2008

Values in relation to acculturation and adjustment

Heather Elizabeth Simonovich
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Simonovich, Heather Elizabeth, "Values in relation to acculturation and adjustment" (2008). *Master's Theses*. 3607.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.uqpm-ne4j>

https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3607

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

VALUES IN RELATION TO ACCULTURATION AND ADJUSTMENT

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

by

Heather Elizabeth Simonovich

December 2008

UMI Number: 1463367

Copyright 2008 by
Simonovich, Heather Elizabeth

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1463367

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2008

Heather Elizabeth Simonovich

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Sharon Glazer

Dr. Joyce Osland

Helen Stevens

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

12/10/08

ABSTRACT

VALUES IN RELATION TO ACCULTURATION AND ADJUSTMENT

By Heather E. Simonovich

This study examined the congruence between personal values and perceived U.S. values among U.S. American students and international students in the U.S. Data were collected from 305 international students and 218 domestic (U.S.) students studying at San José State University during Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters. Stimulation value congruence was greater for U.S. students than for international students, but congruence among personal and perceived power, benevolence, and universalism values was greater for international vs. U.S. students. Personal and perceived affective and cognitive work outcomes were more congruent among international students than U.S. students. Finally, international students valuing benevolence more than they think Americans value it were more marginalized or separated than international students who value benevolence similarly to what they thought Americans value it. Results suggest that international students come to the U.S. already seeing themselves as similar to Americans, whereas Americans see themselves quite differently from other Americans.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis chair, Dr. Sharon Glazer, for all her support, guidance, patience, and motivation throughout the lengthy and labyrinthine thesis process.

Second, I would like to extend my gratitude to my second reader, Dr. Joyce Osland, for her help in revising my writing and the insight she offered me.

I would also like to thank my third reader, Helen Stevens of the International Programs and Services Department, for her input, for writing a letter of support of my research for HS-IRB, and for providing me with international and exchange students' addresses so I could administer the surveys.

I would like to thank Dr. Mark Novak of International and Extended Studies at San José State University for providing his financial support of this thesis and for copying the original surveys for distribution to international and domestic students at SJSU.

I would like to thank the three undergraduate student research assistants who helped me code surveys (Veronica Guzmán), input survey data (Veronica Luna), and summarize articles to develop the SPARC presentation (Ian Moore).

Finally, thanks to my family, Carlos Mario, Marcos Sevastián, and Peter Nicolás for their support and for putting up with the long hours I have dedicated to this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
<i>Background</i>	2
<i>Values, Adjustment, and Acculturation</i>	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	5
<i>Values</i>	5
<i>Basic Life Values</i>	5
<i>Work Values</i>	6
<i>Value Congruence</i>	10
<i>Acculturation</i>	11
<i>Identity Theory</i>	13
<i>Adjustment</i>	14
<i>The Present Study and Hypotheses</i>	16
METHOD	20
<i>Procedures</i>	20
<i>Participants</i>	22
<i>Measures</i>	29
<i>Schwartz's Values Survey</i>	29
<i>Work Values Questionnaire</i>	30
<i>Acculturation Index</i>	31
<i>Socio-cultural Adaptation Scale</i>	33

<i>Demographics</i>	33
<i>Data Analysis</i>	35
RESULTS	36
DISCUSSION.....	53
<i>Value Congruence</i>	53
<i>Acculturation</i>	55
<i>Sociocultural Adjustment</i>	57
<i>Applications for Programs</i>	58
<i>Limitations</i>	61
<i>Future Research</i>	63
CONCLUSION.....	65
REFERENCES	68
APPENDICES	73
Appendix A. Signed IRB Approval Letter	73
Appendix B. International Students' Survey	75
Appendix C. U.S. Students' Survey	87

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. <i>Region of the World Where Born</i>	22
2. <i>Country of Birth</i>	23
3. <i>Ethnic Identity</i>	24
4. <i>Region of the World with Which Students Most Identify</i>	25
5. <i>First Language Spoken</i>	26
6. <i>Primary Language Spoken</i>	27
7. <i>Marital Status, Major, Primary Caregiver, and Secondary Caregiver</i>	28
8. <i>Cronbach Alpha Reliabilities for Schwartz' Ten Value Types, Work Values, Acculturation, and Sociocultural Adaptation for International and Domestic Students</i>	31
9. <i>Factor Analysis of Sociocultural Adaptation Scale</i>	34
10. <i>Mean Gap Between Personal Values and Perceived Values of People from the United States</i>	37
11. <i>Within Sample Life Values Gaps</i>	39
12. <i>Gap Between Personal Work Values and Perceived U.S. Work Values</i>	41
13. <i>Within Sample Values Gaps</i>	42
14. <i>ANOVA of Universalism, Stimulation, Benevolence, and Power Gap on Acculturation Mode</i>	45
15. <i>ANOVA of International Students' Personal Values on Acculturation Mode.</i>	46

