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ABSTRACT

Although there is a handful of research on Emotional Intelligence in organizations, there is a lack of research on the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and the adjustment process of international students. This research aimed to gain a greater understanding of the adjustment process of international students in the United States. In addition, it examined how the components of emotional intelligence can affect the adjustment process in this specific population. Surveys measuring personal characteristics, social networking, homesickness, stress and college adjustment were used to determine the relationships between emotional intelligence and student outcomes (adjustment, stress, homesickness) mediated by social networking. Emotional intelligence was expected to account for decreases in adjustment problems, decreased stress level and decreased homesickness. The findings suggested that the construct of emotional intelligence plays an important role in the adjustment process of international students studying in the United States.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to the Institute of International Education, there were more than 490,933 international students in the U.S. during the 1998-1999 academic year. The number of international students in the U.S. has grown at a phenomenal rate over the last decade. A number of factors exist that drive students from all over the world to seek an education in the United States. One major reason may be that the United States offers the most extensive and diverse opportunities for higher education in the world. American higher education has long been an educational dream to international students. The goal of an American undergraduate or graduate degree has motivated hundreds of thousands of international students to leave their homes, families, friends, and cultures. In addition, the developing third world countries have realized their need for an educated work force. Because they have limited educational resources in their own countries, they have sent their students abroad, many of them to the United States, to be prepared for positions of responsibility in their home countries. However, being so far away from home can lead to negative outcomes for international students.
According to Thomas and Althen (1989), international students share common characteristics regardless of their country of origin, social, religious, and political backgrounds. For example, unlike other ethnic minorities in the U.S., most international students plan to return to their countries after they complete their education in the United States. Therefore they are students in transition who choose to live in a foreign academic setting to realize their educational objectives. Common cultural elements may run among students sharing similar cultural background, but in the end, each student is an individual with different motivations, needs, and attitudes.

International students are constantly being challenged to adapt themselves to a variety of cultural differences. They are far from their families, relatives, and friends at home, so they are also likely to have basic social support networks that are very different from those of American students. In addition, the educational system in the United States may be a factor that contributes to the confusion for some international students because of
its dissimilarity to the educational system in their home country. However, the self-imposed needs to achieve in a new educational environment may be long lasting and intense.

Although the phenomenal growth in the international student population has been a positive development for a number of reasons, the accompanying adjustment issues for the students involved can be a source of frustration and disappointment and a challenge for student affairs professionals. Adjustment to a new culture is considered an important psychological process because of its effects on the performance and functioning of the individual (Robie & Ryan, 1996). International students in the United States may face different cross-cultural adjustment problems such as adapting to new roles, language difficulties, financial problems, homesickness, lack of study skills, academic difficulty, and lack of assertiveness (Charles & Steward, 1991; Hayes & Lin, 1994; Barratt & Huba, 1994; Parr, Bradley, & Bingi, 1992). They need to learn a different culture and typically unfamiliar roles in a short period of time while they are under significant academic stress (Pedersen 1991). However, once international students learn and adapt to the essentials and roles of the new culture, their experience is likely
to be successful. On the other hand, not being able to adapt may affect their psychological (e.g. stress, depression) and physical (e.g. headaches) health, which may lead to obstacles to the achievement of their educational objectives. The faster international students adapt to a new culture, the better they will do academically (Charles & Steward, 1991).

Of the barriers international students face, the language barrier is probably the most significant problem for most international students. Insufficient English skill is basically a constraint to adjusting academically or becoming socially involved in American society. Those students with insufficient language skills usually have decreased ability to understand lectures, to take notes, to complete reading and writing assignments and examinations, and to orally express their opinions and ask questions in classes (Cadieux & Wehrly, 1986). Research shows that international students who report that they have sufficient English skills on arrival in the U.S. are significantly better adapted than those with insufficient English skills (Hayes & Lin, 1994; Barratt & Huba, 1994). Also, students’ social interaction and adjustment level increase as they become better in English (Stoynoff, 1997).
Triandis (1991) describes situations where international students are likely to experience adjustment problems. He believes that adjustment is easier for students who visit a country from the same cultural background. For example, a Western European student in American colleges is likely to have fewer adjustment issues than a Middle Eastern student. Difficulties arise when students face everyday life situations and require a different response than they are accustomed. It is easier for students to adjust to situations that are culturally consistent with their home culture.

Moving to another country for the first time, international students experience a profound sense of loss. Therefore, after arriving in the host country, students often feel less confident, sense constant tension, take less time off, feel guilty, and confused whenever they have fun (Hayes & Lin, 1994). All of these issues could make the adjustment process more difficult and lead to homesickness. Carden and Feicht (1991) studied homesickness of American college freshmen in the U.S. and Turkish college freshmen in Turkey. Their results showed that both American and Turkish homesick groups were lower in social presence, less poised, less spontaneous, and lacked self-confidence in their interactions with others.
The results also showed that both groups were psychologically dependent on their parents and families.

An individual's self-concept and self-esteem are established by significant others who, have similar cultural background, provide emotional and social support. Moving to America, international students lose the shared identity that comes from being with family and peers (Pedersen, 1991; Romero, 1981). Facing a different culture from their own suddenly deprives them of this support system. As a result, they often feel lonely (Schram & Lauver, 1988). Pedersen (1991) states that deprivation of familial support and advice and the lack of self-confidence the students may experience worsen their adjustment problem. Adjustment to the loss of social support can get complicated when the student can not effectively communicate in the host culture. Many studies support the finding that the inability to speak the host language fluently is a primary inhibitor to becoming socially involved in the host society (Furnham & Alibhai, 1985; Heikinheimo & Shute, 1986; Meloni, 1986; Ray & Lee, 1988).

Research has shown the positive consequences of forming relationships with host nationals (Flack, 1976). Individual coping styles and social networks play
significant roles in the social support systems of international students. The size of the social network is the best predictor of social adjustment (Steinglass, DeNour, & Shye, 1985).

