

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2004

Motives as a factor in acculturation among Asian international students

Kevin Ha Hy

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Multicultural Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hy, Kevin Ha, "Motives as a factor in acculturation among Asian international students" (2004). *Theses Digitization Project*. 2678.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/2678>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

MOTIVES AS A FACTOR IN ACCULTURATION AMONG
ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science
in
Psychology:
Industrial/Organizational


by
Kevin Ha Hy
September 2004

MOTIVES AS A FACTOR IN ACCULTURATION AMONG
ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS


A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino


by
Kevin Ha Hy
September 2004

Approved by:


Mark Agars, Ph.D., Chair, Psychology

6/29/04
Date


Jan Kottke, Ph.D.


David Chavez, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

Although the number of international students in the United States continues to increase annually, especially from Asian countries, little research has investigated the relationships between their motives for study abroad and acculturation levels in the United States. This research examined the relationships between international students' acculturation levels and their motives for study abroad, residency intention in the United States, English proficiency and length of residency in the United States.

A total of 110 Asian international students participated in this study. Results of the study found significant relationships between international students' motives and acculturation levels. Asian international students having Permanent resident motives (economic, political, personal, and permanent residency) were more acculturated than those students indicated Temporary resident motives (obligation to return, prestige and academic). Results also revealed international students who intend to stay in the United States were more acculturated than those who intend to return home when their academics are completed. Implications are discussed including how the understanding of or knowledge of

students' motives can be used in counseling and recruitment of international students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis advisor Dr. Mark Agars for all his guidance, dedication, and most of all patience throughout the process of finalizing this thesis project. A very special thank you to my committee, Dr. Jan Kottke and Dr. David Chavez, for providing me with their expertise and insightful feedback. A special thank you to Dr. Norbert Schmitt who granted me permission to use the Vocabulary Test, and Dr. Richard M. Suinn for allowing me to use the The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA). Thank you to the presidents of the Chinese, Taiwanese, Thailand and Japanese International Students Association in the MBA program for assisting me in recruitment and data collection for this research at CSUSB. I would like to thank all the participants who participated in this study. To my family and friends, I would like thank them for their support and encouragement throughout the whole thesis process. Last, but certainly at least, my I/O classmates: Jamie, Hedieh, Kendall, Lisa, Lindsay, Larry, Veronica, and Vy. Thank you for all the motivations, encouragements and for believing in me. I would not have done it without you guys.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	
Statistics and Trends Related to Studying Abroad	15
Motives for Study Abroad	17
Acculturation	29
Present Study	36
CHAPTER THREE: METHOD	
Participants	40
Measures	42
English Proficiency Scale	42
Vocabulary Exercise	43
Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA)	44
Reasons for Studying Abroad Surveys	46
Stay Reason Variable	49
Procedure	50
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	
Data Screening	52
Descriptives	52
Planned Analyses	55
Sobel Test	62

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	65
Traditional Predictions of Acculturation	72
CHAPTER SIX: LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, FUTURE DIRECTION AND CONCLUSION	
Limitations	75
Implications and Future Direction	76
Conclusion	81
APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT	82
APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	84
APPENDIX C: ENGLISH PROFICIENCY SURVEY	86
APPENDIX D: RANK ORDER: REASONS FOR STUDY ABROAD SURVEY	88
APPENDIX E: SUINN-LEW ASIAN-IDENTITY ACCULTURATION SCALE	90
APPENDIX F: REASON FOR STUDYING ABROAD SURVEY	96
APPENDIX G: VOCABULARY EXERCISE	103
APPENDIX H: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT	108
REFERENCES	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Intercorrelations among Aggregated Motives, Length of Residency, English Proficiency, Primary Motive, Acculturation, and Vocabulary Words	53
Table 2. Regression Results for Stay Reason with Predictor Aggregated Motives after Controlling of Length of Residency and English Proficiency	57
Table 3. Regression Results for Acculturation with Predictor Stay Reason after Controlling for Length of Residency and English Proficiency	58
Table 4. Regression Results for Acculturation with Predictor Aggregated Motives; after Controlling for Length of Residency and English Proficiency	60
Table 5. Regression Results for Acculturation with Predictor Aggregated Motives after Controlling Stay Reason (Mediator), Length of Residency and English Proficiency	61
Table 6. Sobel Test: Unstandardized Betas and Standard Errors Associated with Condition 1 and Condition 2	64

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Despite annual increases in the international student populations in universities and colleges in the United States (Wilson, 1990), not much has been done to investigate and understand these individuals. Currently, counseling and academic advising are still considered to be an on going struggle between international students and counselors and/or academic advisors. One cause of these conflicts may be miscommunication and misunderstanding of differences in cultures and values, and a lack of consideration of international students' acculturation and their reasons for pursuing academics in a host society. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between international students' motive(s) for study abroad and their level of acculturation in the United States.

Previous findings from studies on acculturation of foreign students and immigrants have generally taken the viewpoint that an individual will automatically change his or her cultures and values to fit into a new environment (Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000; Sodowsky & Plake, 1992). However, the notion that acculturation into the host society may differ as a function of student motives has

not been examined. The lack of grounded theory on how best to deal with the acculturation process of international students continue to cause counseling issues for these individuals, such as dealing with support for stress and coping conflicts (Pederson, 1991). For example, on college campuses, academic advisers are having difficulties dealing with the academic needs of these international students, such as academic overload, adjustment issues, and cultural sensitivity (Charles & Stewart, 1991). Therefore, the purpose of this study, on the international students' motives for studying abroad and their level of acculturation in the host country, is to shed light on these issues.

The number of international students attending universities and colleges started to expand after World War II when the world's academic and scientific center shifted to the United States (Ritterband, 1970). This boom in the foreign student population led researchers to examine the attitudes of these individuals from foreign lands and the natives in the host country on such topics as how to produce favorable attitudes to develop good relationships with international students (Kelman, 1962), foreign students' attitudes toward the United States (Selltitz, Christ, Havel, & Cook, 1963), natives'

influences on attitudes of foreign students (Selltitz et al., 1963) and many others. These studies were interested in changes in the international students' attitudes and the natives' influences on these individuals as they learned the norms of the host country. Of all the research done on attitudes of foreign students, evidence seems to suggest communication may have the best influence on attitudes (Kelman, 1962).

Later research examined the adaptation/adjustment of international students to their new environment and life (Selltitz et al., 1963; Ying & Liese, 1994). These studies examined student's stress (Sandhu & Asrabadi, 1994), needs and perceptions (Manese, Sadlacek, & Leong, 1988), and the ability to cope with social difficulties in their new environment (Chen, 1993). In many of the literature reviews focusing on international students, language difficulties (Hayes & Lin, 1994; Charles & Stewart, 1991), inadequate financial resources, social adjustment, daily living and loneliness or homesickness (Manese et al, 1988; Pedersen, 1991; Shih & Brown, 2000) were noted as common problems for adjustment. In 1994, Sandhu and Asrabadi developed a Likert format scale to measure the acculturative stress level of international students. The results showed that language difficulties and cultural

barriers were major contributors for international students' stress. However, although these studies have produced interesting findings in adjustment/adaptation of these individuals, the results were based on only a single outcome. Specifically, the adjustment/adaptation of the individuals is based only on their language proficiency in their new environment. The results did not consider other outcomes in the process of adjustment/adaptation.

More recently, with the increasing need for multi-dimensional and multi-faceted research, the concept of acculturation has been applied to understand strategies for adaptation/adjustment of international students further. Adaptation/adjustment only takes into the account the alteration of ones' behaviors to fit into new environments. On the other hand, acculturation not only takes into account the alterations of behaviors, but also the preferences of food, cultures, friends and languages of the individuals. Acculturation, in a broad sense, defined by Gibson (2001), is, "the process of culture change and adaptation that occurs when individuals with different cultures come into contact" (p. 19). Researchers are interested in finding how an individual's acculturation in the host society influence changes in his or her own cultures and values with the increased

interactions in the host society as a whole. Research has shown, in both immigrant and international student samples, that those who can acculturate into their new environment have fewer psychological problems, such as stress (Dona & Berry, 1994; Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, (1987), perform better academically in school (Manaster, Chan, & Safady, 1992), have more American friends, higher self-confidence, and are more involved in host (American) cultures (Ying & Liese, 1994; Pak, Dion, & Dion, 1985; Kagan & Cohen, 1990). Therefore, the level of acculturation of an individual in a host country can have significant impact on his or her well-being and performance.

Language abilities and length of residency in the host society have been consistently found to be two of the contributing factors in individuals' levels of acculturation in their new environments. In general, studies have found that those individuals who are capable of communicating effectively in writing or in oral expression were better acculturated (Kagan & Cohen, 1990). Zweig and Changgui (1995) found that Chinese international students who rated themselves as less fluent in English were more likely to return home after they were done with their studies. Kagan and Cohen (1990) offered that the

lack of proficiency in English may have prevented these students from interacting with other native students in preference for more interaction with their own Chinese nationalities. The success of language acquisition from the host society can have great implications in how individuals acculturate in a host society. Young and Gardner (1990) did a study using both Hong Kong Chinese community and Chinese international students in Ontario, Canada, examining how the acquisition of a second language in the host society impacted acculturation. This study found that those individuals who were proficient in English perceived themselves as Canadian and exhibited lower anxiety in language usage in the host society. In contrast, those who were less proficient in English were more anxious about using the English language and were less likely to consider themselves as Canadian. Further, participants with less proficiency in English were more likely to be involved in the Chinese community than in Canadian activities.

Studies have also found length of residency in the host society significantly increases acculturation (Guan & Dodder, 2001; Ward & Kennedy, 1993; Zhang & Rentz, 1996). In general, studies on acculturation have showed length of residency improves social skill over time; the longer the

individuals had been in the host society, the more comfortable the individuals will be able to deal with the new cultures and their environment. Guan and Dodder (2001) found that Chinese international students who had been in the United States more than two years viewed maintaining ones' traditional cultural values as less important than those who had been in the United States for less than two years. That is, the length of stay in the host country may have shifted the values of these individuals into more Westernized values than their traditional Chinese values. Further, those who adapted the new cultural values functioned better in the host society. Also, in a previous study conducted by Zhang and Rentz (1996), it was found that those individuals who had been in the United States for more than two years scored higher on the knowledge of American culture than those individual who had been in the United States for less than two years. The above studies may have indicated that these individuals, through the passage of time, have adjusted well in the host society, and have accepted the cultures and values of the host society.

In all, research findings have shown that the adaptation of new cultures can be very beneficial to an individual's well being, such as reduction in stress,

higher self-confidence, especially with English proficiency and length of residency as contributing factors, as mentioned above. However, these studies are lacking in that they do not help explain why these individuals may or may not want to acculturate in the first place. Previous studies on acculturation focused mainly on the relationships between changed behaviors, identity, values and attitudes to help cope with new environment. Acculturation is a critical consideration when making various types of decisions that affect those who are not of strictly Anglo descent. For many international students and immigrants that are in the host country, there are only a few who arrived from developed countries (Western Europe and North America, for example). A great percentage of these individuals are from non-Westernized countries, where their values and cultures maybe different from Westernized nations. Conflicts and miscommunications can occur if one assumes that anyone who arrived from the outside will adhere to the Western values and cultures because they are in a Westernized nation. The correct assessment of acculturation level can help avoid misunderstanding and miscommunication. Issues of cultural sensitivity must be taken into consideration, especially to those individuals that are new in this country. For

example, in counseling, issues such as attitude toward counselors, willingness to seek and use counseling services, expectations about counseling, and expected client behaviors could be impacted by acculturation level (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999; Kwan, 2000; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000; Suinn, Khoo, & Ahuna, 1995; Suinn, Rickard-Figueroa, Lew, & Vigil, 1987).

Many studies have addressed the issue of acculturation, and the diverse ethnic minority groups in these studies have been comprised of participants from Hispanic, European, Middle Eastern and Asian cultures (Kim et al., 1999). However, none of these studies have considered the motive(s) that encourage these changes in these individuals. Changes must be accompanied by some strong motive(s); otherwise things will stay the same. Even though the change of an individual's cultures and values as a result of their new environment is a strong argument for acculturation, this argument has some flaws. For example, Gibson (1997) has noted that refugees settling in a host country were less likely to adapt to their new environment and then would more likely to discourage their children from doing so. Gibson offered that the reason for their non-adaptation of the cultures and values of the host society, even though they were in a

new environment, was because they had the anticipation of going back to their homeland in a specific period of time. She then argued that there should not have been any reason why these refugees would discard their cultures and values simply because they are in a new environment. As Gibson stated, they were, "less driven by economics and job aspirations" (p. 433). Further, in a case study of a group of Punjabi Indians children, both from India and U.S. born, Gibson (1998) found that these Indians, attending public schools, were less influenced by the mainstream cultures and values of their communities and society, in general. They were able to keep their Indian values and cultures, while simultaneously using selective techniques to acquire new cultures and language in their environment. These individuals did not forego or discard any of their values or cultures in replacement of the new ones; rather they have used "additive acculturation", which is the addition of the individual's "cultural repertoire" rather than the rejection one's only cultures and values.

