

December 2017

# What Motivates International Students to Acculturate? Exploring Acculturative Beliefs Using the Theory of Planned Behavior as Framework

Seokhoon Ahn

*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.uwm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ahn, Seokhoon, "What Motivates International Students to Acculturate? Exploring Acculturative Beliefs Using the Theory of Planned Behavior as Framework" (2017). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1568.

<https://dc.uwm.edu/etd/1568>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by UWM Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UWM Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [open-access@uwm.edu](mailto:open-access@uwm.edu).

WHAT MOTIVATES INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS TO ACCULTURATE? EXPLORING  
ACCULTURATIVE BELIEFS USING THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR AS  
FRAMEWORK

by

Seokhoon Ahn

A Dissertation Submitted in  
Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Communication

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

December 2017

## ABSTRACT

### WHAT MOTIVATES INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS TO ACCULTURATE? EXPLORING ACCULTURATIVE BELIEFS USING THE THEORY OF PLANNED BEHAVIOR AS FRAMEWORK

by

Seokhoon Ahn

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2017  
Under the Supervision of Professor Tae-Seop Lim

The current study explores what motivates international students to choose how to acculturation in the academic environment. The traditional view in the field tends to consider acculturation as objective criteria with an assumption that a certain acculturation strategy (i.e., integration) is better than another (assimilation). Using Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB; 1991), the study assessed how international students' beliefs (i.e., subjective norms, behavioral control and attitudes) would influence their choice of acculturation behaviors (i.e., affiliating with Americans and/or other international students from the same country, and practicing American and/or home-country values), and how the relationship between the acculturation beliefs and their acculturation choice would relate to their assessment of migration. The study also distinguished the subjective norms into two groups including the host-country group and home-country group, recognizing that international students are exposed to both groups. Participants ( $N = 69$ ) were mainly recruited from a large public university in Midwest in the U.S. A total of 69 international students in the U.S. completed the survey. The sample consisted of 43.47% East Asian students ( $n = 53$ ), 24.63% middle Eastern students ( $n = 17$ ), 20.29% from other regions ( $n = 14$ ) including South Asia, Africa and Europe. The results

showed that attitudes and subjective norms predicted all of the acculturation behaviors, while behavioral control predicted the choice of affiliating with Americans and international students, and practicing American values. The analysis demonstrates that international students' satisfaction with their life in the U.S. was influenced by relationship with Americans and subjective norm of Americans.

© Copyright by Seokhoon Ahn, 2017  
All Rights Reserved

To  
my family,  
my teachers,  
my friends,  
and my God

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Theory of Acculturation .....	6
International Students as Migrants .....	17
Theory of Planned Behavior .....	19
Assessment of Settlement .....	27
Methods .....	30
Results .....	35
Discussion .....	39
Limitation and Future Research .....	45
Conclusion .....	48
Tables .....	49
References .....	60
Appendix .....	78
Curriculum Vitae .....	83

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Correlations Among Acculturation Categories .....	49
Table 2. Correlations Between Acculturative Behaviors and Acculturation Choice .....	50
Table 3. Multiple Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs on Acculturation Choice .....	51
Table 4. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation with Host Group on Assessment of School .....	52
Table 5. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation Home Group on Assessment of School .....	53
Table 6. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing American Values on Assessment of School .....	54
Table 7. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing Home Values on Assessment of School .....	55
Table 8. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation with Host Group on Assessment of Life in the U.S. ....	56
Table 9. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation Home Group on Assessment of Life in the U.S. ....	57
Table 10. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing American Values on Assessment of Life in the U.S. ....	58
Table 11. Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing Home Values on Assessment of Life in the U.S. ....	59

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been indebted to so many people in my life. I would like to first thank my advisor, Dr. Tae-Seop Lim, who has guided me through my academic journey and challenged to become a critical scholar. I also want to thank Mrs. Myunghee Kim, who always showed me warmth and love through great hospitality. I would like to acknowledge and thank my teachers including all of my committee members: Dr. Mike Allen, Dr. Nancy Burrell, and Dr. Sang-Yeon Kim. I would also like to thank Pastor Dong-Ju Choi, who first encouraged me to study abroad and always supported me with prayers and encouraging words.

I would like to thank my friends. My first thank goes to my mentor, Emily Cramer, who has always been there for me. You really changed my life a lot. I also want to appreciate my friendship with Sukwon Lee, Yoonmo Sang, Minchul Kim, and Chang-Shik Choi and his wife. I am just so grateful to have had you throughout my graduate school years.

Last, my utmost thank goes to my beloved family (dad, mom, sister, and brother-in law), who were always by my side regardless. Your endless support enabled me to finish my graduate program. I could not have asked for more loving and encouraging family. I am so proud of you.

## **Introduction**

Since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the number of migrants has significantly increased across countries. As of 2013, 231 million international migrants were living outside their respective home countries (United Nations, 2013), which is a 50% increase over the 1990 migrant population of approximately 154 million. Migration constitutes a global issue: migrant populations increased in the Western countries (e.g., those in Western Europe and North America) as well as in Asia (Korean Immigration Service, 2016; Saw, 2012), Africa (Statistics South Africa, 2015), and South America (Da Silva, 2013).

The rapid growth in global migration encouraged scholars in the field of intercultural studies to investigate how individuals adjust to the new culture. Since anthropologists first raised the subject of migration and adaptation (Refield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936), scholars sought to explain how environmental and social transitions influence migrants' mental health, identity, worldview, beliefs, and values. In particular, theories of acculturation become tested in diverse scholarly fields, including anthropology, psychology, sociology, epidemiology, medicine, business, education, nursing, and communication (McDermott-Levy, 2009).

Studies of acculturation produce incongruent empirical findings. In the domain of public health, a meta-analysis (Bradford, Allen, Casey, & Emmers-Sommer, 2002) assessing the effect of language proficiency (as the acculturation indicator) on health knowledge and behaviors regarding HIV or AIDS confirmed the importance of learning the host-country's language. However, some other empirical studies using different acculturation indicators produce contradictory findings on the effects of acculturation on health. For example, negative mental health such as depression or anxiety was not associated with several acculturation variables: foreign-born status, length of stay in a host country, and language use at home (Hilario, Vo,

Johnson, & Saewyc, 2014). It was also not associated with length of stay in one's home country, language preference, and voter registration (Valencia-Garcia, Simoni, Alegria, & Takeuchi, 2012). Similarly inconsistent findings of acculturation effects were observed in studies related to physical health. Esteban-Gonzalo et al. (2015) reported that a shorter time of residence (i.e., a low acculturation level) correlated with higher risks of obesity, while another study testing the effects of length of stay and adoption of dietary practice on obesity (BMI) found no significant association (Oster & Yung, 2010).

In terms of the role of acculturation in education, Lowing, He, Lin, and Chang (2014) found that proficiency in the home language decreases academic procrastination while culture shock promotes procrastinating behaviors. In contrast, less acculturation to the youth culture of the host society prevents immigrant children from misbehavior, as less-accultured youth are protected by the home culture's values, such as closer relationships with their family, less exposure to delinquent friends in the host culture, and a strong emphasis on collective values (Chen & Zhong, 2013). Smokowski, David-Ferdon and Stroupe's (2009) content analysis of empirical research provided supporting evidence that lower levels of acculturation and perseverance of ethnic values within the host culture correspond to less violent behaviors and aggression, but can offer a causal link to experiencing fear or becoming a victim of bullying.

These incongruent empirical findings on acculturation might have stemmed from the complicated conceptualizations and operationalization of the theory. First, a wide range of acculturation variables, including language use, length of stay in a host country, or practiced cultural values, have been loosely included in research without considering the validity of the construct as an acculturation indicator. In their content analysis of 29 studies, Makarova and Birman (2015) pointed out that different operationalization in each study might have caused

contradictory effects of acculturation. To address such issues, scholars have suggested categorizing acculturation domains to establish the external validity of the concept (Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008).

Another problem is the tendency to overlook migrants' perspectives as to how to acculturate in a host country. The *mainstream-centered* approach caused a false assumption among scholars that migrants should acculturate to the host culture in a certain way. However, migrants settle into various host-culture environments, and the diversity of the host cultures might induce different acculturation needs in order to successfully settle down. Another recent movement in acculturation studies also criticizes the dichotomous view of the host and home cultures, which assumes that the mainstream group is the only host culture and the minority group is always the 'inferior one' (Alba & Nee, 2009).

Encouraged by these newer perspectives, the current study takes a 'migrant-centered' approach, suggesting that the choice of acculturation should be understood in consideration of how migrants define a proper acculturation for their settlement in a host country, instead of viewing acculturation from scholars' perspectives. This migrant-centered approach to acculturation could provide more meaningful implications and practical suggestions for migrants, as it stands on the premise that migrants choose certain behaviors and acculturation strategies according to their beliefs about which strategies would work the best for the host environments into which they are settling.

Thus, the current study aims to identify what determines migrants' acculturation choices from the perspectives of migrants. Specifically, the study will assess (1) how migrants' acculturative beliefs motivate them to adopt their acculturation choices, and (2) how different acculturation categories play a role in the relationship between migrants' beliefs and

acculturation choices. Recognizing the rapid growth and large portion of the populations in higher education institutions the study will particularly focus on international students among different types of migrants (e.g., travelers, students, temporary overseas workers, refugees, and long-term migrants), and investigate how their acculturative beliefs and choices help them assess their adjustment to school and life in the host country.

Emphasizing beliefs about acculturation as precedents of acculturation choices, the current study will use Ajzen's (1985) theory of planned behavior (TPB) as a theoretical framework to explore how individuals' views of acculturation strategies would affect their actual choice to acculturate. The theory suggests that individuals' behavioral choices are predicted by three types of beliefs: attitudes, perceived norms, and behavioral control. Specifically, the current study will examine how international students' choices of acculturation—including affiliation with the host group, affiliation with the home group, practicing host-country values, and practicing home values—are influenced by subjective norms (i.e., what acculturation strategy is considered important by the host and home groups), behavioral control (i.e., how confident the participants feel in each acculturation strategy), and attitudes (i.e., how much they favor each acculturation strategy). The study, then, will investigate how individual choices throughout the process of acculturation affect the assessment of the adjustment in the host environment.

The following section will review the acculturation literature, including conceptualization and model development, and discuss the importance of studying international students as a migrant group for acculturation research. The next section will discuss the theory of planned behavior and provide a rationale for why the theory should be applied to the context of acculturation. The following sections will provide an explanation of the research methods,

present and discuss the results of the analyses, identify several implications for the study, and suggest directions for future research.

## Theories of Acculturation

### Early Stages of Acculturation Theory

The initial work on acculturation utilized the linear and uni-dimensional approach developed in the early 20th century (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). Redfield and his colleagues defined acculturation as “those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original cultural patterns or both groups. Under this definition, acculturation is to be distinguished from culture change, of which it is but one aspect, and assimilation, which is at times a phase of acculturation” (p. 149). The two different groups coming into contact may share different cultural characteristics such as atmosphere (i.e., friendly or hostile), size (i.e., equivalent or different), or economic system (i.e., material vs. non-material). Redfield et al. make a point to distinguish acculturation from assimilation, which they argue is the ending stage of the acculturation continuum.

Moving beyond Redfield and colleagues, the predominant migration frameworks in early acculturation research were Park’s melting pot theory and Oberg’s culture shock theory. Melting pot theory (Park, 1928), drawing from a sociological point of view, posits that an encounter of two different social relations ultimately leads to assimilation through the sharing of experiences and history and the development of a cultural common ground. The theory assumes that (a) one culture is superior and greater than the other and (b) the transformational trajectories migrants experience in the dominant culture result in *emancipation* and *enlightenment*. Consistently, Oberg (1960), also using the context of two groups, viewed individuals’ adjustment as a linear process consisting of six stages: strain, a sense of loss/feelings of deprivation, being rejected,

confusion, surprise/anxiety/disgust, and feelings of impotence. The linear process assumes that individuals experience negative emotions during the adaptation to a new culture.

These linear and uni-dimensional approaches reflect the myth of *second-generation decline* in the historical background of the Age of Mass Migration (1850-1913). The largest influx of migrants came from European countries, and comprised 22% of the labor force in the U.S. during the period. Substantial but unfounded concerns about the European migrants' assimilation were raised among scholars, Congress, and administrators (Abramitzky, Boustan, & Eriksson, 2014). However, regardless of their economic status upon first arrival, the "average" European migrants successfully settled into the U.S. over a long period of time. The linear acculturation model continued to operate as the dominant approach to migrants' acculturation processes (Adler, 1977; Gordon, 1964; Taft, 1962) until the second large wave of migrants came to the U.S. from non-English speaking countries (e.g., Asian and Hispanic countries) in mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. Unlike the second generation of European migrants, the migrants from non-English countries showed different patterns of acculturation, in that some of the second-generation migrants failed to discard ethnic values and cultural practices.

### **The Bi-dimensional Acculturation Model**

The limited applications of the uni-dimensional acculturation framework led scholars to doubt that the dichotomous acculturation process would result in only one product, either *assimilation* or *separation*. In the 1980s, psychologists started to view the acculturation process as a phenomenon with multiple potential outcomes. Berry (1980), who developed one of the most cited acculturation theories over the past three decades, argued that social contact within the acculturation process may result in entirely different consequences for adaptation, rather than viewing acculturation as moving along a continuum (i.e., moving by degree from one side to the

other over time). Accordingly, he proposed a bi-dimensional acculturation model that consists of two basic dimensions: (a) perseverance of a home culture (maintaining cultural identity and characteristics), and (b) contact with the host culture into which migrants settle (maintaining relationships with other groups).

Based on the two dimensions of host and home culture, Berry's (1980) theory identifies four types of acculturation strategies emerging from migrants' varying attitudes toward the host group. The orthogonal model of acculturation includes *assimilation*, *separation*, *marginalization*, and *integration*. *Assimilation* occurs when individuals actively intend to seek relationships with others from the host group and thereby abandon their cultural identities. *Separation* is characterized by individuals only wanting to cling to their original culture while avoiding interaction with the host group. Individuals exhibit attitudes of *integration* when they attempt both to maintain their traditional way of living and to seek daily interactions with the host group. *Marginalization* refers to the attitude of incoming individuals who have little interest in maintaining their own culture and in interacting with others from the host group.

Berry (2005) understood the acculturation process to be a strategy that migrants actively choose. The notion of active choice in acculturation processes came from sociological approaches claiming that individual migrant acculturation experiences are likely to be influenced by the context of a host society. For example, a society that promotes cultural pluralism or multiculturalism would promote migrants' integration. An assimilation-oriented society is one

promoting a melting-pot ideology, whereas marginalization and separation become supported by societies endorsing exclusion and segregation, respectively (e.g., opposing diversity).