16. <i>ANOVA of Cognitive Outcomes at Work and Affective Outcomes at Work Gap on Acculturation Mode</i>	47
17. <i>ANOVA of International Students' Work Values on Acculturation Mode.....</i>	49
18. <i>Partial Correlations between Values Gap (Between Personal Values and Perceived Values of People from the United States) and Sociocultural Adjustment to the United States among International Students.....</i>	50
19. <i>Partial Correlations between Work Values Gap (Personal Work Values and Perceived Work Values of People from the United States) and Sociocultural Adjustment to the United States among International Students</i>	50
20. <i>Correlations between Values, Sociocultural Adjustment, and Time in the U.S.A. among International Students.....</i>	51
21. <i>Correlations between Values and Sociocultural Adjustment among Domestic Students</i>	52

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>FIGURE</i>	<i>PAGE</i>
1. Theoretical model of relationships among motivational values types	7
2. Theoretical structure of work values	10
3. International and domestic students' personal life values and perceived U.S. life values	40
4. International and domestic students' work values and perceived U.S. work values	43

INTRODUCTION

Studies on personal values in relation to well-being are increasing (Schwartz & Bardi, 2001; van Vianen, de Pater, Kristof-Brown, & Johnson, 2004; Ward & Searle, 1991), as it has been shown that values drive psychological responses to various situations or contexts (Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995; Schwartz, 1994). However, one area that has had minimal study (exceptions include Castillo, Conoley, & Brossart, 2004; van Vianen et al.; Ward & Searle) is values or value congruence in relation to acculturation and socio-cultural adjustment. The relevance of such research is evidenced in the problems international students face world-wide.

International students studying in the United States (Li & Gasser, 2005; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004; Swagler & Ellis, 2003; Ward & Kennedy, 1994), Singapore (Ward & Kennedy, 1999), Australia (Ward & Kennedy, 1994), or New Zealand (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1994; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Ward & Searle, 1991) have reported adjustment problems. Some problems include loneliness (Ward & Searle) lack of confidence in English fluency (Swagler & Ellis; Ward & Kennedy, 1999), social contact difficulties with host nationals (Li & Gasser; Searle & Ward; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Ward & Searle), lack of identification with host nationals (Searle & Ward; Swagler & Ellis; Ward & Kennedy, 1994; Ward & Searle), lack of identification with co-nationals (Ward & Kennedy, 1994), difficulty being independent in their daily life (Swagler & Ellis), and greater role ambiguity in performing work/internship duties (Nilsson & Anderson). There is little understanding of *what* influences international students' adjustment problems to life in the United States. In this study, congruence of

international students' values and perceived U.S. values will be compared to the congruence of U.S. students' values and perceived U.S. values. In addition, international students' congruence scores will be examined in relation to their adjustment and acculturation to life in California.

Background

In the United States, international students comprise about 4.0% of university student body populations (Open Doors, 2005). In the 2004-2005 school year, 13.3% of international students in the United States attended college in California, making it the leading host state for international students in the United States (Open Doors). At San José State University (SJSU), international students accounted for approximately 18.5% of the total number of students in the 2004-2005 academic year (Enrollment and Academic Services Department). Furthermore, the ethnic diversity of SJSU's student body is reflected in its ranking as the seventh university in the United States for conferring the most bachelor's degrees on minority students in the 2000-2001 academic year (San José State University, 2003).

Although numerous campus organizations and activities at SJSU serve the domestic student body, fewer focus on international student needs. Two exceptions are SJSU's MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center and SJSU's International House (a housing facility for domestic and international students). The MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center at SJSU is an institution that provides activities and support services for students, such as: advising and advocacy, resources, programs and events, outreach, and academic enrichment (San José State University MOSAIC, 2006). The International House (I-

House) at SJSU is a co-ed residence for U.S. national and international students attending SJSU. It offers a space for friendly interaction among SJSU students from diverse cultures (San José State University International House, 2006).