Since being in a new environment does not necessarily indicate that the individuals will automatically adapt to the host society's cultures and values; there must be some other motive(s) for these foreigners to change their own cultures and values, and to adapt cultures and values of

the host society. Gibson (2001) indicated that immigrants' acculturation in a host society may be based on a conscious decision to achieve economic goals. That is, these individuals are conscious of the changes they are making to their cultures, beliefs and attitudes as well as the adoption of new cultures. These changes of values and beliefs of the host society occurred in order to fit in quickly to gain benefits from the host society, such as jobs, for example. Likewise, those individuals might have the same aspirations to change their values and cultures due to their anticipation of freedom living in a democratic society when they left their home country. Thus, individuals arriving in a host society may already have pre-determined their willingness to change toward the cultures and values of the host society before coming into the society. This pre-determined goal to adapt in their new environment allows these individuals to accept the cultures and values of the host society, thus aiding them in making the transition into the host society more quickly. Also, the pre-determined goal may have given them a purpose to stay and to be involved in their new environment.

The same ideas can be applied to those international students studying abroad in the United States and other

Westernized countries. Some might be here for academic purpose, others might be here to gain economic resources, and others might study abroad due to political reason from home country. International students are likely to have some pre-determined motive(s) when study abroad. Adir (1995) found this to be true when he did a study with Israelis students. He found significant differences on the reasons that influence those decided to return to Israel and those decided to stay in the United States after the completion of their academics. Some of the reasons that influenced return to Israel were (a) the desire for the their children to be educated in Israel, (b) satisfying social life in Israel, and (c) more fulfilling family life in Israel. Some reasons that influenced non-return to Israel were (a) employment opportunities in the United States, (b) good job conditions in the U.S., and (c) better career advancement. Adir also found, using the NEO Five-Factor Inventory, those who decided to stay and clearly stated their reason(s) to stay, such as career and financial opportunities, scored higher in the "conscientious" factor than those decided to return to Israel. He then stated that, "this suggests that at least a portion of the settlers had made the decision to remain in the United States before or soon after arrival; or they

were more receptive to the idea of staying than were the returnees" (p. 736). Similar results were found by Glaser (1978) and Zweig and Changgui (1995); who found that foreign students who came to study abroad for economic and political motives tended not to return home after graduation. This was in contrast to those who came to the U.S. because of the prestige of a foreign degree. In the study done by Zweig and Changgui (1995), using international students from Peoples Republic of China, they found the number one and two motives for staying abroad were political freedom (38.6%) and job choices or opportunities (19.5%), respectively. They also found that a motive that a person might return to Peoples Republic of China after they are done with their education or job was to gain higher social status (26.0%). Glaser's (1978) earlier research had confirmed the motives for studying abroad. He also found similar results in his study using different international student populations from different countries. Good working conditions, such as higher potential in income and living standards, quality of job availability and political conditions were some of the motives for international students to study abroad or planned to stay after the completion of their education in the host country. In contrast, those studying abroad for

academic reasons were more likely to return home. Prestige of foreign training and value of foreign degree were some of the motives of international students who returned home after their studies abroad. These findings have strong linkages to the motives why international students might want to come abroad into host society and the quick adaptations in the host society. The motive(s) for studying abroad in the host society may be predictive of the level of acculturation of the individuals in the host society. However, no study has examined these relationships. Thus, this study will examine the relationships between students' motives for studying abroad and level of acculturation.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Statistics and Trends Related to Studying Abroad

The United States has become the center for international studies since the end of Second World War. In the mid 1950s, the international exchange program had roughly 34,233 international students from abroad (Boyan, Julian, & Rew, 1981). The population reached a total of 154,580 in 1975, nearly an eighty percent increased in student enrollment during the twenty year period (1955 to 1975). The number continued to rise through the 1980s. In 1984, 338,894 attended American higher institutions (Marks, 1987) as foreigners. In the 1990s the momentum started to slow down a bit but the number of international students still continued to increase per year. The recent population in 1999 yielded a total of 490,933 students and the year 2000 accounted for 514,723 students (Open Doors, 2001), a percentage change of 4.8%. Currently, Open Doors reported the international students population of 547,867 (2001), an increase of 6.4% from previous year.

This report clearly showed which part of the world has sent the most students to the United States for education. The report, issued by Open Doors (2001), showed

the top five countries that sent students abroad for studies all came from Asia. India, Japan, Republic of Korea, Taiwan and with China leading the way. The four countries from Asia that ranked outside of the top five but ranked in the top fifteen were Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and Hong Kong. In this case, Hong Kong is still considered to be a separate from China, although Hong Kong has legally belonged to China since 1997. Of the total number of international students in the United States in 2001, more than half (54%) came from Asia. This increase in the Asia student population began when China and the United States signed two critical treaties in the late 1970s and early 1980s, which allowed vast numbers of Chinese students to study abroad (Zweig & Changui, 1995).

Prior to the treaties, around the beginning of 1980, the distribution and countries of origin were fairly equal, but OPEC countries were a little more represented, especially countries from the Middle East, such as Iran, Saudi Arabia and Jordan (Boyan et al., 1981, see Table 2.6). The Asian territories were mainly represented by Taiwan, Hong Kong, India, Japan and Thailand; however, the number of students from Asia was not strong enough to be the dominant sender of students. The current trend of Asia countries providing the most students to study abroad will

continue in the future, because of the economic boom in the Asian markets during the late 1980s and early 1990s, and China's determination to gain recognition in the world markets.

As the international student population continues to increase, special attention must be given these individuals coming from foreign lands. Stress, depression, frustration, fear and pessimism were often generated when international students first arrived on American campuses (Hayes & Lin, 1994). In a review of all research done on international students, Altbach, Kelly, and Lulat (1985) found that university advisers and counselors were not equipped to deal with international students' issues. The basic assumptions of the American counseling or advising practices did not necessarily consider international students. International students will definitely face culture issues and adjustment as they learn how to adapt to their new environment. However, knowing their motive(s) for study abroad might be the first step in helping these students adjust to their new environment.

Motives for Study Abroad

The initial purpose of the "foreign exchange study program" was as a means for countries to have a better

understanding of each other and to build relations. As Kelman (1962) noted, "the exchange of personnel has long been considered a technique for creating goodwill and attitudes across national boundaries" (p 73). Students were specially selected by their governments to represent their countries as "unofficial ambassadors" (Marshall, 1970), to acquire specific knowledge (intellectual and professional development), to gain general education (such as learning the values and to appreciate the culture of another society), and furthering international understanding, which included peacemaking and building relationships among nations (Coelho, 1962). The intention of the program was to build relationships among countries and give these students a chance to see what was outside their own countries. However, after the Second World War, the objective of the study abroad program was shifted toward the government's self-interest rather than in the interest of the students. Many non-Westernized countries, especially undeveloped countries, were seeking new sources of scientific and technological growth in their own countries, and saw the West as the ideal place for the transfer of these resources. The main focus for foreign exchange was to shift and transfer scientific and technological knowledge back to the homeland. The hope of

these governments in sending students to study abroad was for them to come back to their homelands and aid in the development of their own countries into more advanced and productive societies.

For many, the opportunity to study abroad was a liberating experience and, initially, students were returning with scientific skills and technologies. Visiting students were given the chance to exit their homelands and to relocate themselves into another culture and environment that was different from their own. Unfortunately for the home countries, the students started to have their own motives for studying abroad. Many students decided to stay in the host country rather than return home after graduation (Appleton, 1970). These students saw studying abroad as a mechanism to improve their own living standards and conditions from their home countries—they were looking out for their own self-interest rather than in the interest of the government. The obligations of spreading the acquired knowledge from the West back to the home country for social development and advancement, as the intent of the sending countries, became less important to these individuals. These students had adjusted to the political and economic system of the West—the opportunities in the

host country have greatly out-weighed those at home. The decision to stay in the host country by these students can create great drawbacks to the sending countries, especially developing countries. For one thing, talented human capital is lost to the host country, and at times, it can even cripple the advancement of the developing countries, because new talents are needed to replace those lost. These developing countries were sending their best and brightest pupils to seek scientific, technological advancement and special fields of studies from the West in an attempt to improve their own conditions at home. Many of the developing countries saw science and technology as their key for advancement in the new global economy, but talented individuals were lost instead to the western society. The loss of these talents created setbacks rather than advancement for the home countries.

Because the objectives of the government, which are social advancement and development, differ from those factors that influence foreign students to study abroad, a conflict has developed between the government and the individuals' motive(s) to study abroad and stay abroad. Glaser (1978) noted that there is not only one primary motive why international students choose to study abroad; often times, there are many motives to study abroad. The

motives for international students to study abroad vary depending on the individual and on the conditions in his or her own country. Motives can vary depending on their own unique situations and circumstances within their own countries. Some of the motives for study abroad maybe include a chance to gain higher education, which is valued as prestige of foreign degree, obligation to seek and transference of knowledge to homeland, economic, political, personal freedom and become permanent resident in the host country.

The motive for a chance of gaining a higher level of education is considered by international students to study abroad as an asset that has increasing value over time. Many international students from non-Westernized (undeveloped/developing) countries do come to the United States for education and they are able to see that American universities have the most extensive and diverse educational system in the world (Charles & Stewart, 1991), a system which their home countries can not provide. It is the higher quality of education which they are seeking in studying abroad. Further, the field of study or major might not be available within the home country. Studying abroad assures a student of the best instruction and facilities available (Agarwal & Winkler, 1985). Most

American universities are equipped with modern techniques and methodologies in research and application in all fields of studies. Studying abroad can satisfy the needs of the individuals who want a higher level of education. Similarly, due to lack of resources and facilities in the home country, not all of those who apply to tertiary or graduate education may be accepted by the universities at home (Altbach et al., 1985). This factor also pushes students out to foreign countries for higher education.

Studying abroad does have its own reward besides getting a higher education. The motive of prestige of a foreign degree is considered when planning to study abroad. Having a higher education or degree from abroad can help improve job opportunities upon returning home and also can increase prestige and recognition (Glaser, 1978; Altbach et al., 1985). For these students, foreign education is viewed as an investment; a high rate of return is expected. The anticipation of recognition by fellow countrymen, better work or improved standard of living at home also motivate these international students to study abroad. Also, students study abroad with the motive of seeking to aid their governments to grow economically and socially are needed to be considered. These students are here to improve their skills and

knowledge of modern technologies and sciences in preparation for transference back to their home countries. They may have felt that they are obligated to return home with skills and techniques to help their own country grow, both economically and technologically, and to improve the social conditions.

The motive to achieve economic gains from the host country and avoidance of returning home should be considered when student study abroad. According to Altbach et al. (1985), studying abroad can be way of "seeking to achieve upward mobility via higher education abroad, there is already a built-in-self-selection bias among them toward a tendency to consider not returning home as a serious option" (p. 33-34). It is due to the limited career prospect, limited professional environment, and poor living conditions in their home countries which push these students abroad. Studying abroad in gaining a higher level of education can increase the individuals' standard of living conditions in the host country. Better standard of living conditions include higher wages and salaries and/or greater job opportunities—which can lead to the improvement of their own economic conditions.

Political motive needs to be considered when international students study abroad. Political turmoil in

a home country can be a contributing factor in international students studying abroad (Agarwal & Winkler, 1985). Dissatisfaction of the home government's political system can push individuals to study abroad. Zweig and Changgui (1995) cited the rules and constraints of the Chinese Republic of People's government as a factor for Chinese students to study abroad and not return home after completion of studies. The lack of political stability in the home country (especially undeveloped countries) forces students to seek more stabilized forms of government (Western countries, like Western Europe and North America) in which to settle. Studying abroad allows international students to make comparisons of governmental regulations and styles of government with his or her home country. More often, these students are seeking political freedom, freedom that they never encountered before arriving in the host country. Glaser (1978) noted strong dictatorial form of government formed a strong obstacle to return and as a motive to study abroad.

The pursuit of personal freedom may also be a motive in studying abroad. This is the time when the student learns to be independent and make choices for oneself. The period of studying abroad is considered a rite of passage into the real world where the individual will experience

new culture and values - where the individual has the chance to see what is outside of his or her own country. The world can be totally different from what he or she experienced in his or her home country. Self-reliance is needed because the individual will be far apart from family members and to get away from family pressure. Personal freedom from government rules and family pressure can influence a choice of permanent residence in the host country due to loose restrictions on personal expressions and comfort of living conditions.

As the motives for economic gains, political restraints and personal freedom influence international students to study abroad, the prospect of permanent residence in the host country further re-emphasizes these motives. The improved standard of living and political freedom can attract students to stay in the host country permanently. International students find it easier to immigrate into the host country by studying abroad (Agarwal & Winkler, 1985). It can be a step for the international students to take in preparation for migration in the host country in the future. It is a condition known as "brain drain," where the students decide to stay in the host country to seek permanent job opportunities and settlement. China is currently facing

such dilemma as well as other Asian countries (Carrington & Detragiache, 1999).