### **Refinement of the Bi-dimensional Model**

Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, and Senecal (1997) suggested a refinement of Berry's two-dimensional acculturation model (1980), pointing out that Berry's model utilized inconsistent measurements for the two dimensions of host- and home-culture identification. Questions regarding the home culture dimension evaluated individuals' identification with their home cultures, while the host culture dimension was measured by the amount of contact. Efforts to re-operationalize the host culture dimension also led Bourhis and colleagues to distinguish two different types of marginalization within Berry's original model. Focusing on the causes of marginalization, they categorized the attitude of migrants who are culturally alienated (i.e., rejecting both the host and home culture) as *anomie*. Conversely, they labeled the attitude of individuals who do not wish to identify themselves in terms of any culture, and who are marginalized due to an individualistic-type identity, as *individualism* (somewhat different from Hofstede's (1980) use of the term).

Another refinement of the acculturation model (Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, & Szapocznik, 2010) addressed issues with Berry's (1980) *integration* acculturation strategy. While biculturalism and integration were often used synonymously, Schwartz and his colleagues suggested two different types of integration: (a) migrants may separately practice their home cultural heritage and the customs of the host culture, and (b) migrants may create their own bicultural identity that is a mixture of two cultures (also referred to as *ethnogenesis*; Flannery, Reise, & Yu, 2001). The first type of integration presumes that individuals tactfully choose the practices of the home culture or host culture based on specific contexts (Nguyen & Martinez,

2010). For example, one may speak his/her ethnic language fluently but may refuse to be identified with the host culture. Migrants perceive the incompatibility of the opposing contexts in the two different cultures (Chen, Benet-Martinez, & Bond, 2008), and thus choose to practice cultural customs independently. Meanwhile, the “blend” of the two cultures is unique and reflects a totally new culture that does not completely match with either the home culture or host culture. Supposing that ethnicity can be “created and transformed,” acculturation inevitably promotes a new aspect of a culture previously unobserved (Roosens, 1989).

All in all, the recent acculturation models revising Berry’s work suggest that the acculturation process results in at least four possible attitudinal outcomes (Figure 1, for example, shows six types of acculturation). As Schwartz and his colleagues (2010) proposed, integration can be divided into *blended bi-culturalism*, i.e., creating a new cultural identity, and *integration*, practicing both cultures separately in context. The marginalization cell includes two forms of rejection: (a) rejection due to individualism, or seeking identity within oneself by denying any cultural identity, and (b) rejection due to cultural dissociation, such as confusion and chaos within the acculturation process. The expansion of the integration and marginalization domains raises questions as to whether a new dimension should be added to the model. Acculturation scholars possess contradictory view about refining the model: Bourhis et al. (1997) viewed their *individualism* acculturation process merely as a different type of marginalization, while Schwartz et al. (2010) recognized their *blended bi-culturalism* as a new dimension resulting in a tridimensional acculturation model.

### **Tridimensional Models**

Berry’s acculturation theory (1980) and successors mostly rest on the premise that acculturation results from contact between two different social groups. Individuals of an

incoming, often non-dominant, group may resist, integrate, become marginalized, or assimilate into the culture that is dominant in their new society. The simple presumption (i.e., treating one specific ethnic culture as the mainstream host culture) may not capture the true image of a host culture that is a multicultural society. For example, considerable research studying migrants' acculturation in the U.S. context has assumed domination of the European American, receiving culture (Gil-Kashiwabara, 2002; Güngöre et al., 2012; Kawamoto & Anguiano; Pérez-Escamilla, & Putnik, 2006; Tsai, Chentsova-Dutton, & Wong, 2002). However, as a multicultural country the U.S. includes other ethnic cultures: African American culture, for instance, has just as long a cultural history as its European American counterpart. Empirical research demonstrates larger discrepancies between White and non-White individuals, in terms of perceived mainstream U.S. values and personal value orientations (Fujioka & Neuendori, 2015).

Accordingly, conceptions of “mainstream” values may not always be consistent with non-mainstream group values, and overlooking the diversity of a heterogeneous culture may result in misleading implications about the actual culture into which individuals become acculturated. The real problem of the bi-dimensional acculturation model arises when the research is applied to the multicultural societies where one national cultural value cannot be readily defined. In multicultural countries such as Singapore, the dominant culture may also vary based on the regions—a culture considered as a mainstream group in one location may be a minor group in another location. Furthermore, a migrant may reside in a neighborhood of one ethnic group within the host culture, but his workplace may be located in a neighborhood where another ethnic group is dominant. Berry's acculturation theory (1980) fails to capture the dynamics and complexity of such diverse cultural contexts. Given this limitation, the current

study proposes an alternate approach to acculturation that can cover different cultural dynamics and immigration contexts.

In order to address the limited application of uni- and bi-dimensional acculturation models to multicultural societies, some researchers have moved towards a conceptualization of a tridimensional acculturation model, by considering three ethnic cultures in the host society (Ferguson, Bornstein, & Pottinger, 2012; Ferguson, Iturbide, & Gordon, 2014). For example, immigrants from Jamaica who settle in the U.S. may deal with Jamaican, European American, and African American cultures. A tridimensional model would consider these immigrants' identity (i.e., how much they identify themselves as a member of each cultural group), affiliation with each of the three cultural groups, and the food/media preferences of each culture. Both studies conducted by Ferguson and colleagues (2012, 2014) found a similar distribution of acculturation patterns: either integration or separation was observed among Jamaican immigrants. For those adopting attitudes of integration, most immigrants emphasized triculturalism (a strong integration into all three cultural groups) followed by biculturalism (integrated into two of the three cultures). Separation patterns (e.g., preserving a Jamaican culture only) were also found.

### **Operationalization: Instruments of Acculturation**

As discussed previously, acculturation is defined as a set of changes that individual experiences throughout the processes of settling into a new culture. These changes could range from switching linguistic use to adopting new cultural values. This wide range of acculturation contexts has led scholars to develop dozens of scales assessing various changes in acculturation processes. More than 65 acculturation scales have been identified from searches in an online database (Antioch University New England Multicultural Center for Research and Practice, n.d.),

meta-analytic research (Huynh, Howell, & Benet-Martinez, 2009; Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013), an academic handbook (Davis & Engel, 2011), and critical reviews of the acculturation scales in peer-reviewed journals (Kang, 2006; Suinn, 2010; Zane & Mark, 2003). The substantial number of scales may stem from scholars' attempts to address potential ethnic differences (e.g., cultural values) in acculturation and to customize the acculturation scales to the specific ethnic group operating as the target of research. For example, David and Engel (2011) identified several acculturation scales customized for Asian ( $N = 8$ ), Hispanic ( $N = 16$ ), African American ( $N = 14$ ), and Native American ( $N = 2$ ) ethnic groups, as well as scales for generic immigrant populations ( $N = 11$ ).

Cultural complexity also affects the number of scales. As many scholars have recognized, culture is comprised of various components and subcultures. Culture can be “the fabric of ideas, ideals, beliefs, norms, customs and traditions, systems of knowledge, institutions, aesthetic objects, and material things of arts” (Offorma, 2016, p. 4), as well as “food habits, languages, festivals, marriage ceremonies, methods of thinking and etiquette” (p. 4). The values and beliefs, which are passed down across generations, are internalized in oneself, while visible behavioral elements of a culture reflect its underlying core (Erez & Gati, 2004). The broad concepts of *culture* have led to vague conceptualization and operationalization of acculturation scales; some scales such as length of stay (Kuo & Roysircar, 2004), birth place (Duffey, Gordon-Larsen, Ayala, & Popkin, 2008), or immigration generation status (Valentine, 2001) do not perfectly match with the components of a given culture.

In response, some scholars have recently attempted to re-operationalize acculturation. For example, Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga, and Szapocznik (2010) categorized acculturation into three types: *behavioral acculturation* (e.g., language use, media preferences, and food

preferences), *cognitive acculturation* (e.g., prioritizing one's own needs vs. the needs of one's family and community), and *affective acculturation* (e.g., the extent to which one feels a sense of solidarity with, and attachment to, the host country and/or one's country of origin). Schwartz et al. also pointed out that the majority of the scales still utilized uni-dimensional approaches, in spite of the empirical evidence showing the benefits of bi-dimensional approaches.

**Behavioral acculturation.** Behavioral aspects of acculturation have functioned as a main focus of acculturation research (Schwartz et al., 2010). Behavioral acculturation operationalizes acculturation in terms of cultural practices such as language use, media use, dietary preferences, or other daily living habits. Language use may be assessed in several ways, including the frequency of ethnic or host language usage (e.g., *how much do you speak English/Chinese at home/school/work/prayer/with friends*; Tsai, Ying & Lee, 2000), comfort level in using the ethnic or home language (e.g., *how comfortable do you feel speaking/thinking/speaking Spanish/English at home/with friends*; Montgomery, 1992), or proficiency with each language (e.g., *how well can you read, write and speak the ethnic/host language*; Schachter, Kimbro, & Gorman, 2012). Another behavioral acculturation measure is media preferences (e.g., *how much do you enjoy Hispanic or American music/dances/places/recreation/TV programs/radio stations/books and magazines*; Szapocznik, Kurtines, & Fernandez, 1980). Dietary acculturation has been measured by asking research subjects to rate their consumption of specific food items (Kim, Lee, Ahn, Bowen, & Lee, 2007) or report dietary changes (e.g., *is there something you eat a lot now that you rarely ate before you came to the United States*; *food preferences*, Okafor, Carter-Pokras, & Zhan, 2014).

**Affective acculturation.** Affective acculturation deals with cultural identification (Schwartz et al., 2010), including self-identity, family socialization, and social affiliation. Self-

identity scales measure feelings of attachment to a home/host culture (e.g., *how much pride do you have in the oriental/Asian/Asian American/American group*, Suinn, Ahuna, & Khoo, 1992; *I am happy that I am black*, Resnicow, Soler, Braithwaite, Selassie, & Smith, 1999). Socialization with family members is measured using question items such as *I am committed to strength and cohesion in the Black family* (Thompson, 2001). Social affiliation asks about social relationships in terms of preference (e.g., *I would prefer to live in a Chinese/Chinese-American/American community*; Tsai, Ying, & Lee, 2000), comfort levels (e.g., *I feel comfortable with Dutch/Moroccan people*, Stevens, Pels, Vollebergh, & Crijnen, 2004), or the quantity of respondents' relationships/interactions with home/host people (e.g., *the greatest proportions of your friends/people/parties/neighborhood are Black*, Stevens, Pels, Vollebergh, & Crijnen, 2004; *When I was a child, my friends were Chinese/Chinese American/American*; Tsai et al., 2000)

**Cognitive acculturation.** Cognitive acculturation assesses cultural values, norms, or traditions. While some scales operationalize cognitive acculturation more generically (e.g., *I have difficulty accepting some ideas/attitudes/values by Anglos/Mexicans*; Cuellar, Arnold, & Maldonado, 1995), others directly assess ethnic values. The Asian Values Scale (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999), for example, identifies five Asian values: collectivism (e.g., *the welfare of the group should be put before that of the individual*), conformity to norms (e.g., *one should recognize and adhere to social expectations, norms, and practices*), emotional self-control (e.g., *it is more important to behave appropriately than to act on what one is feeling*), family recognition through achievement (e.g., *one should achieve academically since it reflects on one's family*), and humility (e.g., *one should not openly talk about one's accomplishments*).

By delineating these categories of acculturation, the current study will separately examine the relationships between individual acculturative beliefs and the choice of acculturation.

Particularly, the current research will use affective acculturation (i.e., social affiliation with the home-country and host-country group) and cognitive acculturation (i.e., cultural values) for the model. First, however, the study will assess how different categories relate to one another to test if acculturation domains should be treated differently.

*Research Question 1: How do affiliating with Americans, affiliating with international students from the same country, practicing American values, and practicing home-country values correlate with one another?*

## **International Students as Short-Term Migrants**

Based on the characteristics such as the length of stay and voluntariness of intercultural contact, scholars have identified three types of migrants (Berry, Kim, Minde, & Mok, 1987; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001). The first type would be sojourners who migrate to another country for a limited time. Sojourners include international students, foreign workers, missionaries, volunteers, and travelers who migrate voluntarily and temporarily. The second type of migrants is long-term immigrants, who have voluntary motives to move to a new country for a long-term or permanent residency. Refugees, the third type of migrants, have involuntary motivations to settle in a new country, either long-term or short-term, based on the conditions of their asylum.

Although many international students are ultimately expected to return to their home countries after graduation, the large proportion of international students in U.S. colleges has motivated significant scholarly work designed to ensure their well-being and academic success. The number of international students enrolled in the U.S. from 2015 to 2016 exceeded one million, with a total accumulated number of over 20 million international students since 1948 (Institute of International Education, 2016). Many U.S. higher education institutions have focused on international students, as they offer the institutions various benefits in terms of cultural diversity (Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2013; Soria & Troisi, 2014), intellectual insights (Chellaraj, Maskus, & Matto, 2008), and economic resources (NAFSA, 2016). Adjustment issues, as an acculturation outcome, also have immediate and strong impacts on their academic performance, which is particularly important since international students have a restricted timeframe to successfully adjust to their new environments while they pursue their education.

In addition, the potential for international students to live and work in the U.S. long-term after graduation necessitates their adjustment to U.S. cultures. Consistent with the academic definition, the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (UCCIS) office considers a student visa (mainly F1 and J1 types) as a non-immigrant type of visa, and expects students to return to their home countries upon the completion of their studies (UCCIS, n.d.). Although both academia and the U.S. government consider international students to be short-term migrants (or non-immigrants), many international students remain in the U.S. to pursue employment opportunities. The H-1B program regulated by USCIS annually grants approximately 20,000 H-1B visas to F1 students with a master's degree or higher, in addition to the 65,000 H-1Bs that can be issued to any F1 students. There is also an unlimited exemption cap for visa holders who are employed at non-profit organizations such as universities (USCIS, 2017). The chance for employment, then, offers another path to becoming potential long-term immigrants in the U.S. While there is no direct data on the rates of visa transfers from F1 to H-1B to permanent resident, the non-immigrant statistics published in 2017 show that lawful permanent resident status was given to 845,951 individuals, 109,105 of whom (approximately 12.81%) obtained permanent residency based on employment preferences.

## **The Theory of Planned of Behavior**

Empirical studies have found that migrants adopt different acculturation strategies based on the specific contexts of the host country in which they settle (Ait Ouarasse & Vijver, 2004; Birman, Trickett, & Buchanan, 2005). For example, immigrant children tend to behave in an American way outside home when interacting with their American peers, but follow the traditional ways of their own ethnicity at home when communicating with their parents (Schwartz et al., 2010). In order to better understand why migrants choose different acculturation strategies, one should look into what motivates migrants to decide how to acculturate, a process that may differ based on the specific host-country environments.

Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB, 1985) offers a framework to analyze what influences migrants' adoptions of acculturation, and the model has been used to study and predict both social and health behaviors (Rivis & Sheeran, 2003). Derived from Fishbein's (1979) Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), TPB has been widely used as a theoretical model to predict social behaviors in various contexts. By expanding TRA, which emphasizes normative and behavioral beliefs, Ajzen (1985, 1992) proposes three factors that predict the intentions of performing a behavior, and which lead to the actual practice of that behavior. The three precedents of behaviors include attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, which are formed respectively by behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs.

### **Subjective Norms**

While a descriptive norm refers to the perceived behavioral patterns of others (Rimal, Lpinski, Cook, & Real 2005), a subjective norm is defined as "perceived social pressure to perform or not to perform the behavior" (Ajzen, 1991, p. 188), and mainly deals with whether or not individuals perceive that the behavior would be approved or disapproved by the groups that

they consider important. Although the role of descriptive norms in predicting social behavior has been demonstrated by empirical studies (Cialdini, Reno, & Kallgren, 1990; Larimer, Turner, Mallett, & Geisner, 2004; Sheeran & Orbell, 1999), the initial TPB model only included subjective norms as the contributing factor to predict social behaviors. Subjective norms deal more with social pressure, i.e., “what ought to be done,” rather than “what is done” (Rivis & Sheehan, 2003), and are formed by normative beliefs (Ajzen, 2002). Individuals’ perceptions of what the groups to which they belong expect regarding certain behaviors contribute to choosing a certain behavior desired by the group (Ajzen 2011). Perceived social norms play an especially important role in determining social behaviors when a situation features high uncertainty (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004).

The group norms about acculturation that migrants perceive could affect choices of acculturation strategies. If migrants perceive that the group members would approve a certain cultural practice, migrants may comply with the normative acculturation strategy in order to succeed in the group, which could explain the earlier example of why immigrant youths tend to follow American norms when interacting with their peers while practicing the traditional norms of their own ethnicity when they are with their parents. Similarly, at school immigrant children may adapt themselves to the host culture due to peer pressure (Zhou, 1997), fears of victimization (Peguero, 2009), or violence (Peguero, 2008). On the other hand, immigrant children cannot help but comply with the traditional norms of their home culture if they want to avoid conflicts with their parents, who often disapprove of their immigrant children behaving in an “American” way at home (Lim, Yeh, Liang, Lau, & McCabe, 2008).

Migrants are in a unique position to experience these dynamics, since they are exposed to both host and home cultures and deal with both host-country groups and home-country groups.

In a similar way, international students in the U.S. are surrounded by American students, as well as by other international students who are from the same country. Not only would international students perceive the norms of the host group but also those of their home-country peers. Bocner, Mcleod, and Lin (1977) identified three kinds of social networks in which international students are involved: a network from the country of origin, a network of people from the host country, and a multinational network. Their analysis noted that the networks consisting of people from the same country and those from the host country serve as the most important friendships for international students. Schild (1962), in his earlier study, also provided evidence that international students are under pressure to comply with the norms of the host culture, while being placed in a position to maintain or abandon the norms of their home countries after arriving in the host country. Unlike the original TPB model, the current study includes both Americans as the host group and fellow students from the same country as the home group on campus, to test how the perceived norms from the two different groups influence international students' acculturation choices. Therefore, Hypotheses 1 and 2 are proposed as follows:

*Hypothesis 1: Subjective norms of Americans will be positively correlated with international students' acculturation choices.*

*H1a: Subjective norms of Americans will be positively correlated with international students' affiliation with Americans.*

*H1b: Subjective norms of Americans will be positively correlated with international students' affiliation with other international students from the same country on campus.*

*H1c: Subjective norms of Americans will be positively correlated with practicing American values.*

*H1d: Subjective norms of Americans will be positively correlated with practicing home-country values.*

*Hypothesis 2: Subjective norms of other international students from the same country will be positively correlated with international students' acculturation choices.*

*H2a: Subjective norms of other international students from the same country will be positively correlated with affiliating with American students.*

*H2b: Subjective norms of other international students from the same country will be positively correlated with affiliating with other international students from the same country.*

*H2c: Subjective norms of other international students from the same country will be positively correlated with practicing American values*

*H2d: Subjective norms of other international students from the same country will be positively correlated with practicing home-country values.*

## **Behavioral Control**

The second belief pertains to behavioral control, which refers to “people’s perception of the ease or difficulty of performing the behavior of interest” (Ajzen, 1992, p. 183). Behavioral control, or normative beliefs, was not included in the original TRA model (Fishbein, 1979), but TRA does consider *volitional control*, i.e. individuals’ ability to decide to perform the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Behavioral control in TPB has been used interchangeably with Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy (1977), which is defined as “the conviction that one can successfully carry out the behavior required to produce a particular outcome” (p. 193), and scholars have used Bandura’s self-efficacy (1982) scale to measure behavioral control in TPB (Conner & Armitage, 1998). However, Bandura (1992) distinguished between the two concepts: self-efficacy refers to

“beliefs in one’s capabilities of mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to meet given situational demands” (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 364), while Ajzen’s (1991) behavioral control emphasizes one’s *actual* control over accomplishing a behavior in addition to the confidence in one’s ability (indirect control) that derives from a belief.

Empirical research on acculturation, however, has mainly adopted self-efficacy as individuals’ belief that they can control their behavior rather than using Ajzen’s concept of actual behavioral control. Several studies have applied self-efficacy in social relationships in the context of immigration and study-abroad programs (Constantine, Okazaki, & Utsey, 2004; Fan & Man, 1998), but there is little research on how the perceived control would play a role in acculturation behaviors. Some critics also pointed out that acculturation is not a full choice of free will, since migrants may be pressured to adopt a certain acculturation strategy (Ngo, 2008). From the empirical research that showed the influence of self-efficacy on individuals’ behaviors including social relationships, the current study presumes that international students’ behavioral control would be positively related to their acculturation choices (i.e., affiliating with Americans and/or their fellow international students, and practicing host-country and/or home-country values). Thus, I put forth the following hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 3: Behavioral control perceived by international students will predict their acculturation choices.*

*H3a: Behavioral control perceived by international students will predict their affiliation with American students on campus.*

*H3b: Behavioral control perceived by international students will predict their affiliation with other international students from the same country on campus.*

*H3c: Behavioral control perceived by international students will predict their performance of American values.*

*H3d: Behavioral control perceived by international students will predict their performance of home-country values.*

## **Attitudes**

TRA defined an attitude as “a person’s location on a bipolar evaluative or affective dimension with respect to some object, action or event”; these attitudes “represent a person’s general feeling of favorableness or unfavorableness toward some stimulus object” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975, p. 216). Similarly, TPB conceptualized attitude as “the degree to which a person has a favorable or unfavorable evaluation or appraisal of the behavior in question” (p. 188).

Individuals’ beliefs about the outcome of performing a behavior generate their attitudes toward that behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Ajzen’s (2002) proposal on operationalizing behavior, however, focused more on individuals’ evaluations of behaviors by using a scale that counterbalances positive and negative endpoints. For example, he suggested using adjectives like *harmful-beneficial*, *pleasant-unpleasant*, *good-bad*, *worthless-valuable*, and *enjoyable-unenjoyable* as a scale to measure the performance of “walking on a treadmill for 30 minutes each day in the forthcoming month.”

Berry and colleagues’ (1989) popular theoretical model used the term *acculturation attitudes* rather than *acculturation strategies*, because they assumed that the adoption of an acculturation strategy represents migrants’ attitudes toward how they adjust to the new culture. However, acculturation attitudes may be a predictor of how they acculturate, rather than the actual acculturation, as noted by other scholars who pointed out other precedents for acculturation strategies (Ngo, 2008). Recognizing the significant empirical research that

illustrates the effects of attitudes on behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005), the current study will assess the effects of international students' attitudes on their acculturation choice. It proposes the following hypothesis.

*Hypothesis 4: International students' attitudes toward acculturation will be positively correlated with their acculturation choices.*

*H4a: International students' attitudes toward affiliating with Americans will be positively correlated with affiliating with Americans.*

*H4b: International students' attitudes toward affiliating with other international students from the same country will be positively correlated with affiliating with other international students from the same country.*

*H4c: International students' attitudes toward practicing American values will be positively correlated with affiliating with practicing American values.*

*H4d: International students' attitudes toward practicing home values will be positively correlated with practicing home-country values.*

In addition to assessing individual effects of the TPB variables on acculturation, the current study also proposes Research Question 2 to test the overall fit of the TPB model in acculturation. As mentioned earlier, international students' acculturation may not be determined by just one of the variables: their perceived norms of the host group and home-country group, behavioral control, and attitudes may play different roles in how they adopt acculturation strategies. Thus, the current study will explore how subjective norms, behavioral control, and attitudes influence these students' acculturation choices.

*Research Question 2. How is the choice of acculturation influenced by norms, attitudes, and behavioral controls?*

*RQ2a. How is affiliation with Americans influenced by norms, attitudes, and behavioral controls?*

*RQ2b. How is affiliation with international students be influenced by norms, attitudes, and behavioral controls?*

*RQ2c. How is practicing American values be influenced by norms, attitudes, and behavioral controls?*

*RQ2d. How is practicing home-country values be influenced by norms, attitudes, and behavioral controls?*

## Assessment of Settlement

When empirical research in acculturation has examined the relationship between the choice of acculturation strategies and their outcomes, some findings provided contradictory evidence. Migrants who were more oriented toward their home cultures reported some positive effects, such as higher life satisfaction, more often than host-oriented individuals did (Edwards & Lopes, 2006). This suggests that integration or assimilation strategies may not necessarily bring about positive outcomes, as assumed by scholars. Rather, positive acculturation outcomes may correspond to the specific contexts of the host country to which migrants move. For example, while linguistic ability is one of the most widely-used acculturation indicators (Bradford, Allen, Casey, & Emmers-Sommer, 2002), host-language proficiency only predicts positive outcomes based on the contexts that determine the importance of being able to speak the host language. Kang, Domanski, and Moon (2009) examined the effect of English on depression by comparing two groups of Korean immigrant elders: one group lived in ethnic communities in New York City, while the other lived outside ethnic communities in Arizona. They found that English proficiency predicted depression among the Korean immigrant elders in Arizona, while English did not necessarily correlate with depression among the NYC participants. These contrasting results might indicate the importance of considering the specific environment of the host country. Some migrants may reside in an ethnic community where they interact with others from their own ethnicity, taking advantage of the economic benefits that the ethnic enclave offers and receiving psychological comfort and social support from the ethnic community. In this case, a separation strategy of not adopting any of the host-country values and cultural practices may bring higher satisfaction to the migrants.

It is also conceivable that international students' positive assessment of their settlement in the U.S. may depend on how their acculturation strategy is adopted in accordance to their acculturative beliefs and motives that are compatible with specific host-country environments. International students who are in academia may have a greater need to speak fluent English and understand the U.S. classroom culture than other types of migrants who reside in ethnic enclaves, where most of the interactions occur among people from the same ethnic culture. Similarly, if the choice of acculturation strategies is inconsistent with their acculturative beliefs, international students may more negatively assess their settlement compared to those whose acculturation correlates with their acculturative beliefs. Thus, the current study will assess how acculturative beliefs and the choice of acculturation influence international students' assessment of their adjustments to the host country.

The pre-existing assessment of cross-cultural adjustment for migrants suggests two dimensions. The first dimension of this assessment addresses migrants' psychological comfort with living in the host country, while the second dimension is related to work-related aspects (Caligiuri, 1997). The current study adopts both dimensions to examine how international students' assessment of their adjustment is affected by their acculturative beliefs and acculturation choices. The personal-life dimension addresses international students' overall satisfaction with their life in the U.S., while the work-related dimension includes their satisfaction with school in the U.S.

*Research Question 3: How are international students' assessments of school influenced by their acculturation choices and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ3a: How are international students' assessment of school influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ3b: How are international students' assessment of school influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ3c: How are international students' assessment of school influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ3d: How are international students' assessment of school influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*Research Question 4: How are international students' assessments of their life in the U.S. influenced by their acculturation choices and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ4a: How are international students' assessment of their life in the U.S. influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ4b: How are international students' assessment of their life in the U.S. influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ4c: How are international students' assessment of their life in the U.S. influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

*RQ4d: How are international students' assessment of their life in the U.S. influenced by their acculturation choice and their acculturation beliefs?*

## Methods

### Recruitment

The recruitment of the survey was sent out to international students through a listserv of registered school emails through an international student office at a large public university in Midwest, and the recruitment message was also posted on social media groups of international students' associations (i.e., facebook) as well as the researcher's personal facebook page as well. Participants were offered a chance to win one of five \$20 Amazon gift cards. Complying with IRB policy, an alternative non-research activity (summary of a relevant research article) was also made available for those who refused to participate in the survey but wished to be added to the list for a drawing.

### Participants

The screening question was asked to identify their visa status in the U.S. as an international student. The question asked if the participants were a holder of a F1 or J1 visa, which is a common visa for international students. And they were directed to contact the researcher if they did not fall into any of the immigration category but still consider themselves as an international student. A total of 69 international students in the U.S. completed the survey. The sample consisted of 43.47% East Asian students (i.e., China, Japan, and South Korea,  $n = 53$ ), 24.63% 17 middle Eastern students (i.e., Iran, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia,  $n = 17$ ), 7.24% South Asian students (i.e., Bangladesh, India, and Nepal,  $n = 5$ ), 5.80% African students (i.e., Ghana, Malawi, Nigeria, and Senegal,  $n = 4$ ), 5.80% European students (i.e., Germany and Ukraine,  $n = 4$ ), 1.45% (south east Asian student i.e., Philippines,  $n = 1$ ). Ages ranged from 20 to 45, with the mean age of 25.32 ( $SD = 9.37$ ). The sample consisted of 47.82% females ( $n = 33$ ). Twenty-five participants were undergraduate students with three of them enrolled in an exchange

program, and eight of the participants were master students 36 students were enrolled in a doctoral program. The average length of stay was 3.28 years ( $SD = 2.20$ ).

## **Measurements**

**Acculturation beliefs.** The measurement for the beliefs of acculturation also takes into consideration the two domains of acculturation with two dimensions. The first dimension assesses international students' relationship with the host people in the U.S and other international students on campus who came from the same country.