The benefits of this cultural subgroup provide a place where international students can form new primary relations, therefore developing a sense of belonging and a place to share familiar traditional values and belief systems. However in the long run, foreign students were shown to prefer host nationals to other nationals (Alexander, Klein, Workneh, & Miller, 1981; Kang, 1972). These outcomes suggest that international students desire more contacts with host nationals.

At the end of their studies, international students usually have to make a decision about where to live after their graduation, either at home or in the U.S. (Khoo et al., 1994). Regardless of their initial reasons to be in America temporarily, many international students go through a long, difficult process in examining their advantages and disadvantages (Thomas & Althen, 1989). The process involves the student making a decision, which could be complicated, because it involves not only the students' future career plans, but also their self-concept. The effects of different cultural values,
beliefs, traditions, and customs on individuals can be powerful. The changes that international students have experienced in their social roles and positions and interpersonal relations during their studies in the U.S. have affected their self-concept (Winkeleman, 1994) as well as their worldview (Westwood, Lawrence, & Paul, 1996). Returning to their home countries may require considerable professional and personal readjustments, and the "reverse culture shock" (Westwood et al., 1986) may be very challenging for them.

International students usually encounter academic, personal, and social problems (Anderson & Myers, 1985; Heikinheimo & Shute, 1986; Surdam & Collins, 1984) that are closely related to their efforts to adjust to their new culture and to the loss, even if temporarily, of the old culture. These types of students, express happiness in the beginning about being in America, but can soon change to feelings of disappointment and depression (Arredondo-Dowd, 1981).

Thus, among international students, the adjustment process introduces potential sources of conflict and stress. Therefore, it is important to learn about factors that help to decrease adjustment problems and increase
social networking. One of the potential factors may be Emotional Intelligence.

Emotional Intelligence (EQ)

The idea that individuals differ in their ability to understand and deal with emotions has recently caught the attention of academics and the popular media alike. For example, a recently published sentiment is that "IQ gets you the job, but EQ gets you the promotion" (Gibbs, 1995). The above sentiment is an optimistic quote that has been inspired by the popularity of a recent book that emotional intelligence is the most crucial determinant of occupational success (Goleman, 1995).

Although the specific concept of emotional intelligence has only been defined since the beginning of the 1990s (Mayer, DiPaolo & Salovey, 1990, Salovey & Mayer, 1990), interest in the interaction of emotions and intelligence is not new. Scientists like Piaget (1954/1981) explored theoretical connections between affectivity and intelligence and researchers such as Izard (1985), LeDoux (1989), and Lazarus (1982) discussed the connection between emotion and cognition in the 1980s. Salovey and Mayer's work on emotional intelligence was inspired by Thorndike's (1920) work on social intelligence
and Gardner’s (1983) development of the constructs of interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence. 

Social intelligence stresses two aspects: social understanding and situationally-appropriate behavior. Thorndike (1920) defined social intelligence as “the ability to understand men and women, boys and girls, to act wisely in human relations.” Gardner (1983) refers to personal intelligences, which include interpersonal intelligence—the ability to deal effectively with others, and interpersonal intelligence—the ability to know one’s own feelings and understanding one’s own behavior or what others have called emotional intelligence.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) reconceptualized Gardner’s (1983) last two intelligences under the broader label of emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence, according to Mayer and Salovey (1993), “is a type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions.”

Salovey and Mayer were among the first researchers that coined the term emotional intelligence but other researchers like Bar-On (1997), Cooper and Sawaf (1996), Goleman (1995, 1998 a,b), Shapiro (1997) and Weisinger
(1998) have their own notions of emotional intelligence. Weisinger (1998) described emotional intelligence as "the intelligent use of emotions: you intentionally make your emotions work for you by using them to help guide your behavior and thinking in ways that enhance your results." Goleman believes that emotional intelligence is not one thing. "It is a profile of self-awareness, of managing your feelings, of motivation, of empathy and social skills, and so forth" (Goleman, 1995).

There are some similarities between Salovey’s and Mayer’s (1990, 1993, 1994) earlier research and the work of other researchers on emotional intelligence for example Bar-On, 1997; and Goleman, 1995, however there are some important differences. For example Goleman’s (1998a) construct of emotional intelligence includes motivation and empathy, factors that Mayer, Salovey and Caruso believe extends beyond the confines of emotional intelligence. Similarly, Bar-On (1997) includes assertiveness, self-esteem, and independence. These factors clearly go beyond the scope of Mayer and Salovey’s definition of emotional intelligence (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002).

Existing studies on EQ have shown inconsistencies in defining EQ. Some have focused on capacities to adjust to
social situations. Others have focused on cognitive and emotional perception. And, some have focused on social personality dimensions. These different definitions have lead to differences in measurement making it difficult to draw conclusions across the literature. The construct of EQ used in this paper is based on Salovey and Mayer's model. Salovey and Mayer's construct focuses on the link between the cognitive and emotional aspects of intelligence and is not considered as just another set of personality dimensions. Also, the Multi-factorial Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) developed by Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey (1999), measures three standards for the measurement of intelligence. The first standard is that the measure should reflect performance, and not preferred behavior. The second standard is that intelligence should describe a closely related set of abilities that are similar, but different from, already established intelligences. Finally, the intelligence should be capable of developing with age and experience (Jordan, Ashkanasy, Hartel, & Hooper, 2002). This approach focuses on competencies rather than personalities and allows for the development of interventions.