Overall, the motive(s) for international students to study abroad are varied, and can be indicative of their commitments to return home or stay in the host country after the completion of their academics. Those who come for academic reasons, such as prestige of foreign degree or seeking knowledge transference back to their homelands, may not be involved in the social aspects of living in the host country and more than likely to return home when done with their academics. A study done by Bailyn and Kelman (1962) found that Scandinavian scholars who came to the United States strictly for research purposes tended to have few preconceptions of American life. That is, due to their strong research agendas in the States, they were less aware of the other aspects of life in the country and less likely to change their preconceptions about the host country. In contrast, those who came for economic, political, personal freedom or permanent resident motives may already perceive the host country as a place of their future settlement and would likely be more aware of the different aspects of the culture and values of the country.

Further, international students who have the motives to go abroad may already have some preconceptions about the host society and have greater experiences later, after their arrival in the host society. In a study done by Selltiz and Cook (1962), they noted that foreign students from other countries held a positive point of view about American society prior to their arrival. For example, foreign students have the preconception that, "Americans are widely believed to be friendly and informal, practical, efficient, materialistic, ambitious, optimistic, egalitarian, and lacking in individuality" (p. 8). Many foreign students view these traits as desirable rather than undesirable. However, many also view Americans as shallow, and having less strong family obligations. Later in their settlement, foreign students agreed that the standard of living in the United States and the level of democracy are very high; that is, there are no restrictions on freedom of speech and expression in comparison to their home countries. In addition, as mentioned above, foreign students like the individual differences or individuality of American society. They like the standard of living and the friendliness of American society. As they see the more democratic the society is the more they would approve of the country

(Selltitz & Cook, 1962). Many of the preconceptions and later experiences of the American society still exist from the international students. In interviewing Chinese international students, Guan and Dodder (2001) found these students still perceived American society as materialistic, lacking traditions and values, courteous or friendly and very individualistic. These views of American society have not changed much since the 1950s and 1960s.

The preconceptions that international students have about a country can greatly influence the motives for study abroad. Those who choose to study abroad as a chance for permanent residency may have already determined the needs that their own countries cannot provide for them such as freedom and individuality. Similarly, those studying abroad due to economic, political and personal motives may also already have the preconceptions of opportunities for development, freedom and individual identity, respectively, pre and post-arrival in the host country. The motives for international students who decide to study abroad can be indicative of their intention to return to their home countries or not. Therefore, these pre-determined motive(s) for studying abroad may be indicative of or influence acculturation in the host society.

Acculturation

International students studying abroad, in many ways, are like immigrants arriving in a new country. Like any other individuals who come in contact with another environment, they will learn to adapt and integrate into their new environment. This is known as acculturation. The study of acculturation on international students has been limited to a few studies in recent years, such as acculturation on influence of media (Reece & Palmgreen, 2000) and vocational identity (Shih & Brown, 2000). However, studies of acculturation in other areas, such as immigrants, have been well researched. The topic of acculturation on immigrants includes stress (Dona & Berry, 1994; Mena, Padilla, & Maldonado, 1987); attitudes (Van Oudenhoven, Prins, & Buunk, 1998); self-esteem (Pham & Harris, 2001; Herz & Gullone, 1999); and values (Georgas & Kalantzi-Azizi, 1992; Kimhi & Bliwise, 1992; Georgas, Berry, Shaw, Christoakopoulou, & Mylonas, 1996). For example, Dona and Berry (1994), found in a group of Central America refugees that those individuals who had integrated in Canadian society had fewer psychological and somatic stress compared to those who chose to separate themselves from the main society. Georgas et al., (1996) further found that values are subject to change with

acculturative experience. As a new generation starts to live in the host society, new values and cultures will be developed from a mixture of host society's values and old values. Thus, these findings and others on acculturation of immigrants will be used to help explain the process of international students adapting and adjusting to their new environment.

In the past, acculturation has been thought of as a unidimensional process (Berry & Annis, 1974; Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez, 1980). This process assumed as individuals adopt the customs and values of their new environment, they would eventually discard their old cultures and values (Pham & Harris, 2001). In contrast, recent studies have indicated that acculturation can be a multi-dimensional process (Pham & Harris, 2001; Tsai et al., 2000), in which the individuals do not have to discard their own unique cultures and values to replace the new one, but rather, the old cultures and values are added into the new one to create a different or better cultures or values. For example, a study conducted by Georgas et al. (1992) found that second generation immigrants would most likely show the multi-dimensional process primary due to both family and societal influences in their lives. However, as Tsai et al. (2000) pointed

out, new immigrants would be more likely to use a unidimensional approach in their acculturation process instead of multi-dimensional process because of their eagerness to adapt to their new environment as quickly as possible.

Strategies for adaptation can vary dependent on the individual (Van Oudenhoven al., 1998). The choice for acculturation is dependent on the individuals' intended commitment in their new environment. According to Berry (1990), there are two primary questions that must be answered to find out an individual's level of acculturation (p. 245): One, "Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics?" And two, "Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with other groups?" Acculturation strategies are chosen based on the answers to these two questions. Berry's model of acculturation (Zheng & Berry, 1991; Berry, 1990), describes four strategies for adaptation: integration, assimilation, separation and, marginalization (Van Oudenhoven et al., 1998; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999; Jasinskaja-Lahti & Liebkind, 2000). According to Van Oudenhoven and Eisses (1998), these strategies are defined as follow:

- (1) *Integration strategy* is chosen when the individuals want to maintain their own ethnic identity, such as cultures, values, and identity, but also consider the new cultures, values and identity of their environment.
- (2) *Assimilation strategy* is chosen when the individuals choose to foregone their ethnic identity and consider the cultures, values, and identity of their new environment as more important.
- (3) *Separation strategy* is chosen when the individuals choose their own ethnic identity more important over the cultures, values and identity of their new environment.
- (4) *Marginalization strategy* is chosen when the individuals do not consider their own ethnic identity or the identity of their new environment as important. The individuals are in a limbo between two cultures.

If the individual answers "yes" to both questions, the individual has chosen the integration strategy. If the individual answers "no" to question one and "yes" to two, the individual has chosen the assimilation strategy. Further, if the individual answers "yes" to question one

and "no" to question two, the individual has chosen the separation strategy. Lastly, if the individual answers "no" to question one and "no" to question two, the individual has chosen the marginalization strategy.

Not all strategies for adaptation are agreed upon by researchers, however; and not all scales measuring acculturation are alike and may not be used to measure different populations. Suinn et al. (1995), using Asian and Asian American student participants, classified acculturation level into a simpler model. They only included three modes of acculturation, which are similar to Berry's model, but with the exclusion of the marginal strategy—the rejections of both cultures. In 1980, Cuellar, Harris and Jasso created the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican-American that only measures Mexican participants in cultural adaptation; and Suinn et al. (1995) have adapted and modified the scale to fit Asian populations. Suinn et al. (1995) have described three possible outcomes (strategies) of acculturation, instead of four (Berry's model), when individuals come into contact with another culture: (a) assimilation (the process of adopting the host's culture and giving up their own culture); (b) resistance to assimilation or as Berry described it as separation (where the individuals retain

their own ethnic identity and resist to the new culture); or (c) biculturalism, it is the same concept as integration in Berry's model (the adoption of both new and old cultures by the individuals).

In the current study, Asian international students who have been in the United States for a short period of time are the target population. Consequently, the process of adopting the host culture and giving up one's own would be hard to accomplish for this group. In general, research has shown that assimilation can only occur if individuals have been in the host country for a long period of time, such as immigrants' off spring and future generations. Therefore, the measure of the participants' level of acculturation in this study will be based on a continuous scale instead of categorical. Participants' level of acculturation will be measured as more acculturated or less acculturated based on their total score from the acculturation scale.

Many consider biculturalism as the best strategy for acculturation (Suinn et al., 1995; Shih & Brown, 2000). Studies have consistently found that individuals who are more acculturated adjusted better to their new environment in comparison to those who were less acculturated, such as studies done by Szapocznik et al. (1980) and Manaster et

al. (1992). Szapocznik et al. (1980) found that less acculturated Hispanic-American youths have poor communication skills and fewer interactions with American cultures, more likely to be depressed, have neurotic behavior patterns, withdrawn outside activities and may be suicidal. Moreover, a study by Manaster et al. (1992) on Mexican-American immigrant students found that those who are more integrated (bicultural) in their new cultures had higher academic achievement than those who adapted unsuccessfully. Further, the study also found that those students who adapted successfully, their families had higher social economic status and were more likely to live in urban areas in comparison to those adapt unsuccessfully.

Although studies have found bicultural individuals to be better adjusted than non-acculturated, there are important factors that might impact acculturation process. Language proficiency and length of time in the host country can impact acculturation. These factors have already been mentioned above.

Acculturation can be a crucial factor in the adaptation of new environment. It is the change of culture and values that allow these individuals to fit in with others in the host society. However, in order to promote

change in an individual, pre-determined motives must exist to force these changes. It is the intent of this study to find out how pre-determined motives create adaptation and non-adaptation in the United States.

Present Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between international students' motives to study abroad and their level of acculturation. Often times, international students are thought to study abroad for academic motive only; however, studies have found there are other motives besides just acquiring knowledge from a foreign country (Glaser, 1978; Zweig & Changgui, 1995). Motives to study abroad can be political, economical, or personal, dependent on the person and the situations in their home country. For some students, the motives for study abroad may already dictate their behaviors or judgment in the host country. Chang (1973) argued that individuals from another foreign country (especially from developing country to developed country) might already have an idealistic picture of the host country [United States] before even setting foot in the host country. As Van Oudenhoven and Eisses (1998) pointed out, the type of strategies individuals selected for

acculturation is also dependent on "society and the kind of policy promoted by society" (p. 294) and how individuals define themselves. Thus, the strategies for acculturation can be based on individuals' motives or factors for studying abroad (Kagitchibasi, 1978). As Kagitchibasi noted, "the sojourner's prior motives and expectations affect what he finds in the foreign country and sometimes result in a self-fulfilling prophecy through the process of selective perception" (p. 143). Therefore, international students came with different motives might adapt or acculturate differently, dependent on their motive(s) for studying abroad. Individual motive(s) for studying abroad can influence an individual's level of acculturation in the host society.

Based on the review above, motives for study abroad can be categorized in one of two groups: Permanent resident motives versus Temporary resident motives. As indicated earlier, international students have the tendency to stay in the host country if their studying abroad has to do with political, economical, personal or wanting to reside in host country, these individuals are categorized as having *Permanent resident motives*. The thought of potential benefits that can be gained in the host society may lead international students to stay in

the host society, which as indication of their commitment to adapt in the host society. In contrast, international students studying abroad for academic reasons, prestige of degree or seeking transference of science and technology back to home country are categorized as having *Temporary resident motives*, because they may be more likely to return home after their studies; therefore, these individuals would be less likely to adapt the values and cultures of the host society.

However, there is strong research evidence that length of residence in the host country (Shih & Brown, 2000) and proficient of English (Hayes & Lin, 1994; Charles & Stewart (1991); Ying & Liese, (1994) have great influence on individual's level of acculturation. That is, those students with longer length of residency and better English proficiency are more acculturated into the host society than in comparison to those with less proficiency in English and only been in the host country for a short period of time. Therefore, to be consistent with previous research, length of residence and English proficiency will also be examined. Thus, the following hypotheses will be proposed:

Hypothesis 1: International students with longer length of residency in the host society will be more

acculturated than those international students with shorter length of residency.

Hypothesis 2: International students who indicate their English to be proficient will be more acculturated than those international students who indicate their English as less proficient.

International students who have Permanent resident motives may have greater intention to stay in the United States than those with Temporary resident motives; therefore the following will be hypothesized:

Hypothesis 3: International students who have Permanent resident motives will be more acculturated in comparison to students with Temporary resident motives, after controlling for length of residency and English proficiency.

The motives for international students to study abroad may suggest stay intention in the United States, which in turn may effects acculturation level. Therefore, the followed will be hypothesized:

Hypothesis 4: Residency intention in the United States will mediate the relationship between student's motives and acculturation.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants

A total of 110 university students participated in this study. All were Asian international students enrolled in one of two midsize universities in the southwestern United States at the time of participation. The sample consisted of 55 females (50%) and 55 males (50%). Participants' age ranged from 18 to 37 ($M = 25.73$, $SD = 4.20$). Seventy-one (65%) were graduate students from a MBA program, 15 (14%) were seniors, 12 (11%) were juniors and the other 12 (11%) consisted of sophomores and freshmen. GPA was ranged from a low of 2.00 to 4.00 ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .41$) and the average units completed was 63.50 ($SD = 52.74$) based on quarter system, with a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 190 units.