*Subjective norms (Americans).* For perceived norms of Americans, participants were asked to answer what international students perceive American people in the U.S. would think about their adaption to the U.S. in the statements of acculturation using a five-point Likert scale, (*A great deal*– 5, *A lot*– 4, *A moderate amount*– 3, *A little*– 2, *None at all* –1). “Americans would think” was provided on the top of the scale matrix as the conditional phrase. Exemplar items for each acculturation category include, “it is important for international students to have good relationships with Americans” for affiliating with Americans, “international students should make friends with students from their home country” with affiliating with international students from the same country, “practicing American customs is a must for international students” for American values, and “international students should preserve the traditional values of their home culture” for home values. Items were internally consistent with  $\alpha = .88$  for relationship with Americans,  $\alpha = .81$  for relationship with international students from the same country,  $\alpha = .79$  for practicing American values, and  $\alpha = .88$  for practicing home values.

*Subjective norms (International students).* Similar to subjective norms of Americans, the subjective norm measurement of international students from the same country used the same wording and scales except for the conditional phrase of “students from my home country on

campus would think...” on the top of the scale matrix. Using a five-point Likert scale, (*A great deal*– 5, *A lot*– 4, *A moderate amount*– 3, *A little*– 2, *None at all* –1), the questionnaire asked what international students perceive other international student from the same country would think about their adaption to the U.S. in the statements of acculturation”. Reliability for all four acculturation categories was confirmed at  $\alpha = .86$  for relationship with Americans,  $\alpha = .89$  for relationship with international students from the same country,  $\alpha = .84$  for practicing American values, and  $\alpha = .83$  for practicing home values

**Attitudes.** For attitudes toward acculturation, participants were asked about how much they find each acculturation statement favorable using a seven-point Likert scale (*very favorable*– 7, *favorable*– 6, *somewhat favorable*– 5, *neither favorable or unfavorable*– 4, *somewhat unfavorable*– 3, *unfavorable*– 2, *very unfavorable*– 1). Exemplar items includes “sharing concerns with school with Americans” for relationship with Americans, “making friends from my home country on campus” for relationship with international students from the same country, “accepting the American values” for American values, and “behaving in a way of my home culture” for home values. Items were internally consistent with  $\alpha = .83$  for relationship with Americans,  $\alpha = .88$  for relationship with international students from the same country,  $\alpha = .88$  for American values and  $\alpha = .89$  for Home values.

**Behavioral control.** For behavioral control, the questionnaire asked them about how confident they feel toward adopting the acculturation strategies using a five-point Likert scale (*Strongly agree* – 5, *somewhat agree* – 4, *neither agree or disagree* – 3, *somewhat disagree* – 2, *strongly disagree* – 1). Exemplar items include “I feel confident making friends with American students” for relationship with Americans, “I feel comfortable associating with students from my home country on campus” for relationship with international students, “I am confident that I can

behave like an American” for practicing American values, “Practicing American customs is troublesome for me” for practicing home values. Reliability analysis confirmed internal validity among items with standardized  $\alpha = .89$  for relationship with Americans,  $\alpha = .73$  for relationship with international students,  $\alpha = .67$  for practicing American values, and  $\alpha = .85$  for practicing home values.

### **Choice of acculturation strategies**

For the actual choice of acculturation, participants were asked how much they are engaged in the acculturation strategies that are related to their academic life in the U.S. The survey used a five-point Likert scale (*Always*– 5, *often*– 4, *sometimes*– 3, *rarely*– 2, *never*– 1). The following items are examples for each acculturation category; I share concerns about school with American students for the variable of relationship with Americans; I associate with students from my home country on campus for the variable of relationship with international students from the same country; I behave like an American for practicing American values; I preserve my own cultural values for practicing home values. Items were internally consistent with standardized  $\alpha = .88$  for relationship with Americans,  $\alpha = .90$  for relationship with international students from the same country,  $\alpha = .74$  for practicing American values, and  $\alpha = .82$  for practicing home values.

### **Assessment of Adjustment**

Revising Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin’s satisfaction Life Scale (1985), the questionnaire asked international students’ overall life satisfaction and included additional questions to ask satisfaction with school in the U.S. The measurement used a five-point Likert scale (*Strongly agree* – 5, *somewhat agree* – 4, *neither agree or disagree* – 3, *somewhat disagree* – 2, *strongly disagree* – 1). An example item for overall life satisfaction scale is “My decision to move to the U.S. was well made”, and the academic satisfaction was measured with items such

as “I have successfully settled myself in school in the U.S.”. Analysis found the items internally consistent with standardized  $\alpha = .73$  for academic satisfaction and  $\alpha = .86$  for overall life satisfaction in the U.S.

### **Descriptive Analysis**

Descriptive analysis was conducted to identify the number of international students in each quadrant of acculturation as identified by Berry’s bi-dimensional model. Using the mid-point of the five-point Likert scale as a cut point, the number of individuals in each cell was identified as follows; separation ( $n = 9$ ), assimilation ( $n = 23$ ), marginalization ( $n = 32$ ), and integration ( $n = 5$ ) for relationships with host-country and home-country group; separation, ( $n = 8$ ), assimilation ( $n = 22$ ), marginalization ( $n = 35$ ), and integration ( $n = 4$ ) for practicing American and home values. The second analysis using average as a cut point produced the number of international students in each cell as follows; separation ( $n = 12$ ), assimilation ( $n = 20$ ), marginalization ( $n = 25$ ), and integration ( $n = 12$ ) for relationship with host-country and home-country group; separation ( $n = 2$ ), assimilation ( $n = 39$ ), marginalization ( $n = 7$ ), integration ( $n = 21$ ) for practicing cultural values of host country and/or home country. Both analyses did not allow to conduct the goodness of model fit using chi-square, which conditions at least a minimum number of five in each cell.

## Results

### Acculturation Categories

The first research question asked how acculturation variables would correlate with one another. The analyses revealed that there was a significant positive correlation between their choice of affiliating with Americans and the practices of American values,  $r(69) = .36, p < .01$ , and between their choice of affiliating with other fellow home students,  $r(69) = .28, p < .05$ . However, there was no correlation found between relationship with Americans vs relationship with other fellow home students,  $r(69) = .07 (p = \text{n.s.})$ , affiliating with Americans vs practicing home values,  $r(69) = -.02, p = \text{n.s.}$ , vs affiliating with other fellow home students vs practicing American values,  $r(69) = .06, p = \text{n.s.}$ , practicing American values vs practicing home values,  $r(69) = .07, p = \text{n.s.}$

### Theory of Planned Behaviors

**Subjective norms of Americans.** Hypothesis 1 assumed there would be a positive correlation between American norms perceived by international students and their choice of acculturation including affiliating with Americans (H1a), affiliating with their fellow home students (H1b), practicing American values (H1c), and practicing home values (H1d). Significant correlations were found; for H1a,  $r(67) = .23, p < .10$ ; for H1b,  $r(67) = .26, p < .05$ ; and for H1c  $r(67) = .22, p < .10$ . The relationship between perceived American norms and the practices of home values was not significant  $r(67) = .18, p = \text{n.s.}$

**Subjective norms of other international students from the same country.** Hypothesis 2 tested whether or not subjective norms of other fellow students from the same country would be positive correlated with their choice of acculturation. All of the acculturation choices showed significant positive correlations with the subjective norms of other fellow home students

including relationship with Americans (H2a),  $r(66) = .32, p < .05$ ; relationship with other fellow home students (H2b),  $r(66) = .32, p < .05$ ; practice of American cultural values (H2c),  $r(66) = .46, p < .01$ ; and practice of home cultural values (H2d),  $r(65) = .29, p < .05$ .

**Behavioral controls.** Hypothesis 3 examined the effects of behavioral controls on the choice of acculturation. H3a (behavioral control on relationship with Americans and their actual acculturation choice of affiliating with Americans) was supported,  $r(68) = .63, p < .01$ . The correlation between their behavioral control and their choice of affiliating with other international students (H3b) was significant,  $r(66) = .38, p < .01$ . Behavioral control and practicing American values were also positively correlated,  $r(68) = .67, p < .01$ . However, the correlation between behavioral control and the choice of practicing home values was not significant,  $r(68) = .15, p = n.s.$  Therefore, H3d was not supported.

**Attitudes.** Another series of correlation tests for hypothesis 4 was conducted to examine the relationships between attitudes and the choice of acculturation. All of the acculturation choices were positively correlated with their attitudes toward each acculturation choice. Specifically, the data supported H4a (the relationship between international students' attitudes toward affiliating with other Americans and their actual choice,  $r(65) = .52, p < .01$ ), H4b (attitudes toward affiliating with other home fellow students and their actual choice,  $r(65) = .49, p < .01$ ), H4c (attitudes toward practicing American values and their actual choice,  $r(65) = .60, p < .01$ ) and H4d (attitudes toward practicing home values and their actual practices,  $r(65) = .47, p < .01$ ).

#### **Acculturation Beliefs on Acculturation Choice**

A series of multiple regression tests were conducted to examine the combined effects of norms, attitudes and behavioral controls on each acculturation choice including affiliating with

Americans, affiliating with international students, practicing American values, and practicing home values. The test for RQ2a for building relationships with Americans produced a significant model,  $F(4, 58) = 13.68, p < .001, R^2 = .70$ . Behavioral control,  $\beta = .50, t [58] = 4.69, p < .001$ , and attitudes ( $\beta = .26, t [58] = 1.89, p < .10$ ) were predictors for the choice of affiliating with Americans. The significant model (RQ2b) was also established for affiliating with other fellow home students,  $F(4, 56) = 5.13, p < .01, R^2 = .22$ , noting that attitudes ( $\beta = .38, t [56] = 2.21, p < .05$ .) were the sole predictor for the model. RQ2c examined the effects of the norms, attitudes, behavioral controls on practicing American values producing a significant model,  $F(4, 58) = 19.17, p < .001, R^2 = .54$ . Among the variables, perceived norms of fellow home international students ( $\beta = .19, t [58] = 1.79, p < .10$ ), behavioral control ( $\beta = .51, t [58] = 4.76, p < .001$ ), and attitudes ( $\beta = .23, t [58] = 1.94, p < .10$ ) predicted international students' choice of practicing American values. The model for practicing home values was also significant,  $F(4, 57) = 4.55, p < .01, R^2 = .19$ , revealing that attitudes were the only predictor for the choice of practicing home values,  $\beta = .046, t [57] = 3.38, p < .01$ .

### **Assessment**

**Assessment of school.** A series of hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to examine RQ3 on how would international students' assessment of school be influenced by each of the acculturation choice and their acculturation motives (norms, behavioral controls, and attitudes). American and international students' norms, behavioral controls, and attitudes were added to the first block, and each of their actual acculturation choice was added to the second block separately for tests. Cases with missing data were excluded list wise ( $N = 62$  for RQ3a,  $N = 60$  for RQ3b,  $N = 62$  for RQ3c,  $N = 61$  for RQ3d). The data failed to produce a significant model for any of the variables; RQ3a (affiliation with Americans),  $F(5, 57) = 2.10, p > .05, R^2 =$

.08; RQ3b (affiliation with other fellow home students),  $F(5, 55) = 1.55, p > .10, R^2 = .04$ ; RQ3c (practicing American values),  $F(5, 57) = .83, p > .10, R^2 = -.01$ ; RQ3d (Practicing home values),  $F(5, 56) = 1.94, p > .10, R^2 = .07$ .

**Assessment of life in the U.S.** A second series of hierarchical multiple regression was performed to test RQ4 to examine how assessment of living in the U.S. would be impacted by their acculturation and their perceived norms, attitudes and behavioral controls. Cases with missing data were excluded list wise ( $N = 62$  for RQ4a,  $N = 60$  for RQ4b,  $N = 62$  for RQ4c,  $N = 61$  for RQ4d). The impact of the acculturation motives and the choice of affiliating with Americans on international students' positive assessment of their life in U.S. was significant,  $F(5, 57) = 4.84, p < .01, R^2 = .24$ . The further investigation revealed that perceived norms of Americans ( $\beta = .26, t [57] = 2.03, p = .05$ ) and choice of acculturation (relationship with Americans) ( $\beta = .37, t [57] = 2.49, p < .05$ ) were a significant predictor in the second model for international students' satisfaction with their U.S. life. The model for RQ4c (American values) was significant,  $F(5, 57) = 2.95, p < .05, R^2 = .14$ , but none of the variables was produced as a significant predictor in the second model. Only behavioral control was a significant predictor ( $\beta = .26, t [58] = 1.83, p < .10$ ) The hierarchical multiple regression failed to produce a significant model for the effects of *acculturation motives and their choice of affiliating with other fellow home students* (RQ4b)  $F(5, 55) = 1.54, p > .10, R^2 = .04$ , and the effects of acculturation motives and the practices of home values (RQ4d),  $F(5, 56) = 1.68, p > .10, R^2 = .05$ .

## Discussion

### Summary of Results

Research Question 1 explores how acculturation categories (affiliating with Americans, affiliating with international students from the same country, practicing American values, and practicing home-country values) correlate with one another. Moderate levels of positive correlations were only found between the acculturation categories of host culture and those of home country. But acculturations between the home culture and host culture was not correlated with one another. Furthermore, correlative relationships were found only between the same dimensions of acculturation across the categories (i.e., positive correlations between *affiliation with host group* and *host-culture value practices*, and between *affiliation with home group* and *home-culture value practices*), but not between opposite dimensions. The imbalanced correlations across the opposite dimensions may violate some of the quadrants in Berry's acculturation theory, which assumes high correlations between opposite dimensions such as integration (strong positive correlations between host culture and home culture) and marginalization (strong negative correlations between host culture and home culture).

Hypothesis 1 tested whether subjective norms of the host group were positively correlated with international students' acculturation choices. Perceiving subjective norms of Americans was positively correlated with affiliation with Americans, affiliation with participants' fellow home-country students, and adoption of American values. But practicing home values was not predicted by perceiving the norms of the host group. In contrast, testing Hypothesis 2, by assessing the influence of the subjective norms of other students from the same country on international students' acculturation choices, revealed that the subjective norms of the fellow home-country students predicted all of the acculturation choices, including affiliating with

Americans, affiliating with fellow students from the same country, practicing American values, and practicing home-country values. These results indicate that international students' decisions to practice cultural norms are not influenced by what Americans think, but are subject to the norms of the fellow international students from the same country. This may be due to the stronger importance of the home-country group for international students whose English and cultural knowledge are limited. These students' social networks may be mostly centered on peers from their home countries who speak the same language and share the same culture, which increases the pressure to comply with their cultural norms.