Goleman's (1995) review of the EQ literature (e.g. Greenspan, 1989; Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Mayer &
Salovey, 1995; Salovey, Hsee, & Mayer, 1993; Salovey & Mayer, 1990) identified self-awareness, emotional management, self-motivation, empathy, and relationship management as key aspects of EQ. Self-awareness is one’s ability to self-observe which results from dispositional attributes such as purpose-in-life (PIL) (Frankl, 1992), private self-consciousness (attention to one’s inner thoughts and feelings), and public self-consciousness (general awareness of the self as a social object; Fenigstein et al., 1975). At a financial services company emotional self-awareness proved crucial in financial planner’s performance (Goleman, 1998b). The interaction between a financial planner and a client is delicate, dealing not only with hard questions about money but also, when life insurance comes up, the even more discomforting issue of mortality; the planners’ self-awareness apparently helped them handle their emotional reactions better. Emotional management involves self-monitoring, in other words, the regulation of expressive behavior guided by situational cues to social appropriateness (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Snyder, 1974). Self-motivation stems from optimism and the belief that one has the ability to influence events and consequences in his or her life (Paulhus, 1983). Empathy is the ability to recognize and
respond to changes in the emotional states of others through sensitivity, social self-confidence, and even temperedness (Hogan, 1969; Salovey & Shiyter, 1997). The positive impact of the self-confidence competence on performance has been shown in a variety of studies. Among supervisors, managers, and executives, a high degree of self-confidence distinguishes the best from the average performers (Boyatzis, 1982). Among 112 entry-level accountants, those with the highest sense of self-efficacy, a form of self-confidence, were rated by their supervisors ten months later as having superior job performance. The level of self-confidence was in fact a stronger predictor of performance than the level of skill or previous training (Saks, 1995). Relationship management refers to predisposition toward effectively handling interpersonal relationships (Salovey & Shiyter, 1997).

Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) components of emotional intelligence are made up of five abilities:

1. Capacity for self-awareness. Knowing what one feels as it happens; listening to one’s own feeling about what is the right thing to do in a given situation.

2. Skill in managing emotions. Controlling impulses, delay gratification, and handling feelings in a
way that enables one to control anger, regulate anxiety, and manage mood states so that one is not overwhelmed by emotional tidal waves.

3. Power to motivate oneself pursuing goals, staying on track, avoiding procrastination, remaining optimistic in down times, and striving mastery.

4. Ability to empathize with others. Reading and responding to unspoken needs and feelings, avoiding excessive self-absorption, and using one’s self-awareness to understand others.

5. Ability to deal with relationships. Handling emotional responses in others, working through interpersonal problems, interacting maturely and smoothly.

The components of EQ introduced by the above authors, is a framework of emotional competencies. Goleman (1998b) defines an emotional competence as “a learned capability based on emotional intelligence that results in outstanding performance at work.” McClelland (1975) proposed the concept of competence as a basis for identifying what differentiates outstanding from average performers at work. McClelland (1998) reviewed data from more than thirty different organizations and for executive positions in many professions, from banking and managing
to mining, sales, and health care. He showed that a wide range of EQ competencies distinguished top performers from average ones. Those that distinguished most powerfully were Achievement Drive, Developing Others, Adaptability, Influence, Self-Confidence, and Leadership (Goleman, 2001).

In some leadership research, the different aspects of EQ are evident in leaders. For example when a leader is self-aware, he or she may demonstrate determination, farsightedness, and strong convictions in his or her beliefs (Bennis, 1989). Given that self-awareness is a function of PIL (Frankl, 1992), a leader who is self-aware may possess a greater than average sense of meaning and purpose.

The self-awareness aspect of EQ encompasses personal competence (knowing and managing emotions in oneself). At another level, self-awareness is key to realizing one’s own strengths and weaknesses. Among several hundred managers from twelve different organizations, accurate self-assessment was the hallmark of superior performance (Boyatzis, 1982). Individuals with the accurate self-assessment competence are aware of their abilities and limitations, seek out feedback and learn from their mistakes, and know where they need to improve and when to
work with others who have complementary strengths (Goleman, 2001). Accurate self-assessment was the competence found in virtually every "star performer" in a study of several hundred computer scientists and auditors at companies such as AT&T and 3M (Kelley, 1998). Another aspect of EQ introduced earlier, is relationship management. The relationship management set of competencies includes essential social skills (knowing and managing emotions in others). One of the competencies is the communication competence. People who exhibit the communication competence are effective in the give-and take of emotional information, deal with difficult issues straightforwardly, listen well and welcome sharing information fully, and foster open communication and stay receptive to bad news as well as good news (Goleman, 2001). Building bonds is another competency within relationship management. The building bonds competence epitomizes stars in fields like engineering, computer science, biotechnology, and other knowledge work fields in which networking is crucial for success; these stars tend to choose people with a particular expertise or resource to be part of their networks (Kelly, 1998). Outstanding performers with this competence balance their own critical work with carefully chosen favors, building accounts of
goodwill with people who may become crucial resources down the line (Goleman, 2001). One of the purposes of building such relationships is the reservoir of trust and goodwill that they establish; highly effective managers are adept at cultivating these relationships, whereas less effective managers generally fail to build bonds (Kaplan, 1991).

EQ creates and sustains informal networks. Kelley and Caplan (1993) distinguished between average performers and star researchers at Bell Laboratories. The work was such that no single individual possessed all of the knowledge required for task completion. The star performers were characterized by the ability to create and maintain informal networks whose assistance could be called upon in those aspects of the task where the scientist lacked knowledge. Communication and trust networks in which employees shared their private feelings and concerns supported such expertise. In general terms, if one accepts that one third of our work force consists of knowledge workers whose efforts are so highly specialized that they can be productive only if well coordinated (Drucker, 1994), the social skills component of EQ may have become mandatory for success (Abraham, 1999).
Some of the adjustment issues related to relationships faced by international students in American Universities were previously identified. To name just a few, adjustment to the loss of social support, forming relationships with host nationals and lack of self-confidence can make adjustment more difficult. It is important for the student to belong to social networks. The network with other students from same country provides a setting where ethnic and cultural values can be rehearsed and expressed. This type of network can help students maintain their culture of origin. It is also important to network with domestic students. This type of bi-cultural network consists of bonds between international students and significant host nationals such as faculty, students, and university staff. The main function of the bicultural network is to instrumentally facilitate the academic aspirations of the students. International students also need to have a network of friends and acquaintances for companionship for recreational, and non-task oriented activities. These networks are important because through them students can learn social skills of their culture of sojourn. The students will also benefit from opportunities to practice and improve their English while exchanging cultural
information with native English speakers. Since students are often worried about finding jobs after graduation, this stage also helps students with resume writing and job-hunting strategies.

