

April 3, 2011

Dear Dr. Dougherty,

Thank you for your letter and the reviews of our manuscript "Psychometric Validation of a Short Acculturation Scale for Korean Immigrants." The reviewers raised a number of points that may have lead to confusion among readers, and we greatly appreciate all of the comments received. We have done our best to incorporate all of the feedback from the reviewers to improve clarity, and we provided rationale below when we felt suggested changes may not be appropriate.

We addressed comments individually below. Responses to comments are indicated with blue, italic font, with changes in the manuscript highlighted in yellow.

We have also taken this opportunity to ensure that our manuscript follows style rules of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.; 2010) and would greatly appreciate learning if there are any style or formatting rules that we missed.

We feel that the changes we have made have resulted in a substantially improved paper, and we are grateful for the comments and suggestions from the reviewers.

Point- by- Point Response to the Comments of the Reviewers

Nursing Research Manuscript Number: NRES-D-11-00011

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer #1:

P. 1, lines 2-3; p. 2, lines 4-6: Can the authors consider using immigrants instead of "minorities". This study was conducted in the United States and African Americans constitute a minority ethnic group. Will the authors say that African Americans need to acculturate? Surely, they did that centuries ago but may not need to do so in the 21st Century.

Thank you for bringing this to our attention. We have incorporated the suggested changes into the manuscript.

p. 5, lines 10-11: pilot testing sample of five - were they males, females or both?

To better describe the pilot sample, a sentence has been added to the manuscript describing gender breakdown (2 males and 3 females). (Revision p.6, lines 6-7)

In addition to the typical demographics questions, the authors asked about age of arrival and years lived in the U.S. as proxies of acculturation. Can they consider including those two items to the SAS-K and SASH and reassessing the psychometric values in their recommendations for future research? After all, those items helped in the assessment of construct validity for the SAS-K.

Whereas correlations between age of arrival and length of residence in the US with overall and subscale scores of the SAS-K are large, we hesitate to modify the SAS-K to include these items for several reasons. First and foremost, we feel that neither age of arrival nor length of residence reflects acculturation as defined in this study as “the process in which the attitudes and behaviors of persons from one culture are modified as a result of contact with a different culture (Moyerman & Forman, 1992).” Therefore including these additional items into our construct would reduce the content validity of the measure.

Second, as mentioned in the paragraph added to further the importance of validating this measure of acculturation, one of the critiques of other measures of acculturation is the overreliance on proxy measures such as age of arrival and length of residence. Third, as the goal of the manuscript is to show psychometric validation for the SAS-K, including age of arrival and length of residence into the measure would subsume two of the three measures of criterion validity, limiting our ability to validate the scale. Finally, as we were unable to obtain the original data on the SASH, any changes to the scale could only be assessed on the SAS-K.

p. 8, line 17: if appropriate, modify to read as "? similar subscale (SASH-cc) and total scale means ?"

Thank you for the suggestion. We have modified the sentence in question to clarify that we are referring to the SASH-cc in finding similar subscale and total scale means in relation to the SAS-K. (Revision p.9, line 13)

p. 8, line 23: To be consistent, change "larger" to "higher"; on page 10 you use higher. Also, on p. 9, line 10: is it "lower" or "smaller"?

Thank you for noting this inconsistency within the manuscript. We have changed each instance to consistently use either “smaller” or “larger” when comparing two alpha or correlation coefficients. (Revision p.9, line 20; p.10, line 11; p.11, line 14)

p. 9, line 9: Despite the sentence from line 6-9, this reviewer thinks the author should make a statement on the negative correlations of age of arrival with all the three subscales (Table 3). *A statement was added as recommended. (Revision p.10, lines 4-8)*

p. 9, end of section on Criterion and Construct Validity: It is possible that the authors did not have information on the use of the English Proficiency tool with the SASH (depicted on Table 3). The authors should make a statement on that.

Per the reviewer’s suggestion, a statement reflecting such was added. (Revision p.10, lines 15-16)

p. 11, section of limitations: what about the fact that some data were not available and the authors could only make intelligent guess by eye balling or visual inspection of the means. Is that a limitation or not?

Thank you for noting this limitation in our study. We have included this in our discussion. (Revision p.12, lines 18-20)

Table 3. To be consistent with the wordings in the text, "All Items" needs to be changed to Overall or Total Scale"

Thank you for noting this inconsistency. We have incorporated this recommended change.

Reviewer #2:

A stronger argument could have been made for the importance of validating the measure of acculturation. It is not clear how lines 9 through 18 support overall importance. More specifically, what is it about inconsistent findings about the relationship between acculturation and health that warrant validating the Short Acculturation Scale for Korean immigrants?

To address this concern, we have added an extra paragraph to the introduction discussing the need for the validation of an acculturation measure specific to Korean immigrants. (Revision p.2, line 16 through p.3, line10)

The study purpose is clear but aims a & b, as stated on page 4, are confusing. I misinterpreted these aims, initially expecting that the comparisons were between a Korean and English version of the Short Acculturation Scale when used with Koreans.

Thank you to the reviewer for noting potential confusion with the presentation of our research aims. We have now clarified our aims by changing "the SASH English and Korean versions" to "the SASH and the SAS-K" for both aims (a) and (b). (Revision p.4, lines 21-22)

A brief explanation of "double translation" would be valuable to readers who are unfamiliar with translation techniques.

We have included a description of double-translation techniques on page. (Revision p.6, lines 1-4)

Page 7, line 4, was unclear - "due to the nature of data collection, there was no missing data". Were cases selected from the larger study on the basis of no missing data? If yes, this could bias the results. Participants often leave items unanswered if they do not understand them.

We thank this reviewer for pointing out the need for clarification. All 143 participants who were recruited had complete data, and thus were used in all analyses. We clarified this in the text. (Revision p. 5, line14; Revision p. 8, line 1)

The tables and figure are informative but the reader is not prepared for including two Hispanic samples on Table 2.

Thank you for noting the potential for confusion among readers. This was clarified in the text to help prepare readers for the inclusion of two Hispanic samples in Table 2. (Revision p.9, line 12)

CHECKLIST FOR STYLE

TABLE 1 -- Please provide the publication by Marin et al., pp. 183-205.

A pdf file of the publication is attached.

Marin, G., Sabogal, F., Marin, B. V., Otero-Sabogal, F., & Perez-Stable, E. J. (1987).

Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9(2), 183-205.