Hypothesis 3 examined whether international students' behavioral control was positively correlated with their acculturation choices. Behavioral control predicted three of the acculturation choices: affiliating with Americans, affiliating with international students, and practicing American values. But no correlation was found between behavioral control and practicing home-country values. It is conceivable that practicing one's own cultural values is already internalized and established within one's identity, so exercising them does not require any specific skills. By contrast, international students need to have the capacity to learn new cultural values of the host country (Björkman, Stahl, & Vaara, 2007), and develop some new skills (e.g., social skills) to make friends in the U.S., whether those friends are from the same country or different countries (Moe & Zeiss, 1982; Wei, Russell, & Zakalik, 2005)

Hypothesis 4 posited that international students' attitudes toward acculturation would be positively correlated with their acculturation choices. International students' attitudes were a strong predictor for all of the four acculturation choices. Attitudes were found to be the strongest predictors across all of the acculturation strategies when testing how adopting acculturation choices was influenced by norms, attitudes, and behavioral controls. The importance of attitudes

in acculturation is consistent with innumerable empirical studies demonstrating the influence of attitudes on individuals' behaviors (e.g., Glasman & Alberracin, 2006; Hurst, Dittmar, Bond, & Kasser, 2013; Kraus, 1995).

RQ 3 investigated the influence of acculturative beliefs and actual acculturation on international students' assessments of school. These assessments were not predicted by any of the acculturative beliefs or acculturation choices. This is likely due to the context of the academic environments which may be influenced by external factors that do not necessarily relate to acculturation, such as study time, class-management skills to meet different course requirements, and test-taking skills (Stoynoff, 1997). RQ 4 asked about international students' assessments of life in the U.S. Analysis revealed that their assessments were predicted by (1) perceived norms of Americans and actual affiliation with Americans, and (2) behavioral control in practicing American values. The influence of international students' affiliation with Americans and behavioral control in practicing American values on their assessments of life in the U.S. might relate to the students' specific characteristics as a migrant group. For instance, since they came to the U.S. to study, they may be more motivated to learn about American cultures and make more American friends outside school.

### **Theoretical Implications**

The current study first endeavored to include migrants' motives in analyzing the processes of acculturation, addressing issues with the long-standing paradigm that takes a mainstream-centered approach to studying acculturation. Moving from a mainstream-focused to a migrant-based approach, the current study identified migrants' acculturative beliefs that influence how individuals would adjust to the host culture. The analysis revealed that the adoption of acculturation strategies was positively correlated with migrants' beliefs in the chosen

acculturation strategy. These findings support the idea that migrants' adoption of acculturation is influenced by their acculturative beliefs, highlighting the importance of including migrants' acculturation motives in research, as their motives may vary across different host environments.

The study also expanded the application of TPB by considering two different groups from the home country and host country into its analysis of subjective norms. The results showed that the subjective norms of the home-country group predicted all the acculturation choices, while those of the host-country did not work for predicting the practice of home values. This might indicate that the host- and home-country groups have different levels of influence on migrants' acculturation, highlighting the importance of distinguishing the two different groups that migrants interact with.

### **Practical Implications**

The findings of the current study, which confirm positive correlations between acculturative beliefs and the choice of acculturation, provide practical implications for policymakers and program developers interested in intercultural training. First, policymakers should consider individual migrants' motives in how they decide to adjust in the host country. Instead of emphasizing integration or assimilation strategies (e.g., learning about the norms of the host culture; Gallois & Callan, 1991) and devaluing separation strategies, they should develop policies that better address the complicated intercultural dynamics related to individuals' motives. History has shown that even the seemingly good intercultural strategy of integration did not work if the policymakers did not consider the specific contexts of intercultural encounters and forced different groups of people together regardless of individuals' motives. The practice of "Boston Busing" in 1965 started with the legislative disapproval of "segregation." The Massachusetts General Court banned the segregation of public schools to "integrate" and

“balance” the different racial groups (Buell & Brisbon, 1982; Formimsano, 2004). And yet, while it is certainly important to create creating inclusive and welcoming environments for everyone, policymakers should also consider individuals’ motives in intergroup situations as they develop diversity policies, instead of favoring one policy over another regardless of the specific intercultural contexts.

Second, the importance of considering migrants’ motives in the process of acculturation also necessitates the development of customized intercultural training programs, based on the needs of migrants that correspond to the specific host country environments. The effectiveness of intercultural training programs for migrants may be maximized when the customized intercultural training programs address migrants’ different needs and goals, to better assist them in successfully adjusting to different host country environments. Migrants who reside in the ethnic community of their origin often do not feel pressure to adapt themselves to the host culture, since ethnic enclaves serve comprehensive functions for migrants to make a living and socialize with other members of the ethnic group (Zhou, 2010). The availability of various services and businesses (Min, 1993) in an ethnic community, then, may cultivate needs for different intercultural training programs.

In contrast, customized intercultural training programs addressing specific needs of migrants may also help those who do not settle in a mainstream environment. For example, there are many Korean Americans who run their business in African American communities in Los Angeles. Korean immigrants’ insufficient understanding of African American communities often causes tensions. Indeed, the interracial conflicts between Korean Americans and African Americans during the 1992 LA riots derived from such misunderstandings (Bailey, 2000; Chun, 2001). If intercultural training programs aimed at similar migrants do not address their specific

acculturative motives and continue teaching about mainstream cultures, the migrants' attempts to succeed in their "host country" may be doomed to failure. The current study does not reject the importance of learning the host culture's values or the host-country's language, but it does emphasize that successful adjustment does not rely on objective acculturation criteria that all migrants must meet. Therefore, successful intercultural training programs should distinguish between migrants who settle in a homogenous area with a majority mainstream group from those who settle in an ethnic enclave, which is considered separation according to Berry's acculturation model.

## **Limitations and Future Research**

The first attempt to shift focus of acculturation research to migrants' motives, the current study's limitations require acknowledgment. The first limitation reflects the small sample size. Although the study's proposed model was simplified by eliminating the intention components from the existing TPB model, the participants' dropout rates were somewhat high (approximately 45.76%). The high dropout rates may have been due to the complexity of the model, as the research attempted to cover several different categories and dimensions of acculturation, including affiliation and cultural values from the perspectives of both the host and home cultures. The small sample size failed to provide equal distributions of the population to be analyzed as representative of the general population. The descriptive analysis, in accordance to Berry (1980)'s bi-dimensional quadrants, indeed produced unequal distributions of the samples in each cell, which prohibited further investigation into how the relationship between acculturative beliefs and each of the four acculturation strategies would influence international students' assessment of adjustment to the host culture.

The measurement of adopting acculturation was also not aligned with the existing operationalization of behaviors in TPB. Most empirical applications of TPB have focused on specific behavioral aspects (e.g., Norman, Bennett, & Lewis, 1998; Theo & Lee 2010). The results of RQ 2 regarding attitude's influence on acculturation also confirmed Ajzen's explanations (2012) that attitude is the only predictor of behaviors that corresponds to both general and specific behavioral patterns. TPB may be an appropriate theoretical framework for specific acculturation behaviors, such as international students' intentions to (1) learn English, (2) participate in group discussion in the classroom if they come from a country where speaking up is discouraged, (3) join an on-campus student club or organization to affiliate with American

students, or (4) participate in an ethnic student association to interact with students from their respective home countries. To test generic types of acculturation, future research may apply a different theoretical framework to assess the relationships between migrants' acculturative motives and their acculturation, and how these relationships influence their assessment of their lives in the host country. One suggestive framework may be Festinger's cognitive dissonance theory (1957). The cognitive dissonance theory suggests that the more cognitive dissonance that individuals experience between the expected and obtained outcomes, the less satisfied they feel with the decision (Shahin Sharifi & Esfidani, 2014), which can support the intention of the current study aiming to investigate the influence of migrants' motives and their choice of acculturation on their adjustment to the host country.

The measurement of subjective norms failed to identify the important referent groups of international students, as suggested by Ajzen's TPB (2011). Rather, the subjective norms of people from the host country and home country were referred to as "Americans" and "other international students from my home country," wording that does not necessarily indicate the importance and closeness of the groups. Future scales for measuring subjective norms should refer to the groups as "my close American friends" or "my close friends from my same country on campus."

Future research should specify different categories and kinds of acculturation in the measurement. For example, the current measurement for cultural values of the home country and host country was stated in somewhat generic ways, such as *adopting American values*, *behaving like Americans*, or *practicing my own cultural customs*. Because the current research targeted international students regardless of their countries of origin, it was somewhat difficult to customize different cultural values. Future research may implement specific cultural values using

the existing cultural value scales customized for each migrant group, such as the Asian Values Scale (Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999) or the Hispanic Familism Scale (Villarreal, Blozis, & Widaman, 2005). Along similar lines, the current research included only a couple of the existing acculturation categories (i.e., affiliation and cultural values). Many other acculturation categories need to be studied to assess the influence of acculturative motives on acculturation choice in various contexts. For example, future research may investigate categories like identity, language use, language proficiency, or media use, and how migrants would have different motives to adopt the strategies of different kinds of acculturation based on host-country contexts.

Finally, the results for RQ3 showed that the acculturative beliefs that influenced the assessment of both school and their life in the U.S. were predicted by the host-country norms, perhaps because international students are temporary migrants in an academic environment where the mainstream culture of the host country may play an important role (e.g., learning the American classroom culture may increase the odds of performing well in school). Thus, future research should investigate different migrant groups in terms of time and host-country environments, such as long-term migrants who settled in a non-academic and non-mainstream host-country environment.

## **Conclusion**

The current study aimed to shift scholarly attention to a migrant-centered approach to acculturation, departing from the long-standing paradigm that considered acculturation strategy as a set of objective criteria favoring certain acculturation strategies. As documented in this study, the conventional approach resulted in numerous inconsistent findings on acculturation outcomes. This inconsistency might have been caused by the absence of migrants' acculturative motives that may determine their adoption of an acculturation strategy, thus affecting their evaluation of their adjustment in the host culture. Specifically, the current study investigated what motivates international students to decide how to acculturate in the U.S. using Ajzen's TPB, and addressed different acculturation categories by separately conducting the tests for each acculturation category.

While subjective norms, behavioral control, and attitudes each predicted different acculturation strategies (i.e., affiliation with host group, affiliation with home group, practice of American values, and practice of home values), attitudes were the most important predictors when the belief variables were added to test the model of TPB in acculturation. The analyses for the assessment of school and life in the host country as an outcome of acculturation choice revealed that only the assessment of life in the host country was predicted by relationships with Americans. Overall, while this study confirms the importance of the host group in migrants' acculturation, it also highlights the need to expand the research into other diverse host-country environments.

Table 1.  
*Correlations Among Acculturation Categories*

	1	2	3	4
1 Affiliating with Americans				
2 Affiliating with fellow international students	.07			
3 Practicing American values	.36**	.06		
4 Practicing home values	-.02	.28*	.07	

*Notes:* \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .  $N = 69$ .

Table 2.  
*Correlations Between Acculturative Behaviors and Acculturation Choice*

	Norms (Host)	Norms (Home)	Behavioral Control	Attitudes
Affiliating with Americans	.23 ( <i>N</i> = 67)	.32** ( <i>N</i> = 66)	.63** ( <i>N</i> = 68)	.52** ( <i>N</i> = 65)
Affiliating with fellow international students	.26* ( <i>N</i> = 66)	.27* ( <i>N</i> = 66)	.38** ( <i>N</i> = 66)	.49** ( <i>N</i> = 65)
Practicing American values	.22 ( <i>N</i> = 67)	.46** ( <i>N</i> = 66)	.67** ( <i>N</i> = 68)	.60** ( <i>N</i> = 65)
Practicing home values	.18 ( <i>N</i> = 67)	.29* ( <i>N</i> = 65)	.15 ( <i>N</i> = 68)	.47** ( <i>N</i> = 65)

*Note:* \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 3.  
*Multiple Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs on Acculturation Choice*

Predictors	Dependents ( $\beta$ )			
	Affiliating with Americans	Affiliating with Home	American Values	Home Values
Norms (Host)	.10	.18	-.03	-.10
Norms (Home)	.12	.01	.19*	.11
Control	.50**	.17	.51**	.04
Attitudes	.21*	.32**	.23*	.46**
$R^2$	.49	.27	.57	.24
$R^2_{adj}$	.45	.22	.54	.19
$F$	13.68	5.13	19.17	4.55
$df1, df2$	4, 58	4, 56	4, 58	4, 57
$p$	< .001	< .01	< .01	< .01

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 4.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation with Host Group on Assessment of School*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.20	.12	.24*	.19	.12	.22
Norm (home)	-.004	.12	-.01	-.02	.12	-.02
Control	.10	.09	.15	.06	.11	.08
Attitudes	.13	.12	.16	.11	.12	.13
Affiliating with Americans				.09	.11	.13
$\Delta R^2$	.09			.08		
<i>F</i>	2.50			2.11		

Note: \*  $p < .10$ .

Table 5.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation Home Group on Assessment of School*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.08	.11	.11	.09	.12	.12
Norm (home)	.11	.11	.16	.11	.11	.16
Control	.13	.10	.18	.13	.11	.19
Attitudes	.03	.13	.03	.03	.13	.04
Affiliating with internationals				-.02	.10	-.03
$\Delta R^2$	.06			.04		
<i>F</i>	1.96			1.55		

*Note:* None of the values were significant.

Table 6.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing American Values on Assessment of School*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.04	.12	.05	.04	.12	.05
Norm (home)	-.05	.12	-.06	-.05	.12	-.06
Control	.07	.12	.09	.08	.14	.10
Attitudes	.16	.13	.21	.17	.14	.21
Practicing American values				-.02	.18	-.02
$\Delta R^2$	.004			-.01		
<i>F</i>	.06			.83		

*Note:* None of the values were significant.

Table 7.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing Home Values on Assessment of School*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.05	.09	.08	.06	.10	.09
Norm (home)	.07	.11	.10	.06	.11	.08
Control	.09	.08	.13	.08	.08	.13
Attitudes	.19	.13	.22	.15	.14	.17
Practicing home values				.11	.14	.12
$\Delta R^2$	.08			.07	.41	
<i>F</i>	2.26			1.94		

*Note:* None of the values were significant.

Table 8.  
*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation with Host Group on Assessment of Life in the U.S.*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.31	.14	.30**	.27	.14	.26**
Norm (home)	.03	.14	.03	-.02	.13	-.02
Control	.22	.11	.26*	.06	.12	.07
Attitudes	.09	.14	.09	.01	.14	.01
Affiliating with Americans				.32	.13	.39**
$\Delta R^2$	.17			.24		
<i>F</i>	4.12			4.84		

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Table 9.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Affiliation with Home Group on Assessment of Life in the U.S.*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.06	.14	.07	.05	.14	.06
Norm (home)	.20	.13	.23	.20	.13	.23
Control	.06	.13	.07	.05	.13	.06
Attitudes	.09	.16	.09	.07	.17	.07
Affiliating with internationals				.06	.12	.07
$\Delta R^2$	.06			.04		
<i>F</i>	1.90			1.54		

*Note:* None of the values were significant.

