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel the other group members do not realize that I have been changing and still portray me based on my past images.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. I feel the other group members do not know who I used to be when they portray me.

10. When the other group members talk about me, I often wonder if they talk about me or someone else.

11. I feel there is a difference between who I think I am and who the other group members think I am.

12. The other group members do not like the things about me that I like about myself.

13. When I communicate with the other group members, they get to know “real me.”

14. I feel I can communicate with the other group members in the way that is consistent with who I really am.

15. I feel I can be myself when communicating with the other group members.

16. I express myself in a certain way that is not “real me” when communicating with the other group members.

17. I do not reveal important aspects of myself in communication with the other group members.

18. When communicating with the other group members, I often lose sense of who I am.

19. I do not express “real me” when, I think, it is different from the other group members’ expectation.

20. I sometimes mislead the other group members about who I really am.

21. There is a difference between “real me” and the impression I give the other group members about me.

22. I speak truthfully to the other group members about myself.
23. I freely express “real me” in communication with the other group members.

Again, please, think about your interactions or relations, in general, with members of the racial group you contact most frequently in everyday life. Then, rate how easy or difficult doing each of the following items is in the interactions or relations. (1=very difficult; 7=very easy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Difficult</th>
<th>Very Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To effectively deal with communication misunderstanding.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To maintain interpersonal satisfying relationships with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To initiate interaction with a stranger.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To effectively deal with different social customs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To enter into meaningful dialogue with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To deal with different communication styles.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To accurately understand feeling of others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To develop satisfying interpersonal relationship with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To effectively work with other people.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To empathize with another person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please, rate each of the four racial groups of White Americans, Black American, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans, in terms of the following items.

1. What is the income level of a typical or average member of each of the following groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the education level of a typical or average member of each group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is the quality of the job a typical or average member of each group has?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How do you perceive the intellectual ability of a typical or average member of each group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How much discrimination does a typical or average member of each group experiences in society?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Rate the overall social status of each group in American society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How much amount of opportunities does a typical or average member of each group have in society in order to improve his/her life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Rate the overall power each group has in American society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**During the past week, how often did you have the following feelings? (1=hardly ever; 2=sometimes; 3=often; 4=most of time)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Hardly ever (1 day)</th>
<th>Sometimes (2-3 days)</th>
<th>Often (3-4 days)</th>
<th>Most of time (5-7 days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was bothered by things that usually don’t bother me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt that I could not stop myself from feeling unhappy even with help from my family or friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.  
5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.  
6. I felt depressed.  
7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.  
8. I felt hopeful about the future.  
9. I thought my life had been a failure.  
10. I felt fearful.  
11. My sleep was restless.  
12. I was happy.  
13. I talked less than usual.  
15. People were unfriendly.  
16. I enjoyed life.  
17. I had crying spell.  
18. I felt sad.  
19. I felt that people dislike me  
20. I could not get “going.”
Please, circle on an appropriate example related to you for each of the following items.

1. Do you work in Black or Hispanic American area?
   1) YES                        2) NO

2. Do you own a store in Black or Hispanic American area?
   1) YES                        2) NO

3. I am a  
   1) male;  2) female.

4. My age is  
   1) less than 20;  2) 20-29;  3) 30-39;  4) 40-49;  5) 50-59;  
   6) 60-69;  7) more than 70.

5. I am    
   1) a single;  2) married;  3) divorced;  4) widowed.

6. My annual income is  
   1) less than $30,000;  2) $30,000-$50,000;  
   3) $50,000-$100,000;  4) more than $100,000.

7. My education level is  
   1) high school or less;  2) some of college;  
   3) college or more.

8. I usually work for  
   1) 40 hours a week or less;  2) 41-60 hours a week;  
   3) more than 60 hours a week.
9. I have lived in the United States for
   1) less than 2 years; 2) 2-5 years;
   3) 5-10 years; 4) more than 10 years;
   5) born in the U. S.

10. I
    1) am a U. S. citizen or permanent resident;
    2) reside in the U.S. for immigration purpose although I don’t have a permanent
       residentship now;
    3) am a sojourner such as a student, a resident staff of a Korean company, etc.