As indicated earlier, the social-skills component of EQ enhances social networking. Social networking then decreases the outcome problems of international students. The outcome problems are increased adjustment, decreased stress level and homesickness. In other words, a partial mediation is expected rather than a full mediation. Therefore, EQ affects the student outcomes directly or indirectly through social networking.

H1: EQ is related to student outcomes (adjustment, stress, homesickness).

H1 a: EQ is positively related to adjustment.

H1 b: EQ is negatively related to stress.

H1 c: EQ is negatively related to homesickness.

H2: The relationships between EQ and the outcomes are mediated by international students' social networking.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Participants

In this research 67 undergraduate international students from southern California university campuses participated. Based on the information from the International Students Office participants represented a variety of nationalities from all over the world, consisting of 43 females and 24 males. Their ages ranged from 18 to 40, with an average of $x = 23.66$. Among the participants, 91% were single and 9% were married. 88% of participants reported agreed or strongly agreed that their English language proficiency was adequate. The only 12% were able to complete the questionnaire so this was probably tapping into comfort rather than proficiency. In addition, there is a standard TOEFL score requirement to get accepted to the university. Therefore, this sample does have English proficiency.

Materials

Participants were provided an informed consent form, a demographic information form, and a debriefing statement. A packet of questionnaires was also provided to the participants in order to measure the predictor and
criterion variables. This packet included the personal characteristics survey, social networking scale, single-item homesickness measure, college adjustment test, and the perceived stress scale.

**Informed Consent Form**

The consent form contained the following information: identification of the researcher, explanation of the purpose and nature of the study and research method, duration of research participation, discussion of how confidentiality will be maintained, participant’s rights, any possible foreseeable risks on benefits to the participant, and who to contact regarding any questions about subject’s rights or injuries (see Appendix D).

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The demographic questionnaire form included questions regarding the participant’s age, gender, marital status, length of time in the United States, length of time studying in the United States, major of study, and level of English language proficiency (see Appendix E).

Personal Characteristics Questionnaire (Copies of the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale is not presented in the Appendix due to the propriety nature of the measure).
The Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) was developed by Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999). The MEIS is a self-report survey that uses a four branch model of skills involved in Emotional Intelligence. These skills include, reflectively regulating emotions, understanding emotions, assimilating emotion in thought, and perceiving and expressing emotion. The Emotional Intelligence survey was used as a rating instrument where students were asked to rate their level of Emotional Intelligence. Five dimensions identified by Daniel Goleman were used to tap concepts related to each of these four skills. Survey items were categorized under each of the five dimensions in order to effectively tap each skill related to Emotional Intelligence. The dimensions were, self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills. There were a total of 27 items in a seven-point Likert scale format. A high score, such as seven, represented "Strongly Agree" and a score, such as one, represented "Strongly Disagree." The scale range was between one and seven, progressively representing stronger levels of agreement as the numbers increase. The midpoint of the scale, four represented a neutral response, in the middle of agree and disagree. Participants' responses were
averaged for each item in order to establish an overall score.

The overall reliability of the Emotional Intelligence (EQ) scale was tested to ensure adequate reliability. The EQ scale had an overall alpha reliability of .93, indicating a high magnitude of internal consistency. Separate analyses were run for each of the five dimensions to capture the reliability of each specific dimension that encompasses Emotional Intelligence (self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills). The alpha reliability for self-awareness is 0.64. For self-regulation the alpha reliability is 0.77. For motivation, the alpha reliability is 0.85. For empathy, the alpha reliability is 0.78. For social skills, the alpha reliability is 0.86.

Social Network Index Scale

The Social Network Index Scale (SNI) was developed by Berkman and Seeman (1993). This scale was used to measure social networks and the degree and extent of those networks. The multi-item indicator denoted whether respondents belong to a social network of any kind. Measures of marital status, contacts with extended family and close friends, church membership, and other group affiliations were combined to form the Social Network
Index. The directions were modified to ask students to respond regarding networks near school (see Appendix F).

The Social Network Index summarized not only the absolute number of social ties but also the degree of intimacy potentially provided by each source of contact. Thus the intimate contacts of marriage and contact with close friends and relatives are weighted more heavily than church affiliations and group memberships.

The responses were categorized into: low networks, medium-high networks and high networks. The categories were developed to reflect differences in type and extent of social contact (Berkman & Seeman, 1993). The key for this measure provides scores for each of these categories which then they are summed to form one continuous scale.

**Single-Item Homesickness Measure**

The single-item homesickness measure (SIHM) was developed by Fisher and Hood (1987). The questionnaire consisted of 33 items. The participants were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 4 the extent to which they experience homesickness. A score of “1” representing “strongly disagree” versus scores of “2 to 4” representing “disagree” to “strongly agree.” Participants’ responses were averaged across items to establish an overall score. The scale contained seven items (4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 18, and
that were reversed scored during analysis. The Cronbach’s alpha for the SIHM was found to be .91 (see Appendix G).

College Adjustment Test

The College Adjustment Test (CAT) was developed by Pennebaker, Codler, and Sharp (1990). The CAT consisted of 19 items and asked students to assess the degree which they have experienced a variety of thoughts and feelings about being in college within the last week. Items were rated on a 7-point scale from 1 = not at all to 7 = a great deal. Participants’ responses were averaged across items to establish an overall score. The scale contained seven items (9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 18, and 19) that were reverse scored during analysis. The Cronbach’s alpha of this scale was found to be .78 (see Appendix H).