Table 10.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing American Values on Assessment of Life in the U.S.*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	-.01	.14	-.01	-.01	.14	-.01
Norm (home)	.11	.14	.12	.12	.14	.13
Control	.25	.14	.26	.27	.17	.28
Attitudes	.17	.15	.17	.18	.16	.18
Practicing American values				-.04	.20	-.04
$\Delta R^2$	.15			.14		
<i>F</i>	3.74			2.95		

*Note:* None of the values were significant.

Table 11.

*Hierarchical Regression for the Influence of Acculturative Beliefs and Practicing Home Values on Assessment of Life in the U.S.*

Predictors	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Norm (host)	.16	.12	.19	.16	.12	.19
Norm (home)	.20	.14	.21	.20	.14	.21
Control	.09	.10	.11	.09	.11	.11
Attitudes	.01	.16	.01	-.01	.18	-.01
Practicing Home values				.03	.17	.02
$\Delta R^2$	.07		.05			
<i>F</i>	2.14		1.68			

*Note:* None of the values were significant.

## References

- Abramitzky, R., Boustan, L. P., & Eriksson, K. (2012). A nation of immigrants: Assimilation and economic outcomes in the age of mass migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, *122*, 467-506.
- Adler, S. (1977). Maslow's need hierarchy and the adjustment of immigrants. *International Migration Review*, *11*, 444-451.
- Ait Ouarasse, O., & Vijver, F. J. (2004). Structure and function of the perceived acculturation context of young Moroccans in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology*, *39*, 190-204.
- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action-control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*, 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. (2006). Constructing a TPB Questionnaire: Conceptual and methodological considerations. Retrieved Sep 28, 2010 from <http://people.umass.edu/aizen/pdf/tpb.measurement.pdf>.
- Ajzen, I. (2011). Job satisfaction, effort, and performance: A reasoned action perspective. *Contemporary Economics*, *5*, 32-43,

- Ajzen, I. (2012). Martin Fishbein's legacy: The reasoned action approach. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 640, 11-27.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). *The influence of attitudes on behavior*. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, and M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 173-221). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Alba, R., & Nee, V. (2009). *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bailey, B. (2000). Communicative behavior and conflict between African-American customers and Korean immigrant retailers in Los Angeles. *Discourse & Society*, 11, 86-108.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1992). Self-efficacy mechanism in psychobiologic functioning. In R. Schwarzer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action* (pp. 355-394). Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation, theory, models and some new findings*. Colorado CO: Westview Press.

- Berry, J. W. (1990). Acculturation and adaptation: A general framework. In W. H. Holtzman & T. H. Borneman (Eds.), *The mental health of immigrants and refugees* (pp. 90-102). Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, University of Texas.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, *46*, 5-34.
- Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement and applied research* (pp. 17-37). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Berry J. W. (2005). Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *29*, 697-712.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., & Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. *International migration review*, 491-511.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied psychology*, *38*, 185-206.
- Birman, D., Trickett, E., & Buchanan, R. M. (2005). A tale of two cities: Replication of a study on the acculturation and adaptation of immigrant adolescents from the former Soviet Union in a different community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *35*(1-2), 83-101.
- Björkman, I., Stahl, G. K., & Vaara, E. (2007). Cultural differences and capability transfer in cross-border acquisitions: The mediating roles of capability complementarity, absorptive capacity, and social integration. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *38*, 658-672.

Bochner, S., Furnham, A., & Ward, C. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. East Sussex: Routledge.

Bochner, S., Mcleod, B., & Lin, A. (1977). Friendship Patterns of Overseas Students: A Functional Model. *International Journal of Psychology*, *12*, 277-294.

Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, *32*, 369-386.

Bradford, L., Allen, M., Casey, M., & Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (2002). A meta-analysis examining the relationship between Latino acculturation levels and HIV/AIDS risk behaviors, condom use, and HIV/AIDS knowledge. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *31*, 167-180.

Buell, E. H., & Brisbin, R. A. (1982). *School desegregation and defended neighborhoods: The Boston controversy*. Free Press.

Caligiuri, P. M. (1997). Assessing expatriate success: Beyond just *being there*”, in Z. Aycan (ed.) *New approaches to employee management*. JAI Press: Greenwich.

Chellaraj, G., Maskus, K. E., & Mattoo, A. (2008). The contribution of international graduate students to US innovation. *Review of International Economics*, *16*, 444-462.

Chen, S. X., Benet-Martínez, V., & Bond, M. H. (2008). Bicultural identity, bilingualism, and psychological adjustment in multicultural societies: Immigration-based and globalization-based acculturation. *Journal of Personality*, *76*, 803-838.

- Chen, X., & Zhong, H. (2013). Delinquency and crime among immigrant youth—An integrative review of theoretical explanations. *Laws, 2*, 210-232.
- Chun, E. W. (2001). The construction of white, black, and Korean American identities through African American Vernacular English. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 11*, 52-64.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 55*, 591-621
- Cialdini, R. B., Reno, R. R., & Kallgren, C. A. (1990). A focus theory of normative conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 1015-1026.
- Constantine, M. G., Okazaki, S., & Utsey, S. O. (2004). Self-concealment, social self-efficacy, acculturative stress, and depression in African, Asian, and Latin American international college students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*, 230-241.
- Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II: A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17*, 275-304.
- Da Silva, S. A. (2013). Brazil, a new Eldorado for immigrants?: the case of Haitians and the Brazilian immigration policy. *Urbanities, 3*, 3-18.
- Davis, L E , and Engel, R J (2011) *Measuring Race and Ethnicity* New York, NY: Springer.

- Department of Homeland Security (2017) Legal Immigration and Adjustment of Status Report, Fiscal Year 2017, Quarter 3. Retrieved from <https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/special-reports/legal-immigration>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 71-75.
- Duffey, K. J., Gordon-Larsen, P., Ayala, G. X., & Popkin, B. M. (2008). Birthplace is associated with more adverse dietary profiles for U.S.-born than for foreign-born Latino adults. *The Journal of Nutrition, 138*, 2428-2435.
- Edwards, L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2006). Perceived family support, acculturation, and life satisfaction in Mexican American youth: A mixed-methods exploration. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 279-287.
- Erez, M., & Gati, E. (2004). A dynamic, multi-level model of culture: from the micro level of the individual to the macro level of a global culture. *Applied Psychology, 53*, 583-598.
- Esteban-Gonzalo, L., Veiga, Ó. L., Regidor, E., Martínez, D., Marcos, A., & Calle, M. E. (2015). Immigrant status, acculturation and risk of overweight and obesity in adolescents living in Madrid (Spain): The AFINOS study. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health, 17*, 367-374.
- Fan, C., & Mak, A. S. (1998). Measuring social self-efficacy in a culturally diverse student population. *Social Behavior and Personality, 26*, 131-144.

- Ferguson, G. M., Bornstein, M. H., & Pottinger, A. M. (2012). Tridimensional acculturation and adaptation among Jamaican adolescent–mother dyads in the United States. *Child Development, 83*, 1486-1493.
- Ferguson, G. M., Iturbide, M. I., & Gordon, B. P. (2014). Tridimensional (3D) acculturation: Ethnic identity and psychological functioning of tricultural Jamaican immigrants. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation, 3*, 238-251.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Evanston, IL: Row & Peterson.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fishbein, M. (1979). A theory of reasoned action: Some applications and implications. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 27*, 65-116.
- Flannery, W. P., Reise, S. P., & Yu, J. (2001). An empirical comparison of acculturation models. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1035-1045.
- Formisano, R. P. (2004). *Boston against Busing: Race, Class, and Ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s*. Univ of North Carolina Press.
- Fujioka, Y., & Neuendorf, K. A. (2015). Media, Racial Identity, and Mainstream American Values. *Howard Journal of Communications, 26*, 352-380.

- Gallois, C., & Callan, V. J. (1991). Interethnic accommodation: The role of norms. In H. Giles, J. Coupland, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics* (pp. 245-269). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gil-Kashiwabara, E. F. (2002). Body image disturbance and disordered eating in African-American and Latina women. In L.H. Collins, M. R. Dunlap, J. C. Chrisler (Eds.), *Charting a new course for feminist psychology* (pp. 282-306). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger Publishers.
- Glasman, L. R., & Albarracín, D. (2006). Forming attitudes that predict future behavior: a meta-analysis of the attitude-behavior relation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 778-822.
- Gordon, M. M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion and national origins*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Güngör, D., Bornstein, M. H., De Leersnyder, J., Cote, L., Ceulemans, E., & Mesquita, B. (2012). Acculturation of personality: A three-culture study of Japanese, Japanese Americans, and European American. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*, 701-718.
- Hilario, C. T., Vo, D. X., Johnson, J. L., & Saewyc, E. M. (2014). Acculturation, gender, and mental health of southeast Asian immigrant youth in Canada. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, *16*, 1121-1129.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

- Hurst, M., Dittmar, H., Bond, R., & Kasser, T. (2013). The relationship between materialistic values and environmental attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 36*, 257-269
- Huynh, Q. L., Howell, R. T., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2009). Reliability of bidimensional acculturation scores a meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40*, 256-274.
- Institute of International Education (2016). Open Doors. Retrieved from <https://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students>
- Kang, S. M. (2006). Measurement of acculturation, scale formats, and language competence their implications for adjustment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 37*, 669-693.
- Kang, S. Y., Domanski, M. D., & Moon, S. S. (2009). Ethnic enclave resources and predictors of depression among Arizona's Korean immigrant elders. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 52*, 489-502.
- Kawamoto, W.T. and Anguiano, R.V. (2006). Asian and Latino immigrant families. In B.B. Ingoldsby and S.D. Smith (Eds.), *Families in global and multicultural perspective* (pp. 209-230). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Kim, B. S., Atkinson, D. R., & Yang, P. H. (1999). The Asian Values Scale: Development, factor analysis, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 342-352.
- Kim, M. J., Lee, S. J., Ahn, Y. H., Bowen, P., & Lee, H. (2007). Dietary acculturation and diet quality of hypertensive Korean Americans. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 58*, 436-445.

Korea Immigration Service, Ministry of Justice (2016). 출입국 외국인 정책 통계 월보.

Retrieved from

[http://www.immigration.go.kr/doc\\_html/attach/imm/f2016//20160830263386\\_1\\_1.hwp.files/Sections1.html](http://www.immigration.go.kr/doc_html/attach/imm/f2016//20160830263386_1_1.hwp.files/Sections1.html)

Kraus, S. J. (1995). Attitudes and the prediction of behavior: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 58-75.

Kuo, B. C., & Roysircar, G. (2004). Predictors of acculturation for Chinese adolescents in Canada: Age of arrival, length of stay, social class, and English reading ability. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 32, 143-154.

Larimer, M. E., Turner, A. P., Mallett, K. A., & Geisner, I. M. (2004). Predicting drinking behavior and alcohol-related problems among fraternity and sorority members: examining the role of descriptive and injunctive norms. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 18, 203-212.

Lim, S. L., Yeh, M., Liang, J., Lau, A. S., & McCabe, K. (2008). Acculturation gap, intergenerational conflict, parenting style, and youth distress in immigrant Chinese American families. *Marriage & Family Review*, 45, 84-106.

Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2013). Examining the educational benefits of interacting with international students. *Journal of International Students*, 3, 85-101.

Madden, T. J., Ellen, P. S., & Ajzen, I. (1992). A comparison of the theory of planned behavior and the theory of reasoned action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 3-9.

- Makarova, E., & Birman, D. (2015). Cultural transition and academic achievement of students from ethnic minority backgrounds: a content analysis of empirical research on acculturation. *Educational Research, 57*, 305-330.
- McDermott-Levy, R. (2009). Acculturation: a concept analysis for immigrant health. *Holistic Nursing Practice, 23*, 282-288.
- Min, P. G. (1993). *Korean immigrants in Los Angeles*. In I. H. Light, & P. Bhachu (Eds.), *Immigration and entrepreneurship: culture, capital, and ethnic networks* (pp. 185-204). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Moe, K. O., & Zeiss, A. M. (1982). Measuring self-efficacy expectations for social skills: A methodological inquiry. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 6*, 191-205.
- Montgomery, G. T. (1992). Comfort with acculturation status among students from south Texas. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 14*, 201-223.
- NAFSA (2015). International student economic value tool. Retrieved from [http://www.nafsa.org/Policy\\_and\\_Advocacy/Policy\\_Resources/Policy\\_Trends\\_and\\_Data/NAFSA\\_International\\_Student\\_Economic\\_Value\\_Tool/](http://www.nafsa.org/Policy_and_Advocacy/Policy_Resources/Policy_Trends_and_Data/NAFSA_International_Student_Economic_Value_Tool/)
- Ngo, V. H. (2008). A critical examination of acculturation theories. *Critical Social Work, 9*, 1-6.
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2010). Multicultural identity: What it is and why it matters. In R. Crisp (Ed.), *The psychology of social and cultural diversity* (pp. 87-114). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Nguyen, A. M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2012). Biculturalism and adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*, 122-159.
- Norman, P., Bennett, P., & Lewis, H. (1998). Understanding binge drinking among young people: An application of the theory of planned behaviour. *Health education research, 13*, 163-169.
- Oberg, K. (1954). *Culture shock*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Oberg, K. (1960) Culture shock: adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology, 7*, 177-182.
- Offorma, G. C. (2016). Integrating components of culture in curriculum planning. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 8*, 1-8.
- Okafor, M. T. C., Carter-Pokras, O. D., & Zhan, M. (2014). Greater dietary acculturation (dietary change) is associated with poorer current self-rated health among African immigrant adults. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 46*, 226-235.
- Oster, A., & Yung, J. (2010). Dietary acculturation, obesity, and diabetes among Chinese immigrants in New York City. *Diabetes Care, 33*, e109-e109.
- Park, R. E. (1928). Human migration and the marginal man. *American Journal of Sociology, 33*, 881-893.
- Peguero, A. A. (2008). Is immigrant status relevant in school violence research? An analysis with Latino students. *Journal of School Health, 78*, 397-404.