End of the Survey

Thank you very much!
## Appendix B

Korean Version of the Questionnaire used in the Study

1. 백인, 흑인, 히스패닉계 (스패니쉬), 중 어느 타 인종 사람들을 평소에 가장 자주 접촉 하십니까?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) 백인</th>
<th>2) 흑인</th>
<th>3) 히스패닉계 (스패니쉬)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

위에서 정한 가장 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들과의 평소 대화 혹은 접촉을 생각하시면서 다음에 기술된 내용들이 얼마나 맞나요? (혹은 그렇지 않나요) 느껴지는 지적 정도를 아래 주어진 1부터 7까지의 숫자 중 한 숫자에 표시해 주십시오 (1 = 전혀 맞지 않음, 7 = 전적으로 맞음)

| 1. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들은 내가 나 자신을 보는 것과 다르게 나를 보는 것 같다. | 전혀 맞지 않음 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. 나는 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들이 나를 보는 시각이 맞다고 생각한다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 3. 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들이 나에 대해 하는 이야기들은 대체로 정확하다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 4. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들은 나에 대해 틀린 이미지를 가지고 있는 것 같다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들은 나에 대해 대체로 정확하게 알고 있는 것 같다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들과의 대화를 들으면 나를 잘 이해하는 것 같다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들이 나에 대해 편견을 가지고 있는 것 같다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 8. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들이 나가 변한 것을 모르고 아직도 고정관념으로 나를 판단하는 것 같다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. 내가 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들과의 대화를 들고 나가 정말 그런 사람인지 종종 의심하다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 10. 자주 접촉하는 타인종 사람들이 나에 대해 하는 이야기를 듣고 나가 정말 그런 사람인지 종종 의심하다. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
11. 나 자신이 생각하는 나와 자주 접촉하는 타 인종 사람들이 생각하는 나는 다른 것 같다.

12. 내가 나의 정점이라고 생각하는 점들을 자주 접촉하는 타 인종 사람들이 생각이라고 생각하지 않는 것 같다.

13. 나와 이야기를 하면서 상대방 타 인종 사람들이 내가 어떤 사람인지 알게 되는 것 같다.

14. 타인종 사람들과 이야기할 때 나의 본 모습을 정확하게 보여주려 노력한다.

15. 있는 그대로의 내 모습대로 타 인종 사람들과 상대한다.

16. 타 인종 사람들과 이야기할 때 나의 본 모습과 다른 인상을 주려 한다.

17. 타 인종 사람들과의 관계에서 나 자신의 중요한 부분을 드러나지 않는다.

18. 타 인종 사람들과 상대하는 동안 동종 나 자신의 본 모습을 잃어버린다.

19. 타 인종 사람들과의 관계에서 상대방의 기대에 어긋나는 나의 모습은 드러나지 않는다.

20. 타 인종 사람들과 이야기하면서 내가 나 자신에 대해 한 이야기는 종종 사실과 다르다.

21. 나의 본 모습과 타 인종 사람들과 상대할 때 표현한 나의 모습은 종종 다르다.

22. 타 인종 사람들에게 나 자신에 대해 대체로 솔직하게 이야기 한다.

23. 타 인종 사람들과의 정착에서 주기없이 나 자신을 표현한다.
평소 가장 자주 접촉하는 타 인종 사람들과의 관계 혹은 접촉에서 다음에 기술된 사항들을 다루기가 얼마나 어려운지 (혹은 쉬운지) 그 정도를 아래 주어진 1부터 7까지의 측정 숫자 중 한 숫자에 표시해 주십시오 (1 = 아주 어렵다 7 = 아주 쉽다).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 대화 중에 생기는 오해 줄이기</th>
<th>아주 어렵다</th>
<th>아주 쉽다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 좋은 인간관계 유지하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 모르는 타 인종 사람들과 이야기 시작하기</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 다른 생활 관습 이해하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 의미 있는 대화 나누기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 다른 대화 스타일 이해하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 상대방 감정을 정확하게 파악하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 좋은 인간관계 시작하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 같이 일하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 상대방 입장 이해하기</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