Perceived Stress Scale

Perceived Stress Scale (PSS; Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) was used due to its viability as a stress measure. The PSS consisted of 14 items and asked respondents to assess how often they have experienced a variety of stress-related feelings during the past month. Items were rated on a 5-point scale from 0 = never to 4 = very often. PSS scores were obtained by reversing the scores on the seven positive items, e.g., 0 = 4, 1 = 3,
2 = 2, etc., and then averaging across all 14 items. Items 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 13 were the positively stated items. Participants' responses were averaged for each item in order to establish an overall score. The Cronbach's alpha of this scale was found to be .78 (see Appendix I).

Debriefing Statement

The debriefing statement informed participants of the research questions addressed in the study, which they can contact regarding future distress due to the study and who to contact if they wish to obtain the results of the study. Additionally, in order to maintain the validity of the study, participants were requested not to discuss the details of the study with other potential participants (see Appendix J).

Procedures

Participants for this study were recruited from three different universities: California State University San Bernardino, University of California Irvine, and University of California Los Angeles. An attempt was made to contact the representatives of the International Students Offices from each university to get information on their international students' population. Arrangements were made to set up a time to meet in small groups,
convenient for the students to fill out the questionnaires. A second method utilized was to deliver the questionnaires to the participants individually, through the International Students Office and ask them to fill out questionnaires and return them at a later time to the International Students Office. The students were informed regarding their voluntary participation, relevance and purpose of this study.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

Prior to analysis, the Personal Characteristics Scale, Social Network Index Scale, Single-Item Homesickness Measure, the College Adjustment Test, and Perceived Stress Scale were examined for out of range values, missing data, skewness and kurtosis. The variables and scale items were examined separately for the 67 undergraduate international students sampled from Southern California Universities.

There were no significant missing data; therefore all 67 participants remained in the sample. For two cases there were missing data on individual demographic variables, no procedure was used to estimate the data since it was not critical to the hypotheses. The variables included in the hypothesis were screened for skewness and kurtosis. All variables were normally distributed.

Next, the means and standard deviations for each of the variables were calculated (see Appendix A). The mean score of English language proficiency was $x = 3.27$ with a SD of .73. Based on a four-point scale, the English language mean was high. A frequency analysis indicated that 88% of the sample felt their English proficiency was
strong. Only two participants disagreed that English language proficiency prepared them for university requirements. The mean emotional intelligence was $x = 5.33$ with a SD of .72. Based on a seven-point scale, this emotional intelligence mean suggests that on average, participants reported high emotional intelligence.

**Bivariate Correlations**

As a precondition to establish mediation the interrelationship of the variables were examined for relatedness (see Appendix B). The Bivariate Correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment was first examined. The result of the correlation coefficient was statistically significant at $r = -.288$, $p < .05$. Next, the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Stress was investigated by examining the Bivariate Correlation between both variables. Again, the result of the correlation coefficient was statistically significant at $r = -.474$, $p < .01$. Finally the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Homesickness was analyzed. The result of the correlation coefficient was not statistically significant. The result suggests that there is no relationship between Emotional Intelligence and
Homesickness. However, there is a relationship between Emotional Intelligence with Stress and Adjustment.

Mediation Statistics

In order to test the mediation hypothesis, two statistical procedures were utilized: Partial Correlations and Multiple Regression Analysis using the Sobel Test. Both methods were utilized due to a salient criticism regarding the usage of just Partial Correlations. Practitioners have concluded that when testing for mediated relationships, Partial Correlations often over-estimate the effect of the mediator. Therefore, a more conservative test was used, the Sobel Test, to alleviate possible concerns, and ensure that all mediated relationships were estimated correctly.

Beginning with Partial Correlations, the Bivariate Correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Stress was first examined. The results of the correlation analysis were statistically significant at $r = -.474$, $p < .01$. Next, the partial correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Stress controlling for Social Networking was analyzed.

When the mediated partial correlation coefficient was examined, the results indicated that Emotional
Intelligence and Stress remained statistically significant at $r = -.38$, $p < .001$. Therefore, based on this data, no significant mediated relationship emerged due to the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Stress remaining statistically significant after all unique variance accounted for by Social Networking was removed.

After the bivariate and partial correlations were calculated, a Multiple Regression analysis using the Sobel Test was then analyzed. This tests both full and partial mediation ($z-value = a*b/\text{SQRT}(b^2*s_a^2 + a^2*s_b^2)$). The procedures to perform this regression analysis, outlined by Preacher and Leonardelli (2001), were followed.

It was necessary to test the predictive relationships of Social Networking and Emotional Intelligence variables in regards to Stress, to insert into the Sobel Test Equation. A Linear Regression Analysis was first calculated to examine the relationship between Social Networking and Emotional Intelligence. The Unstandardized Coefficient was $B = 1.264$ with a Standard Error of .31. Then, a Linear Regression analysis was calculated to analyze the predictive relationship between both Emotional Intelligence and Social Networking and Stress. The Unstandardized Coefficient for Social Networking was -.0421 and a Standard Error of .032. When the Sobel Test
was conducted, the z score equaled -1.25, p = .211. These results further confirmed that the hypothesized relationship of Emotional Intelligence and Stress, mediated by Social Networking, was not statistically significant. Therefore, no full or partial mediation was found.

Next, the same procedure as above was repeated for testing the mediated effect of Social Networking on Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment. The Bivariate Correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment was examined. The results of the correlation analysis were statistically significant at $r = -.288$, $p < .05$. Next, the partial correlation between Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment controlling for Social Networking was analyzed. When the mediated partial correlation coefficient was examined, the results indicated that Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment remained statistically significant at $r = -.219$, $p < .001$. Therefore, based on this data, no significant mediated relationship emerged due to the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment remaining statistically significant after all unique variance accounted for by Social Networking was removed.
The Sobel Test was then conducted. It was necessary to test the predictive relationships of Social Networking and Emotional Intelligence variables in regards to Adjustment, to insert into the Sobel Test Equation. A Linear Regression Analysis was previously calculated to examine the relationship between Social Networking and Emotional Intelligence. The Unstandardized Coefficient was $B = 1.264$, with a Standard Error of .31. Then, a Linear Regression analysis was calculated to analyze the predictive relationship between both Emotional Intelligence and Social Networking and Adjustment. The Unstandardized Coefficient for Social Networking was $-.042$, with a Standard Error of .054. When the Sobel Test was conducted, the $z$ score equaled $-0.76$, $p = .44$. These results further confirmed that the hypothesized relationship of Emotional Intelligence and Adjustment, mediated by Social Networking, was not statistically significant. Therefore, no full or partial mediation was found.