Although international students in higher learning institutions might interact with domestic students, an often-cited complaint among international students (Li & Gasser, 2005; Swagler & Ellis, 2003) is a lack of friendships forged with domestic students. Given that nearly 20% of SJSU's student body is international and international students play a vital role in campus life, it is imperative to determine their mode of acculturation and level of adjustment, and to learn factors that have an impact on their acculturation and adjustment, so that organizations like MOSAIC or I-House can develop activities that help students resolve salient concerns. One potential antecedent to adjustment might be shared values.

Values, Adjustment, and Acculturation

Values are (1) concepts or beliefs, (2) that pertain to desirable end states of behaviors, (3) that transcend specific situations, (4) that guide selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and (5) that are ordered by relative importance (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987; 1990). When values differ among people, conflict can arise (Cable & Edwards; Schneider, 1987) and lead to poor adjustment and distress (Castillo et al., 2004; Krishnan & Berry, 1992; van Vianen et al., 2004; Verquer, Beehr, & Wagner, 2003). Differences in values between international students and students from the host country might make it difficult to adjust and acculturate to SJSU.

In this study, the extent to which self-reported personal values are congruent with respondents' perceptions of U.S. students' values will be examined in relation to acculturation and sociocultural adjustment. Acculturation refers to psychological and behavioral changes experienced after sustained contact with members of other cultural groups (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999); socio-cultural adjustment refers to the level of acquisition of culturally appropriate skills and the ability to interact with others in the host culture (Ward & Kennedy, 1999).

Theoretical background and definitions of the main study variables are provided in the next section. This is followed by research hypotheses, methodology, results, and finally a discussion of findings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study is based on theories of person-environment fit, identity theory, value congruence, acculturation, and adjustment. Given this foundation, it is expected that as one identifies more with the host culture, one will fit in better with the host society, thereby adjusting and acculturating better to the host nation. Fit refers to the idea that attitudes and behaviors result from congruence between personal characteristics (including values, goals, abilities, personality, and biological or psychological needs) and environmental factors (including intrinsic or extrinsic rewards, physical or psychological demands, cultural values, or environmental conditions) (Cable & Edwards, 2004). Identity refers to the meaning one gives to one's role in a given situation (Stryker & Burke, 2000). In this study, fit and identity are examined in terms of life and work values.

Values

Basic Life Values. According to Schwartz (1992) basic life values are guiding principles that drive individuals' behaviors toward an end-goal. People prioritize values similarly within and across all cultures. Schwartz demonstrates that the values in his survey are comprehensive (i.e., all values important across cultures are included) and hold equivalent meaning across different groups, and uphold a similar structure across nations (i.e., contradictory values consistently oppose each other and related values are compatible; Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz & Boehnke, 2004; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Values are driven by three universal requirements crucial for human survival, including biological needs of individuals, requirements of social interactions, or survival and

welfare of the group (Schwartz, 1992). Upon this foundation, Schwartz developed a list of 57 values, which collapsed into ten motivational types of life values (see Figure 1). These 10 value types are self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, and universalism (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995).

The structure of Schwartz's value types has been found consistently across samples in culturally distinct countries around the world (including many that are represented in the SJSU international student sample) and can therefore be considered to be nearly universal (Sagiv & Schwartz, 1995; Schwartz, 1994, Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). His Basic Values Theory has been successfully used to predict attitudes and behaviors (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz, Sagiv, & Boehke, 2000), and most values are substantially related to commonly recognized corresponding behaviors, implying that values motivate human behavior (Bardi & Schwartz; 2003).

Work Values

Work values are any outcome (object, behavior, or situation) in the work context upon which a group or individual places a high worth or importance (Elizur, 1984; Elizur, Borg, Hunt, & Magyari Beck, 1991; Sagie, Elizur, & Koslowsky, 1996). Work values are an expression of *basic* values in the work setting (Ros, Schwartz, & Surkiss, 1999). According to Elizur and Sagie (1999), life values and work values are distinct, though both work values and personal values are learned from parents, teachers, peers, and others in the culture with which an individual identifies him or herself (Sagie et al.; Schwartz, 1992). Although different theories of work values have been proposed over

the years (Dolan, Diez-Pinol, Fernandez-Alles, Martin-Prius, & Martinez-Fierro, 2004; Furnham, Petrides, Tsaousis, Pappas, & Garrod, 2005; Spony, 2003), Elizur's (1984) theory of work values generalizes to male and female workers in different cultures (Elizur, 1994; Elizur et al., 1991; Sagie et al.).