The amount of time participants had been living in the United States ranged from 2 months to 8.16 years ($M = 2.79$ yrs, $SD = 1.74$ yrs). The breakdown indicated the following: under two years ($n = 33$, 32%), 2-4 years ($n = 48$, 46%), 4-6 years ($n = 14$, 13%), and six years or more ($n = 9$, 9%). During their stay in the United States, 74.5% ($n = 82$) attended language programs while 25.5%

(n = 28) have not. However, in regard to prior visits to the United States, only 29.1% of the participants (n = 32) had visited the States, while 70.9% (n = 78) had never been in the States.

From the breakdown of ethnicity by countries, 35 (31.8%) were from Taiwan, 29 (26.4%) were from Thailand, 16 (14.5%) were from Japan, 14 (12.7%) were from Mainland China, 8 (7.3%) were from Korea, 4 (3.6%) were from China (Hong Kong), 1 was from India, 1 was from Indonesia, while two participants did not report their national origin.

The average TOEFL score for the sample was 550 (SD = 42.23) with a range of 400 to 750. The low average for TOEFL scores is reflected in the high percentage of students attending language programs (74.5%). International students with TOEFL scores below 500 (TOEFL score of 500 are required for admission in one of the studied university) may have elected to enroll in language programs in to increase their language proficiencies, at which time, after the successful completion of the programs, they re-apply to be admitted into the university. This may also indicate, since many of the students attended language programs, that the TOEFL scores are outdated and do not reflect their current language abilities. Also, with recent conversion of the

paper-pencil to computer based testing, interpretation of scores and score conversion may have been compromised. Further, since data were collected in two different universities, the criteria for admission into each of the universities may be different and may not be able to give reliable TOEFL scores—for example, one of the campuses used for data collection was a California State school campus, while the other was a University of California campus. For reasons stated above, it was decided that the TOEFL variable was to be eliminated from data analyses.

Measures

English Proficiency Scale

Scale was developed by Pak et al. (1985) and they obtained a reliability of .93 in their study. Same scale was incorporated by Ying and Liese (1994) in one of their studies, and reliability of .77 (n = 172) was found. Participants were asked to self-rate their level of English proficiency in terms of "understanding," "speaking," "reading," and, "writing." A total of four statements had been developed and the answers can range from 1 = very poor to 5 = excellent in terms of English proficiency. All four statements were combined (maximum score of 20) and the mean score was taken for data

analyses. A reliability of .86 was obtained for the scale in this study.

Vocabulary Exercise

The vocabulary level exercise (Version Two) was taken directly from Schmitt, Schmitt and Clapham (2001). The intention of the exercise was to get an approximation of the vocabulary size of the Asian international student participants. The reason for the usage of this measure was because, as Schmitt et al. (2001) stated, "the rationale for the test [exercise] stems from research which has shown that vocabulary size is directly related to the ability to use English in various ways" (p. 55). An individual's vocabulary size can determine his/her appropriate English level. For instance, students with vocabulary size of the most frequent 2,000 words in the English language can engage in basic oral communications, while those students who command a vocabulary size of the most frequent 3,000 words in the English language can engage in reading beginning texts. Therefore, the more words that an individual can command in the English language, the more he/she can become proficient. Schmitt et al. (2001) has divided the vocabulary test into five levels: 2000, 3000, 5000, 10000 and academic; and each of

the level was scored separately. However, for the current study, all levels will be summed to obtain a total score.

A total of one hundred and twenty vocabularies were extracted based on four levels of word difficulties with the exclusion of the 10,000 words level. Each level consisted of thirty vocabulary words. The first set of thirty vocabularies were of the 2000 most frequent English words (2000 level); second set of thirty vocabularies were of the 3000 level; third set of vocabularies were of the academic level; and lastly, the fourth set were of the 5000 word level. Reliability for each of the vocabulary levels found to be high. Schmitt et al. (2001) reported Cronbach's alpha for each of levels as followed: .92, .93, .96, and .93, respectively. Reliability for the current study was not assessed, because the revised scoring method is cumulative.

Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA)

The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale (SL-ASIA) was modeled after the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican-Americans (Suinn et al., 1987; Suinn et al., 1995) and it was taken from the Internet website at <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw/projects/pmap/>, with the author's permission (Suinn, 2001). The scale is used to

assess Asian acculturation level and it is specific to the general Asian population but not to its sub-groups (Suinn et al. 1995). For example, the scale does not distinguish between Korean, Japanese, or Chinese cultures. The SL-ASIA scale is made-up of 21 multiple-choice questions. The scale contains items assessing acculturation through language (4 items), identity (4 items), friendships (4 items), behaviors (5 items), generational/geographical background (3 items) and attitudes (1 item). Score on each item can range from 1 to 5. A maximum score of 105 can be scored for the scale. The level of acculturation of an individual can be assessed by calculating his or her total score for the scale. Low acculturation (Asian identified) is considered to include total scores from 21-49; medium acculturation (Bicultural identified) is considered to include total scores between 50-77; and high acculturation (Western identified) is considered to include total scores between 78-105 (Shih and Brown, 2000 and Suinn et al., 1987).

The SL-ASIA scale has been found to be reliable in past research. Reliability found for the original pilot test with 59 Asian-American participants was at an alpha coefficient of .88 for the 21-items (Suinn et al., 1987). Another study involving 324 Asian-American participants

revealed a higher Cronbach's alpha of .91 for the 21-items (Suinn et al., 1992). However, in one cross-cultural study using Singapore-Asian and Asian-American students, Cronbach's alpha fell to .79 (Suinn et al., 1995). More recently, Shih and Brown (2000) found a Cronbach's alpha of .76 in their study using the scale with Taiwanese international students. They argued that a reliability of .76 is acceptable because the short scale still reflects reasonable stability. A reliability coefficient of .77 was obtained in this study.

Reasons for Studying Abroad Surveys

Primary Motive Survey. Surveys for the reasons international students study abroad in the United States were modeled after questions asked in a study done by Glaser (1978). Two scales (surveys) were developed to measure the reasons international students study abroad. The first scale asked participants to rank-order their reasons based on the seven motives (reasons) listed by Glaser (1978). Participants were asked to indicate their main reason for studying abroad (from strongest to weakest reason) 1 being strongest and 7 being weakest reason. Participants needed to identify if their reasons to study in the United States were based on academic, political, personal, permanent residency, prestige of foreign degree,

economic or obligation to return home. Participants who answered academic reason indicated that they came for the educational opportunities and higher level of education in the United States. Political reason indicated that the participants came to study abroad in the United States because of unstable political conditions at home or dissatisfaction with home government's policies and regulations. Participants answered personal reason indicated that they came to seek individual freedom, new experiences and cultures. Those with permanent residency indicated they came to explore the possibility of staying permanently or considering migrating to the United States when they were done their studies. Participants who answered prestige of foreign degree as a reason indicated that they saw having a degree from the United States will give them higher social status, wealth and power when returned home. Those who answered economic reason indicated that they came to study abroad in the United States to improve their standard of living conditions in comparison to their home countries. Last, participants who answered obligation to return home indicated they came to study abroad in the United States to acquire skills and knowledge of science and technology in order to return

home to improve their own countries' social and economic conditions.

Based on the participants' rankings, each participant was categorized into one of three groups: stay, return or not sure. This categorization was based on their primary motive for study abroad. *Stay* category consisted of individuals that ranked permanent residency, personal freedom, economic, or political reason as their highest motive for study abroad. *Return* category consisted of individuals that ranked prestige of degree, academic, or obligation to return home as their highest reason to study abroad. *Not sure* category comprised of individuals who may have misread the instructions and/or entered multiple motives as most important, or they did not list a primary motive for study abroad.

Aggregated Motives Survey. In the second survey, questionnaires were developed to fit a Likert-type response. The original options on Likert scale, done by Glaser (1978), were based on the responses of "important to unimportant"; however, the survey has been altered to "strongly agree to strongly disagree." Questions in the survey were based on the motives of international students to study abroad in the host country. These questions reflected academic purpose, prestige of degree at home,

personal reasons to study abroad, obligation to return home, economic reasons, political reasons and permanent residence in the United States. Each of the motives consisted of three questionnaires. For example, one of the questions for economic reason for studying abroad was as followed: "one of the reasons I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to seek economic opportunities here (such as higher salaries and wages or better job opportunities)." Another example, this question was based on permanent residency in the United States: "one of the reasons I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to establish rights of citizenship or permanent residence." Each questionnaire was then summed to the appropriate motive. Then prestige of degree, academic and obligation to return motives were reverse coded and combined with stay motives to create an aggregated motives variable. A Cronbach's alpha of .62 was obtained for this scale.

Stay Reason Variable

Three questionnaires were embedded into the reasons for study abroad survey to directly measure stay-return intentions. One of the questions asked if the participants planned to return home when done with school in U.S. (questionnaire was later reverse coded in the analyses).

The other two questions asked for stay intentions in the U.S. Questionnaires were based on the scale of 1 to 5. "1" being strongly agree and "5" being strongly disagree. The three questionnaires were then combined to create the stay variable. Cronbach's alpha of .80 was obtained for this scale.

Procedure

The questionnaire packet (demographic survey, English proficiency survey, SL-ASIA Scale, two reasons for study abroad surveys and vocabulary exercise) was distributed to international students who were from Asian countries. Participants were recruited via the help of the presidents of the Chinese, Taiwanese, Thailand and Japanese International Students Associations in the MBA program and via the International Student Office of Affair. On site recruitments were done in a building where most international students were most visible. Most of the recruitments were done in the evening, since most international students had classes in the evening. All recruitment occurred on campus or on a nearby university through their Extension Center.

Participants were first asked to read the informed consent, and then to check and date the form. Instructions

for completing the questionnaire were provided in each section. First, participants were asked to complete a standard demographic questionnaire. They were asked about their country of origin, how long have they been in the United States, ethnicity, gender, age, major and grade level with units completed, TOEFL score and GPA. Next, participants completed an English proficiency survey. Then, participants were asked first to rank-order their reasons for studying abroad, and then proceeded to complete the SL-ASIA Scale developed by Suinn et al. (1987). Reason for Studying Abroad Survey then came afterward. And finally, participants were asked to complete a vocabulary exercise. The approximate time for completion of the package was 45 minutes.

A debriefing statement was attached at the end of the questionnaire packet describing the nature and the purpose of the study. Participants were encouraged to return the questionnaire packet to either the presidents of the International Students Association, the International Student Office of Affair or the researcher. A donation of \$2 was given to the International Students Association for each survey completed. As for on-site recruitment, \$2 was also given for each completed survey.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Data Screening

Prior to conducting primary data analysis, acculturation, stay reason, length of residency in the United States, English proficiency and aggregated motives variables were examined through SPSS 11.5 for missing values, and assumptions of univariate and multivariate normality

The length of residency variable had six cases with missing values. These cases were not deleted, instead defaulting to SPSS for Listwise deletion in the analysis. None of the variables skewness values exceeded 1; therefore, transformations were not necessary. No univariate outlier was found, and as for the assumptions of multivariate normality, 8 multivariate outliers were found by using Mahalanobis distance with $p < .05$ (9.488). Because the outliers were not considered to be extreme; all the cases remained in the sample.

Descriptives

Means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, and bivariate correlations for all study variables are presented in Table 1. Frequencies analysis of the SL-ASIA

Table 1. Intercorrelations among Aggregated Motives, Length of Residency, English Proficiency, Primary Motive, Acculturation, and Vocabulary Words

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Aggregated Motives	3.34	.36	.62	-.08	-.14	.42**	-.25**	-.18	.24*
2. Length of Residency	2.79	1.74		---	.13	-.11	.18	.10	.07
3. English Proficiency	3.16	.70		---	.86	.09	.11	.25*	-.01
4. Stay Reason	3.17	.96		---	---	.80	-.20*	.05	.19*
5. Acculturation	43.19	6.90		---	---	---	.77	.12	-.18
6. Vocabulary	102.44	14.08		---	---	---	---	---	-.01
7. Primary motive	2.34	.84		---	---	---	---	---	---

*p < .05; **p < .01

Note: italic indicate Cronbach's alpha

reveal 85% (n = 93) of the Asian international students identified themselves as having low-acculturation (Asian identity), while 15% (n = 17) identified themselves as medium acculturation (bicultural identity). None of the Asian international students identified themselves as having high acculturation (Westernized identity). The mean score for the sample was 43.19 (SD = 6.90) with a low of 29 and a high of 63.

The stay reason questionnaire and primary motive variables reveal very similar results. Many of the Asian international students were undecided in whether to stay or return home after finishing school in the United States. The mean for the stay reason variable was 3.17

(SD = .96) based on a scale of 1 to 5. Primary motive yielded a similar result. The mean score for the primary motive was 2.34 (SD = .84) based on a 3-point scale. "1" being stay in the United States, "2" being not sure, and "3" being return home. Correlation analysis revealed a significant correlation between stay reason and the primary motive variables ($r = .19$, $p < .05$).