- Peguero, A. A. (2009). Victimizing the children of immigrants Latino and Asian American student victimization. *Youth & Society, 41*, 186-208.
- Pérez-Escamilla, R., & Putnik, P. (2007). The role of acculturation in nutrition, lifestyle, and incidence of type 2 diabetes among Latinos. *The Journal of Nutrition, 137*, 860-870.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 38*, 149-152.
- Resnicow, K., Soler, R. E., Braithwaite, R. L., Selassie, M. B., & Smith, M. (1999). Development of a racial and ethnic identity scale for African American adolescents: The survey of Black life. *Journal of Black Psychology, 25*, 171-188.
- Rimal, R. N., Lapinski, M. K., Cook, R. J., & Real, K. (2005). Moving toward a theory of normative influences: How perceived benefits and similarity moderate the impact of descriptive norms on behaviors. *Journal of Health Communication, 10*, 433-450.
- Rivis, A., & Sheeran, P. (2003). Descriptive norms as an additional predictor in the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analysis. *Current Psychology, 22*, 218-233.
- Roosens, E. E. (1989). *Creating ethnicity: The process of ethnogenesis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Saw Swee-Hock (30 June 2012). *The Population of Singapore* (3rd ed.). ISEAS Publishing. pp. 11–18. ISBN 978-9814380980.

- Schachter, A., Kimbro, R. T., & Gorman, B. K. (2012). Language proficiency and health status are bilingual immigrants healthier? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *53*, 124-145.
- Schwartz, S. J., Unger, J. B., Zamboanga, B. L., & Szapocznik, J. (2010). Rethinking the concept of acculturation: implications for theory and research. *American Psychologist*, *65*, 237-251.
- Schwartz, S. J., & Zamboanga, B. L. (2008). Testing Berry's model of acculturation: A confirmatory latent class approach. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *14*, 275-285.
- Selassie, M. B., & Smith, M. (1999). Development of a racial and ethnic identity scale for African American adolescents: The Survey of Black Life. *Journal of Black Psychology*, *25*, 171-188.
- Shahin Sharifi, S., & Rahim Esfidani, M. (2014). The impacts of relationship marketing on cognitive dissonance, satisfaction, and loyalty: The mediating role of trust and cognitive dissonance. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, *42*, 553-575.
- Sheeran, P., & Orbell, S. (1999). Augmenting the theory of planned behavior: Roles for anticipated regret and descriptive norms. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *29*, 2107-2142.
- Schild, E. O. (1962). The foreign student, as stranger, learning the norms of the host-culture. *Journal of Social Issues*, *18*, 41-54.

- Smokowski, P. R., David-Ferdon, C., & Stroupe, N. (2009). Acculturation and violence in minority adolescents: A review of the empirical literature. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 30* (3-4), 215-263.
- Social Science Research Council. (1954). Acculturation: An exploratory formulation. *American Anthropologist, 56*, 973-1000.
- Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2014). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Implications for students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*, 261-280.
- Statistics South Africa (2015). Mid-year Population Estimates. Retrieved from <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022014.pdf>
- Stevens, G. W., Pels, T. V., Vollebergh, W. A., & Crijnen, A. A. (2004). Patterns of psychological acculturation in adult and adolescent Moroccan immigrants living in the Netherlands. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 35*, 689-704.
- Stoyhoff, S. (1997). Factors associated with international students' academic achievement. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24*, 56-68.
- 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.

Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W. M., & Fernandez, T. (1980). Bicultural involvement and adjustment in Hispanic-American youths. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *4*, 353-365.

The Antioch University New England Multicultural Center for Research and Practice. (n.d.). *Multicultural Test Titles*. Retrieved from <http://www.antiochne.edu/multiculturalcenter/test/>

Taft, R. (1962). Adjustment and assimilation of immigrants: A problem in social psychology. *Psychological Reports*, *10*, 90-90.

Teo, T., & Lee, C. B. (2010). Explaining the intention to use technology among student teachers: An application of the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). *Campus-Wide Information Systems*, *27*, 60-67.

Thompson, V. L. S. (2001). The complexity of African American racial identification. *Journal of Black Studies*, *32*, 155-165.

Tsai, J. L., Chentsova-Dutton, Y., & Wong, Y. (2002). In G. C. N. Hall and S. Okazaki (Ed.), Why and how researchers should study ethnic identity, acculturation, and cultural orientation. *Asian American psychology: The science of lives in context*, (pp. 41-65). Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.

Tsai, J. L., Ying, Y. W., & Lee, P. A. (2000). The meaning of "being Chinese" and "being American" variation among Chinese American young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *31*, 302-332.

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2013). Trends in international migrant stock: The 2013 revision- migrant by destination and origin. Retrieved from: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/migration/migrant-stock-origin-2013.pdf>

USCIS (n.d.). Nonimmigrant. Retrieved from <https://www.uscis.gov/tools/glossary/nonimmigrant>

USCIS (2017). H-1B Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 Cap Season. Retrieved from <https://www.uscis.gov/working-united-states/temporary-workers/h-1b-specialty-occupations-and-fashion-models/h-1b-fiscal-year-fy-2018-cap-season#how>

Valentine, S. (2001). Self-esteem, cultural identity, and generation status as determinants of Hispanic acculturation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 23, 459-468.

Valencia-Garcia, D., Simoni, J. M., Alegría, M., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2012). Social capital, acculturation, mental health, and perceived access to services among Mexican American women. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 80, 177.

Villarreal, R., Blozis, S. A., & Widaman, K. F. (2005). Factorial invariance of a pan-Hispanic familism scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 27, 409-425.

Wei, M., Russell, D. W., & Zakalik, R. A. (2005). Adult attachment, social self-efficacy, self-disclosure, loneliness, and subsequent depression for freshman college students: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 602-614.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of management Review*, *14*, 361-384.

Zane, N., & Mak, W. (2003). Major approaches to the measurement of acculturation among ethnic minority populations: A content analysis and an alternative empirical strategy. In K. M. Chun, P. B. Organista, & G. Marin (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research* (pp. 39-60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Zhou, M. (1997). Growing up American: The challenge confronting immigrant children and children of immigrants. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*, 63-95.

Zhou, M. (2010). *Chinatown: The socioeconomic potential of an urban enclave*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Appendix  
Questionnaire

**Acculturation Choice**

*The following question examines how much you are engaged in the following behaviors that are related to your academic life in the U.S. How frequently do you practice the following activities in order to succeed in school? (Always – 5, often – 4, sometimes – 3, rarely – 2, never – 1).*

1. I develop good relationships with American students on campus
2. I make good friends with American students
3. I share concerns about school with American students
4. I associate with students from my home country on campus
5. I make good friends with students from my home country on campus
6. I discuss school problems with students from my home country on campus
7. I practice American customs (the customs of the U.S.)
8. I accept American values
9. I behave like an American
10. I preserve my own cultural values
11. I practice the customs of my home country
12. I behave in my home country's cultural ways.

**Norms**

**A. Norms (Americans)**

*This question measures what you perceive American people in the U.S. would think about your adaptation to the U.S. How much do you think Americans would believe in each of the following statement? (A great deal– 5, A lot– 4, A moderate amount– 3, A little– 2, None at all – 1)*

**American people would think...**

1. It is important for international students to have good relationships with Americans
2. International students should make friends with Americans
3. International students should share concerns about school with Americans
4. International students should be discouraged from associating with other international students of their own ethnicity who live in the U.S.
5. International students should make friends with students from their home country
6. International students should discuss school problems with students from their home country
7. Practicing American customs is a must for international students
8. International students should accept American values
9. International students in the U.S. should behave like an American
10. International students should preserve the traditional values of their home culture
11. International students should practice their own customs

**B. Norms (International Students)**

*This question measures what you perceive **students from your home country on campus** would think about your adaptation to the U.S. How much do you think students from your home country on campus would believe in each of the following statement? (A great deal– 5, A lot– 4, A moderate amount– 3, A little– 2, None at all – 1)*

### **Students from my home country on campus would think...**

1. It is important for international students to have good relationships with Americans
2. International students should make friends with Americans
3. International students should share concerns about school with Americans
4. International students should be discouraged from associating with other international students of their own ethnicity who live in the U.S.
5. International students should make friends with students from their home country
6. International students should discuss school problems with students from their home country
7. Practicing American customs is a must for international students
8. International students should accept American values
9. International students in the U.S. should behave like an American
10. International students should preserve the traditional values of their home culture
11. International students should practice their own customs

### **C. Behavioral Control**

*This question asks you about your confidence in practicing the behavior that are stated below. How much do you agree or disagree with each statement? (Strongly agree – 5, somewhat agree – 4, neither agree or disagree – 3, somewhat disagree – 2, strongly disagree – 1)*

1. I feel confident making friends with American students
2. Having good relationships with Americans is easy for me
3. I have no problems sharing my concerns about school with Americans

4. I feel comfortable associating with students from my home country on campus
5. I am not good at making friends with students from my home country
6. It is difficult for me to discuss school problems with students from my home country on campus in the U.S.
7. I am confident that I can behave like an American
8. I have problems accepting American values
9. Practicing American customs is troublesome for me
10. I find it difficult to practice the customs of my home culture

#### **D. Attitudes**

*The following question asks your views on your interactions with Americans, people who live in the U.S., and friends/family who live in your home country. How much do you find each statement beneficial (very favorable - 7, favorable - 6, somewhat favorable - 5, neither favorable or unfavorable - 4, somewhat unfavorable - 3, unfavorable - 2, very unfavorable - 1)*

1. Having good relationships with Americans
2. Making American friends helps me
3. Sharing concerns with school with Americans
4. Associating with students from my home country
5. Making friends from my home country on campus
6. Discussing school problems with students from my home country in the U.S.
7. Practicing American customs
8. Accepting the American values

9. Behaving like an American
10. Preserving the values of my home culture
11. Practicing the customs of my home culture
12. Behaving in a way of my home culture

**Assessment of Adjustment (Revised from Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985)**

*The following questions asks you about your satisfaction with school and your life in the U.S.*

*Using the five scale below, please respond how much you agree or disagree with the following statements (Strongly agree – 5, somewhat agree – 4, neither agree or disagree – 3, somewhat disagree – 2, strongly disagree – 1)*

1. I made the right decision coming to the U.S. to study
2. I am satisfied with how I am doing at school in the U.S.
3. I have successfully settled myself in school in the U.S.
4. I like going to school
5. My life in the U.S. is close to my ideal
6. The conditions of my life in the U.S. are excellent
7. So far, I have gotten the most important things I want in life in the U.S.
8. My decision to move to the U.S. was well made
9. I have well adapted myself to the U.S. lifestyle

# Curriculum Vitae

---

## SEOKHOON AHN

### EDUCATION

**Ph.D.** in Communication, expected in December 2017

*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee WI*

Emphasis: Intercultural/cross-cultural communication (acculturation, immigration, host culture, multiculturalism, ethnicity, intergroup contact, and cross-cultural comparisons)

Quantitative Method Courses Taken:

- Educational Statistical Methods I
- Philosophy & Practice of Communication
- Quantitative Research in Communication
- Instrument Development
- Fundamentals of Survey Methods
- Seminar in Research Methodology
- ANOVA & Multiple Regression
- Advanced Research Design in Anthropology (Multivariate Analysis)
- Structured Equation Modeling & Path Analysis
- Meta-Analysis
- Social Network Analysis

**Master of Arts** in Communication, December 2012

*University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee WI*

Emphasis: Intercultural/cross-cultural communication, migration, ethnicity and minority

Thesis: Exploring Alcohol Expectancies in Korea and America Using the Holism Theory

**Bachelor of Arts**, February 2009

*Hanyang University, Seoul Korea*

Major: Journalism and Mass communication

Graduated with summa cum laude

## **ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT**

**Assistant Professor**, Fall 2017 - Present

*Department of Communication Studies, St Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN*

Course: CMST 192 (Introduction to Human Communication), Fall 2017

Course: CMST 330 (Intercultural Communication), Fall 2017

**Adjunct Lecturer**, Fall 2016 - Spring 2017

*Department of Communication, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI*

Course: Communication 350 (Intercultural Communication; both online and face-to-face), Fall 2016 - Spring 2017

Course: Communication 105 (Business and Professional Communication), Spring 2017

**Teaching Assistant**, Fall 2010 - Spring 2016

*Department of Communication, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI*

Course: Communication 105 (Business and Professional Communication) Fall 2010 - Spring 2016

Course: Communication 370 (Quantitative Methodology) Fall 2013

Course: Communication 450 (Cross-Cultural Communication) Fall 2014 - Spring 2016

Responsibilities: (1) Developing Syllabi and assignments, (2) Lecturing independently, (3) Consulting with students, (4) Grading, (5) Developing class activities and etc.

**Research Assistant** Fall 2014 – Spring 2015

*UWM Scientific and Medical Communications, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee,  
Milwaukee, WI*

Responsibilities: (1) Running advanced statistical analysis, (2) Writing literature reviews and results for publications, (3) Coding transcripts, (4) Developing questions for focused-group interviews

**Teaching Assistant**, Spring 2009

*Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea*

Course: Globalization and Multiculturalism

Responsibilities: (1) Managing course websites including online discussions, announcement posts, assignment submissions and etc., (2) Preparing class equipment before class, (3) Responding to students' inquiries

**Research Assistant**, March 2009 to February 2010

*Hanyang Institute for Women, Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea (Government funded project)*

Running administrative work and assisting with literature review in the research project, "Social adaptation, transnational identities and flexible citizenship of migrated population".

**Undergraduate Research Assistant**, Fall 2008

*Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea*

Research project conducted by Dr. Sora Park. "Digital convergence policy paradigm by user centered perspective" funded by Korean Communications Commission

**RESEARCH**

**Publications**

- Kim, S., Graham, S. S., **Ahn, S.**, Olson, M. K., Card, D. J., Kessler, M. M., DeVasto, D. M., Roberts, L. R., Bubacy, F. A. (2016). Correcting biased Cohen's Kappa in NVivo. *Communication Methods and Measures, 10*, 217-232. doi:10.1080/19312458.2016.1227772
- Kim, S., Lim, T., Song, H., Cramer, E., **Ahn, S.**, Kim, J., England, N., Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2016). Healthy food and cultural holism. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 52*, 49-59. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.03.002
- Kim, S., Lim, T., Song, H., Hawkins, J., Cramer, E., **Ahn, S.**, Kim, Jihyun, Kim, H., Kim, Junghyun, & Ota, H. (2016). Communicating healthful food choice: Cultural difference in regulatory focus. *Asian Communication Research, 13*, 131-156.
- Graham, S. S., Card, D. J., **Ahn, S.**, Kim, S. Y., Kessler, M. M., & Olson, M. K. (2016). Conflicts of Interest Among Patient and Consumer Representatives to U.S. Food and Drug Administration Drug Advisory Committees. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 165*, 606-607. doi: 10.7326/L16-0031
- Lim, T., & **Ahn, S.** (2015). Dialectics of culture and dynamic balancing between individuality and collectivity. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication, 25*, 63-77. doi 10.1075/japc.25.1.04lim
- Kim, S., Herrman, A., Song, H., Lim, T., Cramer, E., **Ahn, S.**, Kim, J., Ota, H., Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2015). Exploring cultural differences in women's body weight perception: The impact of self-construal on perceived overweight and engagement in health activities. *Health Care for Women International, 37*, 1203-1220. doi:10.1080/07399332.2015.1107070
- Kim, S., **Ahn, S.**, & Lim, T. (2015). Predicting alcohol misuse among college students in the U.S. and South Korea. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse, 14*, 308-322. doi:10.1080/15332640.2014.996313
- Zhao, Q., **Ahn, S.**, Meyers, R. A., Timmerman, E., & Fonner, K. L. (2012). Exploring students' use of email for out-of-class communication: Frequency, satisfaction, and learning self-efficacy. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 23*, 5-32.