In addition, the possible mediation analyses of sub-dimensions of EQ were investigated. Consistent with the earlier results there were no mediating effect (see Appendix C). No mediation analysis was conducted on EQ and homesickness, because EQ is not related to homesickness.
Exploratory Analysis

Based on the results of the initial statistics, the bivariate correlations between all dimensions of EQ and outcome variables were examined (see Appendix B). First, the relationships between Stress and the five dimensions of EQ were investigated. The results of the correlation coefficients were statistically significant between Stress and the five dimensions of EQ. The Bivariate Correlations are as follow: Self-Awareness, $r = -0.435, p < .01$; Self-Regulation, $r = -0.474, p < .01$; Motivation, $r = -0.406, p < .01$; Empathy, $r = 0.298, p < .05$; Social Skills, $r = -0.373, p < .01$.

Next, the relationships between Adjustment and the five dimensions of EQ were investigated. The results of the correlation coefficients were only statistically significant between Adjustment and Self-Awareness, Motivation, and Social Skills.

Finally, the relationships between Homesickness and the five dimensions of EQ were investigated. The results of the correlation coefficients were not statistically significant. These results confirm that there is no relationship between the dimensions and Homesickness. However, there is a pattern of correlations with Stress
and all five dimensions of EQ and Self-Awareness, Motivation and Social Skills with Adjustment.
Overall, results of this study provide evidence that EQ demonstrated a relationship with adjustment and stress. The results indicate that the ability to manage emotions decreases adjustment problems and stress level. Findings in relation to EQ sub-dimensions were especially encouraging. There was a pattern of correlations with stress and all five sub-dimensions of EQ and self-awareness, motivation and social skills with adjustment. The results, however, are consistent with the conceptualization of each dimension. Self-awareness refers to realizing one's own strengths and weaknesses. Individuals with self-awareness are aware of their abilities and limitations, seek out feedback and learn from their mistakes, and know where they need to improve and when to work with others who have complementary strengths. Therefore, it would make sense that students with this competence would also handle stressful situations and overcome adjustment problems. Self-awareness apparently helps individuals handle their emotional reactions better. This is consistent with earlier suggestions in the literature that have not yet
been empirically supported (Carden & Feicht, 1991; Pedersen, 1991).

Self-regulation refers to the regulation of expressive behavior guided by situational cues to social appropriateness. Individuals with this competency, control impulses, handle feelings in a way that enables them to control anger, regulate anxiety, and manage mood states so that one is not overwhelmed by emotional waves (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Thus as the results indicate that self-regulation has a relationship with stress, therefore, an individual with this competence is less likely to become angry or depressed when faced with stressful situations. Therefore, these individuals are best able to manage their own stress and stay unaffected.

The results indicate that there is a relationship between self-motivation with stress and adjustment. Self-motivation stems from optimism and the belief that one has the ability to influence events and consequences in his or her life. An individual who is self-motivated is driven to success and determines one’s reaction to unfavorable events or circumstances. Those who are self-motivated are proactive and persistent, have an optimistic attitude toward setbacks, and have hope to successes. This makes clear that self-motivation decreases
stress and decreases adjustment problems. Individuals with this competence have the power to motivate oneself to pursue goals, stay on track, avoid procrastination, remain optimistic in down times, and strive mastery (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Empathy is the ability to recognize and respond to changes in the emotional states of others through sensitivity, social self-confidence, and even temperedness. The empathetic individual can read people accurately and pick up nonverbal cues. Therefore, it can decrease such pressures of reading others' emotions, concerns, and needs. This makes clear why empathy was negatively correlated with stress. An individual with this competence reads and responds to unspoken needs and feelings, avoids excessive self-absorption, and uses one's self-awareness to understand others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Finally, social skills refer to knowing and managing emotions in others. The results indicate that there is a significant correlation with social skills, stress and adjustment. The results are not surprising. The social skills competence could help an individual to be effective in the give- and -take of emotional information, deal with difficult issues, listen well and accept bad news as well
as good news. Therefore, individuals with this competence handle emotional responses in others, work through interpersonal problems, interact maturely, and smoothly (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). According to the nature of this competence, it makes sense that empathy can help students decrease their stress level and decrease their adjustment problems.

Another notable outcome of the present study was that no correlation was found between EQ and homesickness. The ability to decrease homesickness is especially important because it allows the individual to overcome personal setbacks and thereby to manage one's own and others' emotions. Unexpectedly, however, there was no significant relationship between EQ and homesickness. This result may be due to the fact that EQ provides competencies to cope with adjustment problems. Homesickness is not an adjustment problem; it is an emotional reaction or feeling about the people and places left at home. Therefore, homesickness is an external event while EQ is a competency that helps decrease adjustment problems and stress.

The notion that social networking has a mediating effect on the relationship between EQ and the outcomes was stated in Hypothesis two. Hypothesis two specifically stated that the relationships between EQ and the outcomes
are mediated by social networking. The results, however, suggest that social networking does not fully or partially mediate the EQ and outcomes relationships. This was somewhat surprising, since it would seem that an individual's social networking would decrease the outcome problems of international students. Perhaps the lack of significance is a result of the nature of the social network scale. There might have been other sources of social integration in international students that the scale did not tap. In addition, while literature supports the notion that social network with host nationals can be important to international students (Alexander, Klein, Workneh, & Miller, 1981; Kang, 1972), it is possible that it is not a mediating factor in the relationship between EQ and student outcomes. Therefore, it is possible that EQ decreases negative outcomes because it decreases negative perceptions of social events without needing the help of a social network. However, regardless of the mediating effect of social network, EQ is predicting the outcomes.