백인, 흑인, 히스패닉계 (스페인인), 아시아계 이들 네 인종 그룹에 대해 다음 사항들을 느끼시는 대로 평가해 주십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. 각 인종 그룹의 평균 수입 정도는?</th>
<th>아주 낮다</th>
<th>아주 높다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시아인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. 각 인종 그룹의 평균적인 교육정도는?</th>
<th>아주 낮다</th>
<th>아주 높다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시아인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. 각 인종 그룹 사람들이 가지고 있는 평균적인 직업의 질은?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아주 낮다</th>
<th>아주 높다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시안</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 각 인종 그룹 사람들의 평균적인 지적 능력은?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아주 낮다</th>
<th>아주 높다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시안</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. 각 인종 그룹이 경험하는 인종 차별의 정도는?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아주 낮다</th>
<th>아주 높다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시안</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. 각 인종 그룹의 사회적 지위는?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아주 낮다</th>
<th>아주 높다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시안</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. 각 인종 그룹 사람들에게 주어지는 사회적 성공의 기회는?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아주 적다</th>
<th>아주 많다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시안</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. 각 인종 그룹의 사회적 영향력은?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>아주 적다</th>
<th>아주 크다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>백인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>흑인</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>히스패닉</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아시안</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
지난 일주일 동안 얼마나 자주 다음에 기술된 내용들을 느끼셨는지 표시해 주십시오.
(1 = 거의 전혀 주1일;  2 = 가끔 주2-3일;  3 = 자주 주4-5일;  4 = 거의항상 주6-7일)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>거의전혀 (주1일)</th>
<th>가끔 (주23일)</th>
<th>자주 (주45일)</th>
<th>거의항상 (주67일)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 보통 나를 괴롭히지 않는 일들이 나를 괴롭혔다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 식욕이 없어 될 음식도 물어보지 않아요.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 식구나 친구가 도와 주어도 불행하다는 느낌을 덜채 버틸 수가 없었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 나 자신이 다른 사람들 만큼의 능력을 가진 사람이라고 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 하는 일이 즐겁지 않다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 기분이 우울하다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 의식적으로 애를 써야만 무슨 일을 할 수 있었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 미래에 대해 희망적으로 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 내 삶은 실패라고 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 두려움을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 편하게 점을 잘 수 없다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 혼란을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 평상시 보다 심한 일과 Alban.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 외로움을 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 주위 사람들이 다정하지 않다고 느꼈다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 미안한 생각이 들었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 불고 싶었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 숨었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 사람들로 나를 싫어하는 것 같았다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 늘 하던 일을 하기 힘든 일이 들었다.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
다음 각 사항에 대해 자신과 관련되는 적절한 날에 표시해 주십시오.

1. 나는 주로 흑인 혹은 히스패닉(스패니시) 지역에서 일한다.
   1) 예  2) 아니오

2. 나는 흑인 혹은 히스패닉(스패니시) 지역에 상점을 소유하고 있다.
   1) 예  2) 아니오

3. 성별
   1) 남  2) 여

4. 연령
   1) 20세 미만  2) 20 – 29 세  3) 30 – 39 세  4) 40 – 49 세
   5) 50 – 59 세  6) 60-69 세  7) 70세 이상

5. 결혼 여부
   1) 미혼  2) 기혼  3) 이혼  4) 사별

6. 연 수입
   1) 3만달러 미만  2) 3 – 5 만 달러  3) 5 – 10 만 달러  4) 10만 달러 이상

7. 교육 정도
   1) 고졸 이하  2) 대학 재학 혹은 중퇴  3) 대졸 이상

8. 주당 일하는 시간
   1) 40시간 이하  2) 41-60 시간  3) 61시간 이상

9. 미국 거주기간
   1) 2년 미만  2) 2 – 5 년  3) 5 – 10년  4) 10년 이상  5) 미국에서 출생
10. 이민 상태

1) 시민권 혹은 영주권자  2) 영주권은 없지만 이민을 목적으로 미국에 거주
3) 한시적으로 미국에 거주 (예: 유학생, 상사 주재원)
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