According to the data obtained from the English proficiency survey, many of the Asian international students considered themselves to have average skill in their English proficiencies. The mean score for the English proficiency survey was 3.15 (SD = .68) based on a scale of 1 to 5. "1" was considered poor and "5" was considered to be excellent in the English language. However, the vocabulary exercise did not reflect a similar result as the English proficiency scale. The mean score for the vocabulary exercise was 102.44 (SD = 14.08) with a low score of 63 and high score of 120, based on a total of 120 vocabulary words. The vocabulary scores have indicated a higher level of English proficiency than what the international students self-reported. A correlation was employed to see if there was a relationship between English proficiency and vocabulary words correct. Results of the analysis revealed a significant correlation between

English proficiency and vocabulary levels ($r = .25$, $p < .01$). The correlation was not as strong as one might have hoped.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were also computed to examine relationships between the other hypothesized variables. Aggregated motives and acculturation were found to be negatively correlated ($r = -.25$, $p < .05$). Acculturation and stay reason were also negatively correlated ($r = -.20$, $p < .05$). These correlations were negative because the scales (aggregated motives and stay reason) were scored in the opposite direction as the acculturation scale. Although they were non-significant, acculturation and length of residency, and acculturation and English proficiency were positively correlated, $r = .18$ and $r = .11$, respectively.

Planned Analyses

In order to test the study hypotheses, a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to test the relationship between motives and acculturation, as mediated by stay intention. The analyses also tested for the impact of length of residency, English proficiency, and aggregated motives on acculturation level.

According to Baron and Kenny (1986), in order for mediation to be established, four conditions must be met. First, the independent variable and mediator must be associated to each other. Second, the mediator and dependent variable must be associated. Third, independent variable and dependant variable must be associated. Lastly, independent variable and dependent variable should not be associated after controlling for the mediator. However, if the final step is violated, partial mediation may have occurred, if there is reduction in the relationship. The Sobel test (Baron and Kenny) then can be used to test for partial mediation.

For each analysis of the conditions, predictor variables were entered in two steps, except for condition 4, for which a third step was required. In the first step, English proficiency and length of residency were entered as controlled variables. These were to help indicate the effect of IV on DV after the differences in English proficiency and length of residency were statistically eliminated. That is, would the DV be affected by the IV if all the participants have the same English proficiency and length of residency as other international students? For condition 4, stay reason was entered in the second step to control for mediation.

Regression results for each of the four conditions are presented in Tables 2 through 5. Table 2 reveals a significant model [$F(1, 100) = 23.57, p < .05$] for the prediction of stay reason, the mediator. The overall model explains 21% of the variance in stay reason, 18.6% of which is explained by aggregated motives. English proficiency and length of residency accounted for only 2.4% of the variance. In the final model, English proficiency and length of residency proved to be non-significant. Only aggregated motives were found to be significant predictor of stay reason; that is, aggregated motives and stay reason have demonstrated strong association.

Table 2. Regression Results for Stay Reason with Predictor Aggregated Motives after Controlling of Length of Residency and English Proficiency

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Length of residency	-.00	.01	-.13
English proficiency	.15	.14	.11
Step 2			
Aggregated Motives	1.16	.24	.44*

Note: $R^2 = .02$ for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .19$ for Step 2. $N = 104$.

* $p < .001$

Table 3 reveals a significant model [$F(1,100) = 5.11$, $p < .05$] for the prediction of acculturation. The overall model explains 8.9% of the variance in acculturation, 4.7% of which is explained by international students having the intention to stay in the United States when done with their education. English proficiency and length of residency accounted for 4.2% of the variance. In the final model, only stay reason was found to be a significant predictor of acculturation.

Table 3. Regression Results for Acculturation with Predictor Stay Reason after Controlling for Length of Residency and English Proficiency

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Length of residency	.00	.00	.14
English proficiency	.04	.05	.09
Step 2			
Stay reason	-.08	.03	-.22*

Note: $R^2 = .04$ for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .48$ for Step 2. $N = 104$.

* $p < .05$

Contrary to what was predicted in Hypothesis 1 (length of residency) and Hypothesis 2 (English proficiency), non-significant relationships were found between acculturation level. That is, international students with longer length of residency did not

acculturate more than international students with shorter length of residency. Similarly, the results also reveal non-significant relation for English proficiency.

International students with better self-rated English proficiency did not acculturate more than international students with less self-rated English proficiency. These non-significant findings may be due the restriction of variance in the sample and the small sample size; theses possible limitations are discussed later.

Table 4 reveals a significant model [$F(1,100) = 6.49$, $p < .05$] for the prediction of acculturation. The overall model explains 10% of the variance accounted for acculturation, 5.8% of which is explained by aggregated motives. Once again, English proficiency and length of residency accounted for 4.2% of the variance. In the final model, again, English proficiency and length of residency were found to be non-significant. Only aggregated motives was found be a significant predictor of acculturation. The model indicates significant association between aggregated motives and acculturation.

Thus, as predicted in Hypothesis 3, international students with permanent resident motives were more acculturated than international students with temporary resident motives. The significant relationship reported

Table 4. Regression Results for Acculturation with Predictor Aggregated Motives, after Controlling for Length of Residency and English Proficiency

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Length of residency	.00	.00	.16
English proficiency	.04	.05	.09
Step 2			
Aggregated Motives	-.23	.09	-.24*

Note: $R^2 = .04$ for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .48$ for Step 2. N = 104.

* $p < .05$

above indicates that international students came to study in the United States due to wanting to stay permanently in the U.S., political, economic, or personal motive were more acculturated than Asian international students came due to prestige of degree, obligation to return home, or academic motive.

Table 5 reveals a non-significant model [$F(1,99) = 3.00, p > .05$] for the prediction of acculturation when controlling for stay reason in the second step. The overall model explains 11.5% of the variance in acculturation, 4.7% of which is explained by stay reason variable when entered in step 2. Again, English proficiency and length of residency accounted for 4.2%, and aggregated motives only accounted for 2.7% of the variances. In the final model, only stay reason

Table 5. Regression Results for Acculturation with Predictor Aggregated Motives after Controlling Stay Reason (Mediator), Length of Residency and English Proficiency

Independent Variables	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Length of residency	.00	.00	.14
English proficiency	.04	.05	.09
Step 2			
Stay reason	-.08	.03	-.22*
Step 3			
Aggregated Motives	-.17	.10	-.18

Note: $R^2 = .04$ for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .05$ for Step 2; $\Delta R^2 = .03$ for Step 3. N = 104. * $p < .05$

(mediator) was found be a significant predictor for acculturation while other variables in the model were found to be non-significant. The non-significance of the model and the reduction of the β for aggregated motives indicate satisfaction for condition 4 in the requirements for mediation testing set by Baron and Kenny; that is, independent variable and dependent variable were not associated after controlling for the mediator. All four conditions for mediation testing set by Baron and Kenny were met.

In all, the result of the analyses revealed non-significant relationships for Hypotheses 1 (length of residency) and 2 (English proficiency), but a closer examination of the intercorrelations in Table 1 suggest

positive relationships among these variables, $r = .18$ and $r = .11$, respectively. As for Hypothesis 3, a relationship between aggregated motives (permanent vs. temporary resident motives) variable and acculturation level was found to be significant. Asian international students with permanent resident motives acculturated more than those with temporary resident motives. As predicted in Hypothesis 4, the results provided support for mediation of stay reason between aggregated motives and acculturation. However, in reviewing the standardized coefficient (β) for condition 3 and 4 [see Tables 4 and 5]; the presence of stay reason was found to have minimal effect influencing the β coefficient of the aggregated motives. This indicated there might not be a full mediation in the model. It was decided partial mediation was to be tested. The Sobel test was then utilized to test for partial mediation.

Sobel Test

The Sobel test is used to test for the indirect effect of mediation. The test was done by testing the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable via the mediator (Baron and Kenny) by utilizing the following formula:

$$Z = \frac{ab}{\sqrt{S_a^2 S_b^2 + b^2 S_a^2 + a^2 S_b^2}}$$

Where:

a = unstandardized Beta value associated with
independent variable and mediator

(Condition 1)

b = unstandardized Beta value associated with
mediator and dependent variable (Condition 2)

S_a = standard error associated with Condition 1

S_b = standard error associated with Condition 2

If the Z value is greater than ± 1.96 , it is suggested
that partial mediation is significant at the .05 level.

The equation can be easily hand calculated or calculation
can be done over the Internet with the assistance of a
program. Calculation for the Sobel test for this study was
done at <http://www.unc.edu/~preacher/sobel/sobel.htm>.

Outputs for the Sobel test is presented in Table 6. Result
from the calculation indicated that there was significant
partial mediation in the model, $Z = -2.33$, $p < .05$.

Table 6. Sobel Test: Unstandardized Betas and Standard Errors Associated with Condition 1 and Condition 2

<u>Input</u>		<u>Test-Statistic</u>	<u>P-value</u>
a	1.16	-2.33	.02
b	-.08		
S ^a	.24		
S ^b	.03		

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The results of the study provide evidence of relationships between motives for study abroad in the United States, stay intention in the U.S. and acculturation level among Asian international students. Also, support for partial mediation (stay reason) was found between motives for study abroad and acculturation level. Asian international students indicating plans to stay in the United States when done with their academics were more acculturated than those Asian international students having the intention of returning home when done with their studies. This finding is consistent with predictions, and suggests Asian international students arriving in United States without having intentions of staying for a long period of time may have less motivation to adapt to new cultures. Gibson (2001) commented on the conscious decision of some refugees and immigrants from other countries on the quickness to adapt the cultures of the host country when they arrived, because theses individuals anticipated a long term settlement in their new environment. This conscious decision may have to do with the intention of these individuals wanting to stay in

their new environment. Rejection of the new environment (no intent to stay) may result in rejection of the cultures and values of the host country. Again, as commented by Gibson (2001), those rejecting their new environment may already be anticipating going back to their home countries in a short period of time. Adaptation of new culture may not be as important or relevant to these individuals. Similarly, like refugees and immigrants, some Asian international students may have made a conscious decision of staying in the United States when done with their academics, thus leading them to become more acculturated than those Asian international students less inclined to stay in the United States when done with their educations.

The intention of staying factor implies these individuals may already come to accept and feel comfortable in their new environment. Much research has been done to better understand the acculturation process for international students. Some dealt with cultural adjustment issue (Kagan & Cohen, 1990), and acculturative stress (Berry et al, 1987), while many have commented on the lack of preparation to help international students to cope with issues, and the factors of counseling and/or advising cultural differences (Marks, 1987; Hayes & Lin,

1994). However, the root of these concerns may be directly related to whether these international students intend to stay or returning home after the conclusion of their studies and their motives for study abroad in the host country.

Motives for study abroad in the United States have also been found to affect acculturation level. Asian international students that came to study in the United States with Permanent resident motives, such as political, economic, permanent resident or personal reasons tend to be more acculturated. Contrary to those with Permanent resident motives, Asian international students with Temporary resident motives, such as prestige of foreign degree, academic or obligation to return home motives tend to be less acculturated. These findings are consistent with previous studies of international students' stay intention and motives for study abroad. Adir (1995) found income and employment opportunities were main factors that influenced Israeli international students to study and to stay abroad in the United States. Zweig and Changgui (1995) further found in Chinese international students that came for economic or political motives tended to want to stay abroad instead of returning home. Glaser (1978) also confirmed that international students that came to

study abroad because of prestige of foreign degree or for educational purposes were more likely to return home when they completed their academics. This study further added additional evidence that international students study abroad may acculturate differently due to differences in study abroad motives and it may help explain why these individuals may or may not want to stay in the United States once they have completed their degrees.

Asian international students that have permanent resident motives may indeed have more incentive to acculturate in the United States than those Asian international students only planning to stay for a short period of time. Asian international students that came planning to stay in the United States permanently may voluntarily seek to adapt and integrate with the natives. For these individuals, the goal may be to be familiarized with the cultures and customs of the natives as quickly as possible, because they want to establish a firm foundation for settlement in their new environment as soon as possible. Likewise, Asian international students with political motives may make comparisons between their own countries' rules and regulations to those of the United States. Those who are dissatisfied with home government's political systems may seek to identify themselves more

politically with the United States. Political freedom in the west, such as freedom of expression and speech, may have helped convinced these individuals to view the United States as a better place for relocation, thus leading them to be more receptive of the U.S. cultures and norms. Further, Asian international students with economic motives came largely seeking to improve their standard of living conditions. This improvement of standard of living or upward mobility to a different class can be achieved through the acculturation process. These individuals may be more than likely to accept the American ways of doing things, such as rules and regulations for doing tasks. They may be more than willing to listen and learn from the natives on how to act appropriately in public. The acceptance of the values and cultures of the host society may enable these Asian international students to gain access to job opportunities and career advancements, thus improving their living conditions. Lastly, Asian international students with personal motives for study abroad may be seeking to express themselves in ways that they were not allowed in their home country. The freedom from family pressure and governmental regulation along with loose restrictions on personal expression may entice values and behavioral changes in the United States.