Figure 1: Schwartz's (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995) Theoretical model of relationships among motivational values types.

Elizur (1984; 1994; Elizur et al., 1991; Elizur & Sagie, 1999; Sagie et al., 1996) proposed two distinct criteria for classifying work values, modality of outcome (Facet A) and system-performance contingency (Facet B) (see Figure 2). Facet A deals with three distinct modalities of work outcomes, including instrumental or material outcomes, affective outcomes, and cognitive outcomes. Instrumental or material outcomes at work are those that are external motivators and of concrete or practical use to the worker. Pay is the most direct of this type of outcome, but benefits, hours of work, and work conditions all have direct practical consequences as well. Affective outcomes concern interpersonal relations, such as opportunities to interact with other people, including colleagues and supervisor. Cognitive outcomes reflect a person's belief system regarding appropriate behavior at work, and include interest in the job, achievement, responsibility, and independence on the job.

Facet B classifies work values in terms of system-performance contingency (Elizur, 1994; Elizur et al., 1991). System-performance contingency distinguishes between rewards offered by the organization to its members that are unrelated to task performance and those that are contingent upon task performance. The former, includes benefit plans, working conditions, transportation or subsidized meals, and other services or resources provided to all employees by the organization regardless of task performance. Performance rewards are provided after task performance and in exchange for task performance; they include recognition, advancement, feedback, status, and pay.

The hypothesized radex structure of Elizur's (1984) theory of work values positions the three modalities from Facet A (instrumental, affective, and cognitive

outcomes at work) around the circumference of the values structure, while the two types of rewards that compose Facet B are positioned from the center (performance rewards) to the periphery (resources or system rewards) of the structure (see Figure 2). This structure has been validated in numerous studies across diverse cultures (i.e., Western and Far Eastern) and among countries with different political systems and ideologies (i.e., communist and capitalistic countries), with minor variations (Elizur, 1984; 1994; Elizur et al., 1991). In this thesis, Facet A is studied, rather than Facet B.

Sagie and colleagues (1996) note that while values are learned from significant others in one's environment, they are modified based on further experience. Work values are related to and may be influenced by one's gender, age, education, seniority within the organization, work ethics based on religious tradition, need for achievement, motivation, organizational commitment, level of value congruence with the organization, work norms, job performance, and national culture. Sagie and colleagues propose that work values (including the modality of outcome facet and the system-performance contingency facet), background (i.e., culture, religion, socioeconomic status, organizational membership, societal roles), and correlates of work values (such as ethics, norms, motivation, attitudes, etc.) are antecedents of group or individual job behaviors. In this study, work values are examined in relation to acculturation and socio-cultural adjustment. Although not exactly behavior, the acculturation index and the sociocultural adjustment rating scales address people's feelings and cognitions, which are known to precede behavior (Ellis, 1991; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999; Ward & Searle, 1991).

Figure 2. Elizur's (1984) Theoretical structure of work values.

Value Congruence

The extent to which the values of an individual are similar to those of others (including organizations and people) is known as value congruence (Cable & Edwards, 2004; Kristof, 1996). Individuals who experience similarity between their own values

and the values of their environment are likely to report better communication and improved interpersonal relationships (Kalliath, Bluedorn, & Strube, 1999; O'Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991) and to experience fewer role stressors (i.e., role ambiguity and conflict; Verquer et al., 2003). People who espouse values different from those prominent in the external environment (i.e., value incongruence) are more likely to experience cognitive dissonance (O'Reilly et al.). For example, Mexican American female college students in the United States who feel discomfort with White American values report an increase in distress (Castillo et al., 2004). Van Vianen and colleagues (2004) report that expatriates from 26 countries experience greater difficulty adjusting at work and interacting with host nationals when they perceive value differences with host nationals. In this study, because greater value congruence is indicative of greater identification with host nationals, it is expected that the extent to which international students' personal and work values are congruent with their *perceptions* of the personal and work values held by people from the United States will relate to the ease with which they acculturate and adjust to life in the United States.