Limitations

There were several limitations that may have changed the obtained results. The first of which regard the sample population participated in this study. The participants
may not be representative of all undergraduate international students in the United States. The majority of students came from California State University San Bernardino. This university has a high level of diversity; therefore, students might not feel as isolated as they would if the university population were more homogenous. In a more homogenous population students will have a higher chance to network with other students from same country. This type of network can help students maintain their culture of origin. In addition, this type of networking can provide them a setting where ethnic and cultural values can be rehearsed and expressed. Therefore, it might help them to deal with their adjustment problems.

Additionally, the study was not culturally sensitive to different populations in measuring their adjustment to a new culture. There might be special characteristics of each population that the scales did not take into consideration. Therefore, it is important to look carefully at the cultural differences among international students. There are similarities across cultures (Thomas, & Althen, 1989) and that this study chose to look across cultures.

Additional limitations regard the method of data collection. The findings are based on self-reported data.
A self-report survey may cause response bias. The students' perceptions might be different than their actual adjustment level or problems; they may have interpreted the questions differently, they may have not taken the survey seriously and answered the questions quickly without any thought or consideration. This limitation probably not relevant for the outcome variables. It may not be truly relevant of their social skills rather than their own social skills.

A very important limitation has to do with measurement of social networking. One of the important notions in the social networking literature is forming networks with host nationals (Flack, 1976; Alexander, Klein, Workneh, & Miller, 1981; Kang, 1972). Relationships with host nationals might help students in educating them about the differences between their cultures and Western cultures. This type of network might also help students to instrumentally facilitate the academic aspirations of the students. Therefore, it might help their adjustment process. The measure did not separate out network forms with host nationals versus other international students or family members.
Implications

A particularly interesting result of the present study was that there was a significant relationship between EQ and international student outcomes. These results will help us understand those factors that lead to international students' positive outcomes. Being aware of the adjustment process of international students might help the student support personnel cope with foreign student behavior. EQ focuses on competencies that can be trained. International Student Services can develop EQ training to help students be better prepared to cope with the social aspects. Therefore, it might help the students to be more successful academically and increase satisfaction with their scholastic stay in the United States.

Additionally, the results of this study have implications for managers suggesting that organizations could take into consideration an intervention program that focuses on the above relationships. In this era of diversity and multiculturalism, organizations are faced with various adjustment issues of their foreign employees. Foreign employees may not be the easiest population with which to work, but organizational personnel, can surely have a positive impact on their lives during their period
of stay in the United States. Interventions can be designed to develop EQ competencies for not only foreign employees working in the United States but also on American expatriates working abroad.

Although the social networking scale utilized in this study resulted in a non-significant mediating effect on the relationship between EQ and outcomes, future studies should consider improving upon the measurement. In addition this study suggests that questions or measures should be considered to capture sociocultural differences. A more appropriate measure may use questions that capture other unmeasured ties or social contacts particularly focusing on networks related to host national.
APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Awareness</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Skills</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesickness</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Proficiency</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

CORRELATION TABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness (1)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation (2)</td>
<td>.614**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (3)</td>
<td>.617**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy (4)</td>
<td>.682**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Skills (5)</td>
<td>.641**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ (6)</td>
<td>.844**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking (7)</td>
<td>.319**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress (8)</td>
<td>-.435**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment (9)</td>
<td>-.311**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homesickness (10)</td>
<td>-.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
APPENDIX C

SOBEL TEST
**SOBEL TEST FOR EQ DIMENSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DV = Stress</th>
<th>Med = Social Networking</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.595</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.356</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.368</td>
<td>0.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.781</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.655</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DV = Adjustment</th>
<th>Med = Social Networking</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.603</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.478</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT
INFORMED CONSENT

The research you are about to participate in is designed to investigate the adjustment process of international students. Hedieh Khajavi is conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Professor of Psychology as a requirement for her graduate program. The questionnaire will take approximately 25 minutes to complete.

This study has been approved by the Psychology Department Human Subjects Review Board, California State University San Bernardino. The University requires that you give your consent before participating in a research study.

Your anonymity will be maintained at all times. Please be assured that any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. At no time will your name be reported along with your responses. At the study’s conclusion, you may receive a report of the results. All data will be reported in-group form only. Results of the study will be available in the Fall 2002.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from this study at any time without any penalty. There are not any foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study. Any questions should be directed to Hedieh Khajavi at (909) 880-5587. If you have any questions about any research subjects’ rights, contact the University’s Institutional Review Board at (909) 880-5027.

By placing a mark in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. By this mark I further acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Give your consent to participate by making a check or ‘X’ mark here: __________

Today’s date is __________
APPENDIX E

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Demographic Information Sheet

Please answer each general information question listed below.

1. Age __________

2. Gender (please check one)
   Male __________
   Female __________

3. Marital Status (please check one)
   Single __________
   Married __________

4. Please indicate the length of time you have been in the United States:
   ______ yr ______ months

5. Please indicate the length of time you have been studying in the United States:
   ______ yr ______ months

6. What is your major of study? ______________________

7. I feel my level of English proficiency is adequate to meet my academic and social needs at University.
   1 2 3 4
   Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree
APPENDIX F

SOCIAL NETWORK INDEX SCALE
Social Network

The questions in this scale ask you about your social networks and the degree and extent of those networks within your host national. Please indicate your answer by checking the appropriate box. Thank you.