Further, new experiences from abroad may replace old traditional values with new ones, for example, celebrating Thanksgiving as a holiday.

Contrary to Asian international students with permanent resident motives, Asian international students with temporary resident motives may be less likely to acculturate in the United States due to their intention to return home. Asian international students having the notion of obtaining a foreign degree for a prestige once returned home may consider foreign education to be an invaluable commodity. Many students may have the thought that a degree from the United States maybe worth more in their home country because it may bring them better job opportunities, career advancements and the prestige attached to foreign education. These benefits may have motivated Asian international students to mainly focus on their studies and not become aware of their surrounding environment which can lead to non-adaptation of cultures and values in the United States. In the same light, Asian international students who come with the obligation to return home motive might also be so preoccupied with learning and seeking new knowledge in hope of transferring back to their home countries, they may also be unaware of the social environment surrounding them. The lack of

social interactions in the United States could have contributed to lesser understanding of daily activities of the natives which lead to less acculturation of these Asian international students. And above all, Asian international students with academic motives came to study abroad because they considered the United States to have a higher level of education in comparison to their own country, or the field of interest they were looking for within their home country may not have been available to them, thus pushing these individuals to study abroad. Asian international students with academic motives may have plans to seek improvement of their standard of living (greater job opportunities or career advancements) when returned home with their education in the United States. The desire to seek a higher education in the United States may push these individuals to mainly concentrate on their academics and less with social activities. Family pressure to achieve academically in the United States may also contribute to the less acculturation of these Asian international students.

What this study has found is that the motives to study abroad may correspond with intention to stay or not in the United States, which promotes acculturation or less acculturation depending on the motive. Asian international

students with permanent resident motives for study abroad may have already influenced their stay intention, which may have led to the acceptance of U.S. cultures and values. In contrast, Asian international students who have temporary resident motives may have influenced their return home intention, which in turn promoted lesser acceptance of U.S. cultures and values. Those students with temporary resident motives may already have planned either to seek wealth, prestige, or obligation to help their motherland to grow socially and economically when they returned home. For the Asian international students with temporary resident motives, the preservation of ones' ethnic identity and self may become more important than acceptance of foreign cultures and values. It is these motives that may have further helped explained acculturation level among Asian international students, beside other factors such as length of residency and English proficiency.

Traditional Predictions of Acculturation

Traditionally, acculturation level has been found to be related to English proficiency and length of residency; however, these relationships were found to be non-significant in this study—although they were in the

expected direction. There are at least two explanations for the non-significant relationship among acculturation, length of residency and English proficiency in this study. First, data obtained for length of residency and English proficiency revealed minimal variance. For length of residency, 72% of the sample clustered within the range of three and a half years or less; with the average length of stay in the United States for the students of only 2.7 years. The clustering of the data might have indicated difficulties in finding differences in the sample. Further, with the Asian international students' short period of residency in the United States, they may not have been able to more completely adapt the new cultures and values. Likewise, the closeness of the data may have also prevented significant differences between acculturation level and English proficiency. Self-rating of English proficiency by Asian international students indicated average skill in the English language based on the criteria of "understanding," "speaking," "reading," and, "writing," with a mean of 3.17 and standard deviation of .96. And from viewing the data in frequency distribution, nearly 52% of the sample ranged around 3 ($\pm .25$) based on the 5-point scale English proficiency scale. Clearly, the closeness of the data may have

prevented the finding of significant between acculturation level and English proficiency. In sum, the range restriction in both length of residency in United States and English proficiency may have restricted the variance in the sample to find any differences between acculturation.

Second, the sample size in this study may also further prevented finding significant differences between acculturation level, length of residency and English proficiency. The sample size may have been too small to find any significant differences on the acculturation level for length of residency and English proficiency, but the intercorrelations among the variables were in the predicted directions, $r = .18$, and $r = .11$, respectively. A bigger sample size may have helped achieved significant differences among the variables, although the percent of variance accounted for would be small.

CHAPTER SIX
LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, FUTURE DIRECTION
AND CONCLUSION

Limitations

First, the findings of non-significant relationships of acculturation level between length of residency and English proficiency in this study does not in any way indicate these factors are not important or have no effect in the acculturation process for international students or immigrants. On the contrary, length of residency and English proficiency are considered to be important factors in acculturation (Ward & Kennedy, 1993; Young & Gardner, 1990, respectively). As discussed, the non-significant findings in this study may be due to both restriction of variance and sample size. Table 1 reveals a non-significant positive correlation among acculturation level and length residency ($r = .18$) and acculturation level and English proficiency ($r = .11$). It clearly showed the relationships can become more positively correlated with increased sample size. Second, although the study was set out to study Asian international students studying abroad in the United States, the majority of the sample consisted of graduate students in MBA programs. Therefore,

caution should be taken in generalizing findings to undergraduate students, because the relationship between motives and acculturation may be different for graduate students, in this case, MBA students, than it is for others. Third, more than 85% of all the participants in the sample consisted of business major students, which reflect the current trend in the major studied by international students in the United States (Open Door, 2001); so caution should be taken if results are used to generalize to specific Asian international student groups other than those being study here, such as engineering or biology major. Further data collection incorporating a broader participant base is warranted.

Implications and Future Direction

The findings from this study can have profound implications for academic advising and counseling. First, academic advisors/counselors may want to identify or categorize international students' motives for study abroad (permanent or temporary resident motives,) because that may help advisors to deal with their needs accordingly. Advisors need to understand that students with temporary resident motives tend to be less acculturated, and they have a tendency for wanting to

return home as soon as possible. So, it is imperative that advisors should spend more time with these individuals and explain their role as counselors and the issues they may face in their new environment. Second, an accurate identification of motives for attending higher education in the United States can help advisors apply the appropriate techniques to students with issues, such as academic overload or adjustment problems. Advisors may be in a better position to deal with cultural shock or acculturative stress by knowing the motives of international students. For example, international students with temporary resident motives tend to be less acculturated which in turn can lead to adjustment issues. If such is the case, advisors may want to encourage these individuals to join clubs or events of their own nationalities first and then gradually interact with other groups around their environment. Last, the implications of knowing why international students study abroad may help academic advisors to set-up appropriate course activities or counseling techniques to fit these individuals. The assumption that all international students act and think alike is simply not true. Each individual must be given greater considerations than before, because each individual has special needs, attention, and especially,

different motives for being in the United States. English proficiency and length of residency may be important factors in acculturation, but they can only provide a limited understanding of the behavior of an individual; however, knowing the motives may help predict behavioral problems typically arisen during their stay. For example, individuals with permanent resident motives may be more receptive to opinions or suggestions given by advisors in comparison to individuals with temporary resident motives.

Future research can address the limitations of the present study by comparing between international students from different Asian groups, such as comparison between Japan and China international students. The motives for Asian international students to study abroad may vary from country to country, because each has its own rules and regulations to follow. For example, the political climate in Japan might not be the same in a country such as China. Japan has a democratic form of government, like the west. China's government, however, is based on a Communist party system in which freedom of expression and speech are censored. A student from Japan may be more than likely to return home in comparison to a student from China. A between group comparison can give a clearer picture on the motives students choose to study abroad even though their

cultures and values may be identical. Comparison allows for the important motives to be clearly understood. Another example between Japan and China is that it is more than likely that Japanese students would have personal freedom and want to live in the United States as their permanent resident motives. In comparison, China students would probably have economic and political as their permanent resident motives, because Japan has a very stable political and balance economy, while China is still struggling to stabilize its political system and economy. Finding the differences in motives to study abroad between ethnic groups may lead to root of the problem within each country. Maybe the political system in China is the main motive for study abroad. Findings between group differences can have real implications. Implications for such findings may help counselors devise the needs and attention for each group for study abroad in the United States. For example, Japanese international students may have different needs than Chinese international students.

Another future research direction is to examine the relationship between motives and stress. Studies have found acculturative stress can lead to cultural adjustment problem for international students (Kagan and Cohen, 1991). The current study shows that those Asian

international students with temporary resident motives seem to be less acculturated in comparison to Asian international students with permanent resident motives. Speculation can be made that motives may contribute to stress level of international students. International students with temporary resident motives may be more stressed, because they may have more problems adjusting to the social environment. It would be important to find if stress moderates the relationship between motives and acculturation.

Finally, future research should examine if motives for study abroad also relates to individual's ethnic identity. Although international students with permanent resident motives have indicated changes in cultures and values, which lead to acculturation, this is not the same as changing his or her ethnic identity due arriving in new environment. For example, would some international students considered themselves to be part of the American culture and reframe from thinking they are foreigners? The finding in this study suggests individuals' may gradually changes his or her ethnic identity toward the United States, because a section of the acculturation scale reflects on one's ethnic identity; however, this is not measured directly. However, further investigations are

needed to clarify the relationships between acculturation and ethnic identity. It is worth the effort to find this out in future research.

Conclusion

Past research assumptions on acculturation are that individuals will automatically default to learn the cultures and values of their host country if enough time is given and with adequate language skills. None, however, have examined the motives for wanting to acculturate in the host country. In conducting this study, results found that motives and international students having the intention to stay or not after their academics in the United States are related to acculturation level. Specifically, students with motives that lead them to return home after their academics are less acculturated. The implications of this study may help advisors identify the needs of the international students based on their motives (permanent vs. temporary resident motives) and also assisting counselors and academic advisors on the type of help that are appropriate for these students. However, more research are needed, these findings are just the tip of the iceberg.

APPENDIX A
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Participant:

You are invited to participate in a Thesis Project study, which is being conducted by Kevin Hy, under the supervision of Dr. Mark Agars, Assistant Professor of Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino. In this study, you will be asked a series of questions about cultural identity and to rank order your reasons for studying in the United States. You are invited to participate in this study if you are Asian international students (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Taiwanese, etc.). Please give careful consideration to each item and respond accurately and honestly.

There are no foreseeable (immediate or long-term) risks involved by the procedures used in this study. The benefits of the study are that maybe some of the results found in this study will help academic advisors and counselors able to understand Asian international students better by knowing your reason(s) for study abroad in the United States.

The attached questionnaire should take appropriately 45 minutes to one hour of your time, and your participation is anonymous. You are not asked to provide your name. Your responses will be used only to examine in group form. Please keep in mind that your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw without penalty at any time.

The Department of Psychology Institutional Review Board of California State University, San Bernardino, has approved this project. If you have any questions regarding the nature of this study, or wish to receive a copy of the results, please feel free to contact Dr. Mark Agars at (909) 880-5433. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

I have read the above description and understand the study's nature and purpose. I agree to participate and acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Please Check _____ and Date ____/____/____.

APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Demographic Information

Please fill out the following prior to completing the surveys. This information will not be used for identification purposes. Thank you.

Your country of origin is:_____.

Since arriving, how long have you been in the United States? This includes studying in other universities or colleges (such as junior colleges). _____ year(s)
 _____ month(s)

Have you ever attended a language program or institution during your stay in the United States?

 Yes

 No

If "Yes," how long were you enrolled? _____ year(s)
 _____ month(s)

Have you ever been in the United States prior to arriving here? _____ Yes
 _____ No

If "Yes," how long did you stay? _____ year(s)
 _____ month(s)

Ethnicity (please circle one)

1. Chinese (Mainland)
2. Chinese (Hong Kong)
3. Taiwanese
4. Japanese
5. Thai
6. Korean
7. Indian
8. Indonesian
9. Vietnamese
10. Other: (please specify) _____

Gender (please circle one): Male Female

Age: _____

Major or field of study: _____

What is your current grade level? Freshman _____ Sophomore _____
 Junior _____ Senior _____
 Graduate Student _____

How many units have you completed? _____

What is your grade-point average (GPA)? _____

What was your TOEFL score? _____

APPENDIX C
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY SURVEY

English Proficiency Survey

Please read each of the statements carefully and answer them appropriately. Choose the one answer which best describes you in each statement.

How proficient is your English in terms of understanding?

- 1) Very Poor
- 2) Poor
- 3) Average
- 4) Good
- 5) Excellent

How proficient is your English in terms of speaking?

- 1) Very Poor
- 2) Poor
- 3) Average
- 4) Good
- 5) Excellent

How proficient is your English in terms of reading?

- 1) Very Poor
- 2) Poor
- 3) Average
- 4) Good
- 5) Excellent

How proficient is your English in terms of writing?

- 1) Very Poor
- 2) Poor
- 3) Average
- 4) Good
- 5) Excellent

APPENDIX D

RANK ORDER: REASONS FOR STUDY ABROAD SURVEY

RANK ORDER: REASONS FOR STUDYING ABROAD SURVEY

Listed below are some of the reasons why international students decide to study in the United States. Please read each of the reasons *carefully* and then rank order the top reason (1 to 7) *why you* study in the United States, “1” being the strongest and “7” being the weakest reason. By rank order, we mean the reason most important to you on your decision to study in the United States—“1” is considered *most* important, “2” is considered second most important ...so on and “7” is considered *least* important. Please read and think carefully before ranking the reasons.