Park, S., & **Ahn, S.** (2010). Assessing the impact of social relationships and media use on the acculturation and ethnic identities of second generation Korean Americans. *Comparative Korean Studies*, 18, 197-224.

### **Book Chapter**

Lim, T., & **Ahn, S.** (2015). Politeness and social influence. C. Berger & M. Roloff (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Interpersonal Communication*. doi: 10.1002/9781118540190.wbeic159

### **Published Proceedings**

**Ahn, S.**, Kim, S., & Lim, T. (2013). Different alcohol expectancies across cultures: A comparison between Korea and the U.S. In Y. O. Lee (Ed.), *Intercultural Communication in the Global World* (pp. 131- 149). Paper presented at the 30th annual conference of World Communication Association, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Korea, 8-12 August. Seoul, Korea.

Kim, S., England, N., Cramer, E., Grimes, D., **Ahn, S.**, Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2013). Holistic-analytic thinking and somatization: A cross-cultural study. In Y. O. Lee (Ed.), *Intercultural Communication in the Global World* (pp. 150-169). Paper presented at the 30th annual conference of World Communication Association, Sungkyunkwan University, Seoul, Korea, 8-12 August. Seoul, Korea.

### **Journal Papers in Preparation**

Graham, S. S., Kessler, M. M., Kim, S., **Ahn, S.**, Card, D. J. (to be submitted in October). A comprehensive evaluation of the FDA patient representative program. *Health Communication*.

Graham, S. S. Kessler, M. M., Kim, S., **Ahn, S.** The effects of differential inclusion on FDA pharmaceuticals policy deliberation. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*.

Graham, S. S. Kessler, M. M., Kim, S., **Ahn, S.** *Conflicts of interest and adverse events*. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*.

**Ahn, S.** The Influence of Intergroup Contact and Media Portrayals on Host People's Attitudes toward East Asian, Middle Eastern, and Hispanic Immigrants, Mediated by Integrated Threats.

### **Conferences Presentations and Panels**

**Ahn, S.** (2016, November). *The influence of intergroup contact and media portrayals on host people's attitudes toward East Asian, Middle Eastern, and Hispanic immigrants, mediated by integrated threats.* Poster presented at the 102nd annual convention of the National Communication Association, Mass Communication Division, Philadelphia, PA.

Kim, S., Dellinger, J., **Ahn, S.**, Cramer, E. M., Nicolini, K., Marks, L., Wagner, J. (2016, November). *Diminishing cultural differences: Transitioning from cross- to inter-cultural communication.* Paper presented at the 102nd annual convention of the National Communication Association, International and Intercultural Communication Division, Philadelphia, PA.

Graham, S. S., Kim, S., Kessler, M. M., Card, D. J., DeVasto, D. M., **Ahn, S.**, Olson, M., Bubacy, F., Roberts, L. (2015, October). *The effects of differential inclusion on FDA pharmaceuticals policy deliberation.* Paper presented at the 7th annual convention of the Science in Society. Chicago, IL.

Allen, M., Cole, A., & **Ahn, S.** (2015, May). *Predicting host country nationals contact with immigrants: How perception of others predicts contact.* Paper presented at the annual convention of International Communication Association, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Choi, C. S., **Ahn, S.**, Zhao, T. (2015, April). *The effects of intercultural communication competence and knowledge about the counterpart's culture on adaptive message use in intercultural negotiation.* Paper presented at the Central States Communication Association 2015 Convention, Intercultural Communication Interest Group, Madison, WI

Kim, S., **Ahn, S.**, Cramer, E. M., Hawkins, J., & Song, H. (2015, April). *Promotive versus preventive dietary practice and self-construal: Communicating healthful food choice.*

- Paper presented at the annual convention of the Central State Communication Association, Health Communication Interest Group. Madison, WI.
- Kim, S., Cramer, E. M., & **Ahn, S.** (2015, April). *Family illness, self-construal, perceived susceptibility, and health promotion: Implications for prosocial behavior across cultures.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the Central State Communication Association, Intercultural Communication Interest Group. Madison, WI.
- Omori, K., **Ahn, S.**, Mutua-Kombo, E. M., Astrid, V., Omachinski, K. M., & Lie, S. (2015, April). "*Beyond foreignness: Converging foreign and local experiences to enrich intercultural communication/intercultural interactions on campus and surrounding community.* Panel organized the Central States Communication Association 2015 Convention, Intercultural Communication Interest Group, Madison, WI
- Lim, T., & **Ahn, S.** (2014, November). *Dialectics of culture and dynamic balancing between Individuality and Collectivity.* Poster presented at the 100th annual convention of the National Communication Association, Intercultural Communication Division, Chicago, IL.
- Kim, S., **Ahn, S.**, & Cramer, E.M. (2014, May). *The impact of self-construal on weight estimation and health practice.* Paper presented at the Intercultural Communication Division of the International Communication Association 2014 Conference, Seattle, WA
- Kim, S., Song, H., Cramer, E., **Ahn, S.** (2014, May). *Food preference and Cultural Holism.* Paper presented at the Intercultural Communication Division of the International Communication Association 2014 Conference, Seattle, WA
- Ahn, S.**, & Choi, S. (2014, April). *Compliance-gaining strategies used by Asian American adult children and parents in the wedding planning process.* Paper accepted to the Trans-Asia Graduate Student Conference, Madison, WI
- Kim, S., Allen, M., Cole, A., Cramer, E. C., **Ahn, S.**, Becker, K. A., Choi, C. S., Dilbeck, K. E., Gross, C. M., Hawkins, J. L. M., Jayroe, T. J., Kim, M., Mullane, R. R., Priddis, D. M., Smith, K., Victor, A. K., Willes, K. L., & Zmyslinski-Seelig, A. N. (2013, November). *Testing the evidence effect of Additive Cues Model (ACM).* Paper

presented at the 99th annual convention of the National Communication Association, Communication and Social Cognition Division, Washington, DC.

**Ahn, S.** & Kim, S. (2013, August). *Different alcohol expectancies across cultures: A comparison between Korea and the U.S.* Paper presented at the annual convention of World Communication Association, Seoul, South Korea.

Kim, S., England, N., Cramer, E., Grimes, D., **Ahn, S.**, Kim, H., & Kim, J. (2013, August). *Holistic-analytic thinking and somatization: A cross-cultural study.* Paper presented at the annual convention of World Communication Association, Seoul, South Korea.

**Ahn, S. (Chair)**, Delliinger, J., Hawkinson, J., Lamborn, S., Mutua, E. (2018, April). *Response to Diversity Crisis: Challenges and Strategies for Effective Intercultural Education.* Panel Proposal Submitted to the annual convention of Central State Communication Association 2018, Milwaukee, WI.

### **Research in Progress**

**Ahn, S.** *Meta-Analysis on Immigrants Acculturative Strategies by Contexts.* (Currently collecting manuscript and coding)

**Ahn, S.** *Meta-Analysis on Multicultural Ideology by Contexts* (Currently collecting manuscript and coding)

**Lim, T-S., & Ahn, S.** *Revisiting the Face Theory with Holism* (Currently collecting data from China; reached 70% of the aimed participant number)

**Ahn, S.** *How Cross-Cultural Training Affects Employees' Assessment of Work and Relationships in Diverse Work Settings* (Currently Developing research design)

### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Intercultural GIFTS - Share ideas, activities, assignments, suggestions, resources, and links for teaching Intercultural Communication at CTEM Conference, September 2017

Technology for Teaching and Learning Showcase including Virtual Reality, Library Widgets, Syllabus Re-design, Presentation/Instructional Materials, and TK20 (External tool for assessment) at SCSU, August 2017

Branding and Marketing Campaign of Campus facilitated by Lisa Foss , August 2017

Presentation on Student Success Collaborative facilitated by Glenn Davis, August 2017

Colloquium on “Romantic Relationships and Ghosting on Social Media” by Lea Lefebvre, University of Wyoming, at UWM, April 2016.

Workshop on “A Traveler’s Guide To a Done Dissertation” led by Drs. Foss and Walters, at UWM, March 2016.

Colloquium on “Online Teaching and Use of the Internet Technology,” by Tanya Joosten, at UWM, September 2015.

Colloquium on “How to Make Yourself Competitive: The Transition from Doctoral Student to a Research University Faculty,” by Jihyun Kim, at UWM, October 2015.

Rhetorical Leadership Scholarly Presentation, by Jeremy Engels, at UWM, October 2015.

Peer-reviewing NCA Presentation Practice Session, at UWM, November 2015.

Colloquium on “How to Prepare Job Interview” by Erin Parcell, at UWM, November 2015.

Colloquium on “Destination Dissertation: A Traveler’s Guide to a Done Dissertation,” by Sonja Foss and William Waters, at UWM, March 2016.

Colloquium on "Creating Your Elevator Speech", at UWM, Spring 2014

Professional Development on CSCA Practice Presentations, Spring 2014

Colloquium on "Health Communication and Technology" by Dr. Hayeon Song, at UWM , Spring 2014

Colloquium on “President Lincoln’s Rhetorical Leadership” by Dr. David Zarefesky, at UWM, Spring 2014

Professional Development on "Process and Strategies of Writing and Submitting for Scholarly Publication" by Dr. Mike Allen, at UWM, Fall 2013

Professional Development on NCA Conference Practice Presentations, at UWM, Fall 2013

Colloquium on “Working on Diabetic Education with Urban African American Populations” by Dr. Diane Ames, at UWM, Fall 2013

Colloquium on “Preparing to Work at a State University” by Dr. Kathleen Valde from Northern Illinois University, at UWM, Fall 2013

Colloquium on “Queering President Lincoln” by Dr. Charles Morris III, at UWM, Spring 2013

Professional Development on CSCA Practice Presentations, at UWM, Spring 2013

Professional Development on “Writing Argumentative Essays” by Dr. John Jordan, at UWM, Spring 2013

Colloquium on “The Rhetoric of Science and Jacques Lacan” by Dr. Christian Lundberg from UNC-Chapel Hill, at UWM, Spring 2013

### **SERVICE**

Committee on Community Outreach for the Department of Communication at SCSU, Fall 2017

Committee on Webpage Management for the Department of Communication at SCSU, Fall 2017

Committee on Multicultural Resources Center at SCSU, Fall 2017 to Spring 2018

Ph.D. Representative at Graduate Affairs Committee for the Department of Communication at UWM, Fall 2015

UWM Graduate School Open House at NCA conference, Fall 2015

Peer-tutoring for the Quantitative Methodology Course (graduate course) at UWM, Spring 2015

Ph.D. Representative at Graduate Affairs Committee for the Department of Communication at UWM, Spring 2015

Reviewer for International Communication Association Conference, Fall 2014

Ph.D. Representative at Graduate Affairs Committee for the Department of Communication at UWM, Fall 2014

Instructor at Korean Language School, Fall 2014 to Spring 2015

Guest speaker at the Graduate Student Orientation at UWM, August 2014

Peer-tutoring for the Quantitative Methodology course (graduate level) at UWM,  
Spring 2014

Ph.D. Mentorship coordinator for the Department of Communication at UWM, Spring  
2014

Peer-mentoring for first year doctoral student in the Department of Communication at  
UWM, Fall 2013 to Spring 2014

The vice president of the Korean Student Association at UWM, Fall 2012 to Spring 2013

Guest speaker at the Graduate Teaching Assistant Orientation at UWM, Summer 2012

Volunteered at Hanyang-Shaanxi University Symposium, November 2009

Volunteered at Conference by Korean Association for Advertisement and PR, May 2009

Voluntary translator at KoRoot (Organization for serving Korea-born adoptees),  
November 2009

Voluntary translator at Korean Cultural Center of Korean Embassy in China, February  
2008

Daycare for children with disability at Seoul Children's Hospital, Seoul, Korea, Summer  
2004

### **SCOLARSHIP, GRANTS & AWARDS**

Professional Development Grant, St. Cloud State University, Fall 2017 - Spring  
2018

Graduate Student Travel Award, Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-  
Milwaukee, Fall 2016

Conference Travel Award, Communication Department, University of  
Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Spring 2015

Graduate Student Travel Award, Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-  
Milwaukee, Fall 2014

Conference Travel Award, Communication Department, University of  
Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Spring 2014

Graduate Student Travel Award, Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Spring 2014

Chancellor's Graduate Student Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Fall, 2012

Outstanding Research Award, Communication Department, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Spring 2012

Summa Cum Laude, Hanyang University, Winter 2009

Scholarship of Academic Achievement, Hanyang University, Fall 2003

Scholarship of Academic Achievement, Hanyang University, Spring 2004

Silver Prize on Concours National de Récitation de Poèmes en Français by Association Coréenne des Professeurs de Français, Fall 2001

Bronze Prize on French Poetry Recitation Contest by Gangwon University, Fall 2001

Encouraging Prize on French Language Contest by the Incheon Metropolitan City Office of Education, Spring 2001

Bronze Prize on French Language Competition, Incheon Korea, Spring 2000

### **PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT**

Assistant Editor at University Press in Hanyang University in South Korea, January to December 2009

English Instructor at YBM in South Korea, November 2009 to April 2010

Internship at YTN, News Channel in South Korea, Summer 2007

Internship at Children's Hospital in Seoul, Summer 2004

Internship at Seoul City Hall, Summer 2004

### **LANGUAGES**

Korean - Native in speaking, writing, reading, listening.

English - Fluent in speaking, writing, reading, listening.

Chinese - Fluent in speaking, writing, reading, listening

Certificate: Standard Chinese Proficiency Test (HSK/汉语水平考试) - Advanced Level, 2008

French – Basic in speaking and reading

Certificate: The Diplôme D'études En Langue Française (French Language Proficiency Certification) - A1 Level, 2001