(1) Marital Status:
1) Have you ever been married?
   ( ) yes   ( ) no

2) If yes, is your spouse with you in the United States?
   ( ) yes   ( ) no

3) If yes, are you now married, separated, divorced, widowed?
   ( ) married   ( ) separated   ( ) divorced   ( ) widowed

(2) Friends and Relatives who live within 100 miles from where you go to school:
1) How many close friends do you have?
   (People that you feel at ease with, can talk to about private matters, and can call on for help.)
   ( ) none   ( ) 1 or 2   ( ) 3 or 5   ( ) 6 to 9   ( ) 10 or more

2) How many friends do you have on campus?
   ( ) none   ( ) 1 or 2   ( ) 3 or 5   ( ) 6 to 9   ( ) 10 or more

3) How many relatives do you have that you feel close to?
   ( ) none   ( ) 1 or 2   ( ) 3 or 5   ( ) 6 to 9   ( ) 10 or more

4) How many of these friends or relatives do you see at least once a month?
   ( ) none   ( ) 1 or 2   ( ) 3 or 5   ( ) 6 to 9   ( ) 10 or more
(3) & (4) Church and Group Membership:
(within 100 miles from where you go to school)

1) Do you belong to any of these kinds of groups?

Yes    No

a. A social or recreational group? ( ) ( )
b. A labor union, commercial group, professional organization? ( ) ( )
c. Church group? ( ) ( )
d. A group concerned with children (PTA, Boy Scout) ( ) ( )
e. A group concerned with community betterment, charity, or service? ( ) ( )
f. Any other group? Describe ( ) ( )

__________________________________________
APPENDIX G

THE SINGLE-ITEM HOMESICKNESS MEASURE
The Single Item Homesickness Measure

The aim of this questionnaire is to find out the level of homesickness among students. Please indicate your response of each item by using a 4-point scale, where 1 stands for "strongly disagree," 2 stands for "disagree," 3 stands for "agree," and 4 stands for "strongly agree." In other words, the larger the number, the greater the degree of homesickness. Circle one number (either 1, 2, 3, or 4) for each item. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I cannot help thinking about my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I cannot concentrate on my work because I am always thinking about home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I am thinking about nothing in particular my thoughts always come back to home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I hardly ever think about my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is so much going on here that I hardly ever think about home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I visit home as often as I can.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I write home every week.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thinking about home makes me cry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I dream about my friends at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have settled in really well at the university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If I ever went home for the weekend I would not want to come back.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I try to make my room like that at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I rarely write home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I hate this place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I hardly ever visit home during term time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am drawn towards people who come from my hometown.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I get really upset when I think about home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am really happy to be here at university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It upsets me if I am unable to phone home each week.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I can’t concentrate on my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel empty inside.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I avoid going home because it would be too upsetting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I wish I had never come to the university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I dream about my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I try to shut off thinking about my home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The people here annoy me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I cannot seem to settle here at the university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I often dream about my family back home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My parents pushed me into coming to university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I feel as if I have left part of me at home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I blame myself for having come to university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I feel restless here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If I go home for the weekend I feel excited at the prospect of coming back to university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

COLLEGE ADJUSTMENT TEST
The College Adjustment Test

This questionnaire taps the degree to which students have experienced a variety of thoughts and feelings about being in college. Please indicate your response of each question by using a 7-point scale, where 1 stands for “not at all”, and 7 stands for “a great deal.” In other words, the larger the number, the greater the degree of that question is to you personally. Circle one number (either 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7) for each question. Thank you.

Within the LAST WEEK, to what degree have you:

1. Missed your friends from high school _____
2. Missed your home _____
3. Missed your parents and other family members _____
4. Worried about how you will perform academically at college _____
5. Worried about love or intimate relationships with others _____
6. Worried about the way you look _____
7. Worried about the impression you make on others _____
8. Worried about being in college in general _____
9. Liked your classes _____
10. Liked your roommate(s) _____
11. Liked being away from your parents _____
12. Liked your social life _____
13. Liked college in general _____
14. Felt angry _____
15. Felt lonely _____
16. Felt anxious or nervous _____
17. Felt depressed _____
18. Felt optimistic about your future at college _____
19. Felt good about yourself _____
APPENDIX I

PERCEIVED STRESS SCALE
Perceived Stress

The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, you will be asked to indicate how often you felt or thought a certain way. Although some of the questions are similar, there are differences between them and you should treat each one as a separate question. The best approach is to answer each question fairly quickly. That is, do not try to count up the number of times you felt a particular way, but rather indicate the alternative that seems like a reasonable estimate.

For each question choose from the following alternatives:

Please read each question carefully and circle the number that best reflects your response. Thank you.

1. In the last month, how often have you been upset because
   0 1 2 3 4
2.                                 0 1 2 3 4
3. dealt successfully with irritating life hassles?  0 1 2 3 4
4.                                 0 1 2 3 4
5. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were effectively coping with important changes that were occurring in your life? 0 1 2 3 4
6. In the last month, how often have you felt confident about your ability to handle your personal problems? 0 1 2 3 4
7. In the last month, how often have you felt that things were going your way? 0 1 2 3 4
8. In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?  
   | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
   | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |

9. In the last month, how often have you been able to control irritations in your life?  
   | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
   | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |

10. In the last month, how often have you felt that you were on top of things?  
    | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
    | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |

11. In the last month, how often have you been angered because of things that were outside of your control?  
    | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
    | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |

12. In the last month, how often have you found yourself thinking about things that you have to accomplish?  
    | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
    | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |

13. In the last month, how often have you been able to control the way you spend your time?  
    | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
    | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |

14. In the last month, how often have you felt difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?  
    | never | almost never | sometimes | fairly often | very often |
    | 0     | 1           | 2         | 3           | 4         |
APPENDIX J

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Statement

The main purpose of the current study was to investigate the relationship between personal characteristics and the adjustment process of international students. Your responses to the questionnaires are anonymous, and at no time was your name requested along with your responses. Please be assured that any information you provided will be held in strict confidence by the researcher, and all data will be reported in group form only. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, or you would like to discuss the results, please feel free to contact Hedich Khajavi at (909) 880-5587. Results of the study will be available in the Fall 2002. It is not anticipated that participants will experience negative emotional or psychological symptoms as a result of completing this questionnaire. However, if you should feel a need to seek counseling service, you may contact the CSUSB Counseling Center at (909) 880-5040. To ensure the integrity of this study, I ask that you do not reveal information about this study to other prospective participants.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Please detach and keep for your records.
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