_____ **Obligation to return home:** I felt it is my obligation to return home when I am done with my study in the United States. I felt it is my duty to return home and applied all the knowledge and skills that I have learned in the United States to help my home country grow. I wanted to use all the acquired knowledge that I have learned from the United States to help improve my home country's social and economic conditions.

_____ **Academic reason:** I came to the United States because of the educational opportunities. The level of education is high, and the number of opportunities is great. I can get an education here that is not available in my home country. Because of my foreign degree, I am able to secure more jobs and career advancements when I return home in comparison to those with domestic degrees.

_____ **Political reason:** I came to the United States because of the unstable political conditions in my home country. I am dissatisfied with my government's policies and regulations (e.g. strong dictatorial form of government). I am currently seeking a more stable form of government [United States] to settle down.

_____ **Personal reason:** I came to the United States because of the personal freedom. I wanted to see what is out there in the world; experiencing new cultures and values. I wanted to be independent—to be able to make my own decisions without rules and constraints and family pressures.

_____ **Exploring the possibility of permanent residency in the US:** I came to the United States to explore the possibility of staying permanently. I was considering migrating and thought it would be best to try it out first as student. I found it is a lot easier to stay in the United States by studying abroad as international student.

_____ **Prestige of foreign degree:** I came to the United States because of the value of the degree or education. A degree from here can give me higher social status when I return to my home country. I can obtain wealth and power, such as better job opportunities and improve my standard of living, like better housing for my family.

_____ **Economic reason:** I came to the United States because of the economic opportunities and standard of living conditions. Economic opportunities and better standard of living conditions include higher wages and salaries and/or greater job opportunities. I felt studying abroad in the United States can increase my social economic conditions. Also, there are limited career opportunities in my home country.

APPENDIX E

SUINN-LEW ASIAN-IDENTITY ACCULTURATION SCALE

SUINN-LEW ASIAN-IDENTITY ACCULTURATION SCALE
(SL-ASIA)

INSTRUCTIONS: The questions which follow are for the purpose of collecting information about your historical background as well as more recent behaviors which may be related to your cultural identity. Choose the one answer which best describes you.

1. What language can you speak?
 1. Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
 2. Mostly Asian, some English
 3. Asian and English about equally well (bilingual)
 4. Mostly English, some Asian
 5. Only English
2. What language do you prefer?
 1. Asian only (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
 2. Mostly Asian, some English
 3. Asian and English about equally well (bilingual)
 4. Mostly English, some Asian
 5. Only English
3. How do you identify yourself?
 1. Oriental
 2. Asian
 3. Asian-American
 4. Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Korean-American, etc.
 5. American
4. Which identification does (did) your mother use?
 1. Oriental
 2. Asian
 3. Asian-American
 4. Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Korean-American, etc.
 5. American
5. Which identification does (did) your father use?
 1. Oriental
 2. Asian
 3. Asian-American
 4. Chinese-American, Japanese-American, Korean-American, etc.
 5. American

6. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child up to age 6?
 1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
 4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
 5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
7. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had, as a child from 6 to 18?
 1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
 4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
 5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
8. Whom do you now associate with in the community?
 1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
 4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
 5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
9. If you could pick, whom would you prefer to associate with in the community?
 1. Almost exclusively Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 2. Mostly Asians, Asian-Americans, Orientals
 3. About equally Asian groups and Anglo groups
 4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
 5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, Hispanics, or other non-Asian ethnic groups
10. What is your music preference?
 1. Only Asian music (for example, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.)
 2. Mostly Asian
 3. Equally Asian and English
 4. Mostly English
 5. English only

11. What is your movie preference?

1. Asian-language movies only
2. Asian-language movie mostly
3. Equally Asian/English-language movies
4. Mostly English-language movies only
5. English-language movies only

12. What generation are you? (circle the generation that best applies to you)

1. 1st Generation = I was born in Asia or country outside the U.S.
2. 2nd Generation = I was born in U.S., either parent was born in Asia or country outside the U.S.
3. 3rd Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S., and all grandparents born in Asia or country outside the U.S.
4. 4th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S., and at least one grandparent born in Asia or country outside the U.S. and one grandparent born in U.S.
5. 5th Generation = I was born in U.S., both parents were born in U.S. and all grandparents also born in U.S.
6. Don't know what generation best fits since I lack some information

13. Where were you raised?

1. In Asia only
2. Mostly in Asia, some in U.S.
3. Equally in Asia and U.S.
4. Mostly in U.S., some in Asia
5. In U.S. only

14. What contact have you had with Asia?

1. Raised one year or more in Asia
2. Lived for less than one year in Asia
3. Occasional visits to Asia
4. Occasional communications (letters, phone calls, etc) with people in Asia
5. No exposure or communication with people in Asia

15. What is your food preference at home?

1. Exclusively Asian food
2. Mostly Asian food, some American
3. About equally Asian and American
4. Mostly American food
5. Exclusively American food

16. What is your food preference in restaurant?

1. Exclusively Asian food
2. Mostly Asian food, some American
3. About equally Asian and American
4. Mostly American food
5. Exclusively American food

17. Do you

1. read only an Asian language
2. read an Asian language better than English
3. read both Asian and English equally well
4. read English better than an Asian language
5. read only English

18. Do you

1. write only an Asian language
2. write an Asian language better than English
3. write both Asian and English equally well
4. write English better than an Asian language
5. write only English

19. If you consider yourself a member of the Asian group (Oriental, Asian, Asian-American, Chinese-American, etc, whatever term you prefer), how much pride do you have in this group?

1. Extremely proud
2. Moderately proud
3. Little pride
4. No pride but do not feel negative toward group
5. No pride but do feel negative toward group

20. How would you rate yourself?

1. Very Asian
2. Mostly Asian
3. Bicultural
4. Mostly Westernized
5. Very Westernized

21. Do you participate in Asian occasions, holidays, traditions, etc?

1. Nearly all
2. Most of them
3. Some of them
4. A few of them
5. None at all

APPENDIX F
REASON FOR STUDYING ABROAD SURVEY

Reason for Studying Abroad Survey

Please read each one of the questions *carefully* and then indicate by circling one number, 1 through 5, for each question (with one meaning “strongly agree”, two meaning “Agree”, three meaning “Not Sure”, four meaning “Disagree” and five meaning “Strongly disagree”).

1. I plan to return home (my birth country) after I am done with my study in the United States?
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
2. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I wanted a better living conditions and standards here. For example, having better housing or transportation.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
3. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I was seriously considering migrating and I thought it be best to try it out first as student.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
4. An important reason I came to the United States to study is because of the higher quality of education here.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

5. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because of the prestige attached to foreign education after I return home.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
6. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I thought there would be more freedom in my personal life.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
7. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to establish rights of citizenship or of permanent residence.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
8. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because a degree from here is worth more in my country than a degree from my own country.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
9. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because the field of study or major I am interested in was not offered in my home country.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

10. It is likely I will stay in the United States when I am done with my study.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

11. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to get away from family pressure in my home country. I wanted to be able to make my own decisions and be independent.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

12. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I can get a level of education that is not available in my home country.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

13. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because of the economic opportunities here (such as higher salaries and wages, and good job opportunities).

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

14. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I thought there would be more political freedom here, and I would be able to express my political views.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

15. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I disapproved of my home government's policies and regulations, such as having restrictive rules and constraints to perform daily activities.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
16. I am obligated to return home when I am done with my study in the United States so I can help my family improved their social and economic conditions.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
17. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because of the limited career opportunities in my home country.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
18. I am obligated to return home to spread all the knowledge and skills I have learned in the United States to help improve the social and economic conditions in my home country
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

19. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to get away from the political situations (conditions) at home. For example, country having a strong dictatorial or unstable form of government.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
20. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to prepare in the way for other members of my family to come to this country.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
21. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because a degree from here can increase my job opportunities and career advancement at home.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
22. I prefer to stay in the United States than to go back home once I am done with school.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree
23. I felt obligated to return home when I am done with my study in the United States so I can help my country grow economically and technologically.
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Not sure
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly disagree

24. An important reason I came to study in the United States is because I wanted to see the world.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Not sure
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

APPENDIX G
VOCABULARY EXERCISE

Vocabulary Exercise

This is a vocabulary exercise. You must choose the right word to go with each meaning. Write the number of that word next to its meaning. Here is an example.

- | | | | |
|---|----------|-------|----------------------------|
| 1 | business | | |
| 2 | clock | _____ | part of a house |
| 3 | horse | _____ | animal with four legs |
| 4 | pencil | _____ | something used for writing |
| 5 | shoe | | |
| 6 | wall | | |

You answer it in the following way.

- | | | | |
|---|----------|---------|----------------------------|
| 1 | business | | |
| 2 | clock | __ 6 __ | part of a house |
| 3 | horse | __ 3 __ | animal with four legs |
| 4 | pencil | __ 4 __ | something used for writing |
| 5 | shoe | | |
| 6 | wall | | |

Some words in this exercise are to make it more difficult. You do not have to find a meaning for those words. In the example above, these words are *business*, *clock* and *shoe*.

If you have no idea about the meaning of a word, **do not guess**. But if you think you might know the meaning, then you should try to find the answer. **Note:** Please do this exercise on your own and avoid using external aid (such as friends, dictionary, thesaurus, etc.) to help find the meaning of a word(s).

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|-------|------------------|---|----------|-------|-----------------------|
| 1 | copy | _____ | end or highest | 1 | accident | _____ | loud deep sound |
| 2 | event | _____ | point | 2 | debt | _____ | something you must |
| 3 | motor | _____ | this moves a car | 3 | fortune | _____ | pay |
| 4 | pity | _____ | thing made to | 4 | pride | _____ | having a high opinion |
| 5 | profit | _____ | be like another | 5 | roar | _____ | of yourself |
| 6 | tip | | | 6 | thread | | |
-
- | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|-------|---------------------|---|---------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | coffee | _____ | money for work | 1 | arrange | _____ | grow |
| 2 | disease | _____ | a piece of clothing | 2 | develop | _____ | put in order |
| 3 | justice | _____ | using the law in | 3 | lean | _____ | like more than |
| 4 | skirt | _____ | the right way | 4 | owe | _____ | something else |
| 5 | stage | | | 5 | prefer | | |
| 6 | wage | | | 6 | seize | | |

1 clerk	_____ a drink	1 blame	_____ make
2 frame	_____ office worker	2 elect	_____ choose by voting
3 noise	_____ unwanted sound	3 jump	_____ become like water
4 respect		4 threaten	
5 theater		5 melt	
6 wine		6 manufacture	
1 dozen	_____ chance	1 ancient	_____ not easy
2 empire	_____ twelve	2 curious	_____ very old
3 gift	_____ money paid to	3 difficult	_____ related to God
4 tax	_____ the government	4 entire	
5 relief		5 holy	
6 opportunity		6 social	
1 admire	_____ make wider or	1 slight	_____ beautiful
2 complain	_____ longer	2 bitter	_____ small
3 fix	_____ bring in for the	3 lovely	_____ liked by many people
4 hire	_____ first time	4 merry	
5 introduce	_____ have a high opinion	5 popular	
6 stretch	_____ of someone	6 independent	
1 bull	_____ formal and serious	1 muscle	_____ advice
2 champion	_____ manner	2 counsel	_____ a place covered with
3 dignity	_____ winner of a sporting	3 factor	_____ grass
4 hell	_____ event	4 hen	_____ female chicken
5 museum	_____ building where	5 lawn	
6 solution	_____ valuable objects are shown	6 atmosphere	
1 blanket	_____ holiday	1 abandon	_____ live in a place
2 contest	_____ good quality	2 dwell	_____ follow in order
3 generation	_____ wool covering used	3 oblige	_____ to catch
4 merit	_____ on beds	4 pursue	_____ leave something
5 plot		5 quote	_____ permanently
6 vacation		6 resolve	
1 comment	_____ long formal dress	1 assemble	_____ look closely
2 gown	_____ goods from a	2 attach	_____ stop doing something
3 import	_____ foreign country	3 peer	_____ cry out loudly in fear
4 nerve	_____ part of the body	4 quit	
5 pasture	_____ which carries feeling	5 scream	
6 tradition		6 toss	

1 pond	_____ group of animals	1 drift	_____ suffer patiently
2 angel	_____ spirit who serves	2 endure	_____ join wool threads
3 frost	_____ God	3 grasp	_____ together
4 herd	_____ managing business	4 knit	_____ hold firmly with
5 fort	_____ and affairs	5 register	_____ your hands
6 administration		6 tumble	
1 brilliant	_____ thin	1 aware	_____ usual
2 distinct	_____ steady	2 blank	_____ best or most important
3 magic	_____ without clothes	3 desperate	_____ knowing what is
4 naked		4 normal	_____ happening
5 slender		5 striking	
6 stable		6 supreme	
1 area	_____ written agreement	1 adult	_____ end
2 contract	_____ way of doing	2 vehicle	_____ machine used to
3 definition	_____ something	3 exploitation	_____ move people or
4 evidence	_____ reason for believing	4 infrastructure	_____ goods
5 method	_____ something is or is	5 termination	_____ list of things to do at
6 role	_____ not true	6 schedule	_____ certain times
1 debate	_____ plan	1 alter	_____ change
2 exposure	_____ choice	2 coincide	_____ say something is
3 integration	_____ joining something	3 deny	_____ not true
4 option	_____ into a whole	4 devote	_____ describe clearly and
5 scheme		5 release	_____ exactly
6 stability		6 specify	
1 access	_____ male or female	1 correspond	_____ keep
2 gender	_____ study of the	2 diminish	_____ match or be in
3 psychology	_____ mind	3 emerge	_____ agreement with
4 license	_____ entrance or way in	4 highlight	_____ give special attention
5 orientation		5 invoke	_____ something
6 implementation		6 retain	
1 edition	_____ collecting things	1 bond	_____ make smaller
2 accumulation	_____ over time	2 channel	_____ guess the number
3 guarantee	_____ promise to repair	3 estimate	_____ or size of something
4 media	_____ a broken product	4 identify	_____ recognizing and
5 motivation	_____ feeling a strong	5 mediate	_____ naming a person or
6 phenomenon	_____ reason or need to do something	6 minimize	_____ thing

1 explicit _____ last	1 abstract _____ next to
2 final _____ stiff	2 adjacent _____ added to
3 negative _____ meaning "no" or	3 neutral _____ concerning the whole
4 professional "not"	4 global _____ world
5 rigid	5 controversial
6 sole	6 supplementary
1 analysis _____ eagerness	1 artillery _____ a kind of tree
2 curb _____ loan to buy a house	2 creed _____ a system of belief
3 gravel _____ small stones mixed	3 hydrogen _____ large gun on wheels
4 mortgage _____ with sand	4 maple
5 scar	5 pork
6 zeal	6 streak
1 cavalry _____ small hill	1 chart _____ map
2 eve _____ day or night before	2 forge _____ large beautiful house
3 ham _____ a holiday	3 mansion _____ place where metals are
4 mound _____ soldiers who fight	4 outfit _____ made and shaped
5 steak _____ from horses	5 sample
6 switch	6 volunteer
1 circus _____ musical instrument	1 revive _____ think about deeply
2 jungle _____ seat without a back	2 extract _____ bring back to health
3 trumpet _____ or arms	3 gamble _____ make someone angry
4 sermon _____ speech given by a	4 launch
5 stool _____ priest in a church	5 provoke
6 nomination	6 contemplate
1 shatter _____ have a rest	1 decent _____ weak
2 embarrass _____ break suddenly	2 frail _____ concerning a city
3 heave _____ into small pieces	3 harsh _____ difficult to believe
4 obscure _____ make someone feel	4 incredible
5 demonstrate _____ shy or nervous	5 municipal
6 relax	6 specific
1 correspond _____ exchange letters	1 adequate _____ enough
2 embroider _____ hide and wait for	2 internal _____ fully grown
3 lurk _____ someone	3 mature _____ alone away from
4 penetrate _____ feel angry about	4 profound _____ other things
5 prescribe _____ something	5 solitary
6 resent	6 tragic

APPENDIX H
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Dear Participant:

Thank you again for participating in the study. The main purpose of the study was to examine the reason(s) international students study abroad, and how those reasons influence adaptation (acculturation) in the United States. Your responses to the survey are anonymous and your name was not asked anywhere in the survey. If you want to discuss the results or have any questions about the study, please contact Dr. Mark Agars at (909) 880-5433. The results of the study will be available in the Spring of 2003. No negative emotional or psychological symptoms are anticipated from the participation of this study. However, you may contact the CSUSB Counseling Center at (909) 880-5040, if you should feel a need for counseling service. Lastly, to ensure the integrity of the study, I request that you not reveal the nature of this study to other potential participants, as it may bias the results.

Thank you very much for your participation.

REFERENCES

- Adir, Y. (1995). The Israeli brain drain: A psychological perspective. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10(3), 731-740.
- Agarwal, V. B., & Winkler, D. R. (1985). Migration of foreign students in the United States. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56(5), 509-522.
- Altbach, P. G., Kelly, D. H., & Lulat, Y. G. (1985). Research on foreign students and international study: An overview and bibliography. New York: Praeger Publisher.
- Appleton, S. (1970). Silent students and the future of Taiwan. *Pacific Affairs*, 43(2), 227-239.
- Bailyn, L., & Kelman, H. C. (1962). The effects of a year's experience in America on the self-image of Scandinavians: A preliminary analysis of reactions to a new environment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18(1), 30-40.
- Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173-1182.

- Berry, J. W. (1990). Psychology of acculturation: Understanding individuals moving between cultures. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology (pp. 232-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Berry, J. W., & Annis, R. C. (1974). Acculturative stress. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 5, 382-406.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International Migration Review*, 21(3), 491-511.
- Boyan, D. R., Julian, A. C., & Rew, J. (1981). Open doors: 1980/81: Report on international educational exchange. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Carrington, W. J., & Detragiache, E. (1999). How extensive is the brain drain? *Finance and Development*, 36(2), 46-49.
- Chang, H. (1973). Attitudes of Chinese students in the United States. *Sociology and Social Research*, 58(1), 66-77.
- Charles, H., & Stewart, M. A. (1991). Academic advising of international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 19, 173-180.

- Chen, G. M. (1993). Self-disclosure and Asian students' abilities to cope with social difficulties in the United States. *The Journal of Psychology*, 127(6), 603-610.
- Coelho, G. V. (1962). Personal growth and educational development through working studying abroad. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18(1), 55-67.
- Cuellar, I., Harris, L., & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 2, 199-217.
- Dona, G., & Berry, J. W. (1994). Acculturation attitudes and acculturative stress of Central American refugees. *International Journal of Psychology*, 29(1), 57-90.
- Georgas, J., Berry, J. W., Shaw, A., Christakopoulou, S., & Mylonas, K. (1996). Acculturation of Greek family values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27(3), 329-338.
- Georgas, J., & Kalantzi-Azizi, A. (1992). Value acculturation and response tendencies of biethnic adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(2), 228-239.

- Gibson, M. A. (2001). Immigrant adaptation and patterns of acculturation. *Human Development*, 44, 19-23.
- Gibson, M. A. (1998). Promoting academic success among immigrant students: Is acculturation the issues? *Educational Policy*, 12(6), 615-633.
- Gibson, M. A. (1997). Complicating the immigrant/involuntary minority typology. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 28(3), 431-454.
- Glaser, W. (1978). *The brain drain: Emigration and return*. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Guan, J., & Dodder, R. A. (2001). The impact of cross-cultural contact on value and identity: A comparative study of Chinese student in China and in the U.S.A. *Mankind Quarterly*, 41(3), 271-289.
- Hayes, R. L., & Lin, H. (1994, January). Coming to America: Developing social support systems for international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 22, 7-16.
- Herz, L., & Gullone, E. (1999). The relationship between self-esteem and parenting style: A cross-cultural comparison of Australian and Vietnamese Australian adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(6), 742-761.

- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Liebkind, K. (2000). Predictors of the actual degree of acculturation of Russian-speaking immigrant adolescents in Finland. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 503-518.
- Kagan, H., & Cohen, J. (1990). Cultural adjustment of international students. *Psychological Science*, 1(2), 133-137.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1978). Cross-national encounters: Turkish students in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2(2), 141-160.
- Kelman, H. C. (1962). Changing attitudes through international activities. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18(1), 68-87.
- Kim, B. S. K., Atkinson, D. R., & Yang, P. H. (1999). The Asian Value Scale: Development, factor analysis, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 46(3), 342-352.
- Kimhi, S., & Bliwise, N. G. (1992). Perceived change of values and intention to return among Kibbutz people who emigrated from Israel. *The Journal of Psychology*, 126(6), 661-670.

- Kwan, K. L. K. (2000). The internal-external ethnic identity measure: Factor-analytic structures based on a sample of Chinese Americans. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(1), 142-152.
- Lay, C., & Nguyen, T. (1998). The role of acculturation-related and acculturation non-specific daily hassles: Vietnamese-Canadian students and psychological distress. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 30(3), 172-181.
- Manaster, G. J., Chan, J. C., & Safady, R. (1992). Mexican-American migrant students' Academic success: Sociological and psychological acculturation. *Adolescence*, 27(105), 124-136.
- Manese, J. E., Sedlacek, W. E., & Leong, F. T. L. (1988). Needs and perceptions of female and male international undergraduate students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 16(1), 24-29.
- Marks, M. S. (1987). Preparing international students in the United States for reentering the home country. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 15(3), 120-128.

- Marshall, T. (1970). The strategy of international exchange. In I. Eide (Ed.), *Students as links between cultures* (pp. 3-31). Oslo, Norway: Dreyer Aksjeselskap.
- Mena, F. J., Padilla, A. M., & Maldonado, M. (1987). Acculturative stress and specific coping strategies among immigrant and later generation college students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 207-225.
- International Educational Exchange. (2001). *Open Doors 2001 report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved December 15, 2001, from <http://opendoors.iienetwork/?p = 31670>
- Pak, A. W., Dion, K. L., & Dion, K. K. (1985). Correlates of self-confidence with English among Chinese students in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 17(4), 369-378.
- Pham, T. B., & Harris, R. J. (2001). Acculturation strategies among Vietnamese-Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 279-300.
- Pedersen, P. B. (1991). Counseling international students. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 19(1), 10-58.

- Reece, D., & Palmgreen, P. (2000). Coming to American: Need for acculturation and media use motives among Indian sojourners in the US. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 807-824.
- Ritterband, P. (1970). Law, policy, and behavior: Educational exchange policy and student migration. *American Journal of Sociology*, 76(1), 71-82.
- Ryder, A. G., Alden, L. E., & Paulhus, D. L. (2000). Is acculturation unidimensional or bidimensional? A head-to-head comparison in the prediction of personality, self-identity, and adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(1), 49-65.
- Sandhu, D. S., & Asrabadi, B. R. (1994). Development of an acculturative stress scale for international students: Preliminary findings. *Psychological Reports*, 75, 435-448.
- Schmitt, N., Schmitt, D., & Clapham, C. (2001). Developing and exploring the behaviour of two new versions of the vocabulary level tests. *Language Testing*, 18(1), 55-88.
- Selltiz, C., Christ, J. R., Havel, J., & Cook, S. W. (1963). *Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States*. Minneapolis, MN: Lund Press, Inc.

- Selltiz, C., & Cook, S. W. (1962). Factors influencing attitudes of foreign students toward the host country. *Journal of Social Issues*, 18(1), 7-23.
- Shih, S., & Brown, C. (2000). Taiwanese international students: Acculturation level and vocational identity. *Journal of Career Development*, 27(1), 35-47.
- Sodowsky, G. R., & Plake, B. (1992, September/October). A study of acculturation differences among international people and suggestions for sensitivity to within-group differences. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 71, 53-59.
- Suinn, R. M. (2001). Psychosocial measures for Asian Americans: Tools for practice and research. Retrieved October 8, 2001, from Columbia University, School of Social Work Website:
<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw/projects/pmap>
- Suinn, R. M., Khoo, G., & Ahuna, C. (1995). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: Cross-cultural information. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 23, 139-148.

- Suinn, R. M., Ahuna, C., & Khoo, G. (1992). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: Concurrent and factorial validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 52, 1041-1046.
- Suinn, R. M., Richard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47, 401-407.
- Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W. M., & Fernandez, T. (1980). Bicultural involvement and adjustment in Hispanic-American youths. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 4, 353-365.
- Tsai, J. L., Ying, Y., & Lee, P. A. (2000). The meaning of "being Chinese" and "being American": Variation among Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(3), 302-332.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., & Eisses, A. M. (1998). Integration and assimilation of Moroccan immigrants in Israel and the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(3), 293-307.
- Van Oudenhoven, J. P., Prins, K. S., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). Attitudes of minority and majority members towards adaptation of immigrants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28, 995-1013.

- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(4), 422-442.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1993). Where's the "culture" in cross-cultural transition?: Comparative studies of sojourner adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 24(2), 221-249.
- Wilson, R. (1990, November 28). Foreign students in U.S. reach a record 396,000. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A1.
- Ying, Y., & Liese, L. H. (1994). Initial adjustment of Taiwanese students to the United States: The impact of postarrival variables. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(4), 466-477.
- Young, M. Y., & Gardner, R. C. (1990). Modes of acculturation and second language proficiency. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 22(1), 59-71.
- Zhang, N., & Rentz, A. L. (1996). Intercultural adaptation among graduate students from the People's Republic of China. *College Student Journal*, 30(2), 321-328.

- Zheng, X., & Berry, J. W. (1991). Psychological adaptation of Chinese sojourners in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology*, 26(4), 451-470.
- Zweig, D., & Changgui, C. (1995). *China's brain drain to the United States: Views of overseas Chinese students and scholars in the 1990s*. Berkley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California at Berkley.