Acculturation

Acculturation is the process of psychological and behavioral changes that a person undergoes after sustained contact with members of another cultural group (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Berry (1989) proposes that individuals in the process of acculturating to a culture different from their own face two questions: "Is it of value to me to maintain my own cultural identity and characteristics?" and "Is it of value to me to maintain relationships with other groups?" Their responses to these questions reflect

their attitudes regarding both cultures (Berry; Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989). A person's chosen acculturation attitude places him or her in one of four modes of acculturation, including assimilation, integration, separation, or marginalization (Berry; Berry, et al.; Krishnan & Berry, 1992). (1) People who seek to maintain relationships with members of the other culture (i.e., with members of the host culture, in the case of sojourners and international students), but do not maintain a relationship with members of their own cultural group have adopted *assimilation* as their mode of acculturation. (2) Those who seek to maintain relationships with both co-nationals and host nationals have adopted an *integration* mode of acculturation. (3) People who seek to only maintain relationships with others of their own cultural group have adopted *separation* as their acculturation mode. (4) Finally, individuals who neither maintain relationships with others from their own cultural group nor with those of the host culture have adopted *marginalization* as their acculturation strategy. Antecedents of an adopted mode of acculturation include demographics (age, gender, marital status), desires for children (e.g., to speak language of host culture and/or language of one's own culture), food choices (one's own culture's food or host culture's food), communication (ability to understand and communicate in host culture's language, frequency of speaking one's own culture's language, reading newspapers from host culture and/or one's own culture), participation in host culture and/or own culture organizations (Krishnan & Berry), need for cognitive closure, and availability of co-ethnics upon arrival to host country (Kosic, Kruglanski, Pierro, & Mannetti, 2004).

Identity Theory

A person's chosen acculturation mode and the acculturation process itself is framed around the concept of identity. One's identity is formed by giving meaning to one's role in a given situation (Stryker & Burke, 2000). It is influenced by both internal processes (i.e., comparison of meaning given to a situation with one's identity standard; Burke, 1991; Burke & Reitzes, 1991; Burke & Stets, 1999), and societal structure (i.e., expectations for proper behavior in a given role; Stryker & Burke; Stryker & Serpe, 1994). One who integrates into society identifies with both the host culture and with others of the same culture of origin (i.e., co-national identification). One forms an identity with some entity (e.g., religious group, workplace, or society) when one perceives his or her role within that entity to be important in relation to the importance placed on such a role by the majority in that same context (Stryker & Burke). For example, a young woman might take on the roles of student, friend, worker, daughter, and sister. Depending upon the situational context (i.e., school, with friends, at work, with parents or siblings), she will see one of her roles as salient and act according to the culturally defined identity standard of that salient role. More specifically, if her role is that of student, she will engage in typical student behaviors in class, thereby forging a stronger sense of student identity. When a person's identity standard matches the perceived situational meaning, the person will likely act in accordance with the culture's behavioral expectations associated with the salient role, which will lead to the person's perception of reinforcement of his or her connectedness to the salient role and commitment to the group. For example, at school, the young person's self-perception as

a student will be reinforced by her professors and classmates when she engages in typical student behaviors. As a result, the student better identifies with the school context and with her role as student. In the current study, the extent to which international students identify with country of origin and/or their host country, will determine the acculturation mode into which they will be classified.

International students' identification will be examined by way of value congruence. The extent to which one identifies with the host culture's values will be examined in relation to acculturation. If student sojourners perceive themselves to share values with the host culture (i.e., United States; i.e., high value congruence), they will likely report greater integration or assimilation than international students whose values diverge from the host culture.

Adjustment

Searle and Ward (1990) propose two interrelated, but conceptually separate dimensions of adjustment: psychological adjustment and sociocultural adjustment. These two components of adjustment significantly correlate with each other, but remain distinct (Searle & Ward; Ward & Kennedy, 1999; Ward & Searle, 1991). Psychological adjustment refers to individual psychological and emotional well-being or satisfaction and can be understood in a stress and coping framework. The transactional framework of stress would suggest that the impact of the challenges one confronts when facing a transition to a new culture is affected by one's personality, coping styles, life changes, and social support (Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Searle). Psychological adjustment has been associated with personal flexibility, internal locus of control, relationship

satisfaction, approach-oriented coping styles, and use of humor (Searle & Ward; Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). In contrast, psychological difficulties are associated with higher incidence of life changes, loneliness, stress, and avoidant coping styles (Searle & Ward; Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Rana-Deuba). In this thesis, sociocultural adjustment, rather than psychological adjustment, is studied.

Sociocultural adjustment is considered a measure of behavioral competence in the new culture (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). It refers to the ability of a sojourner to fit into the host culture, to acquire skills that are appropriate in the new culture, and to navigate daily aspects of life in the new environment. According to Ward and Kennedy, sociocultural adjustment is best understood within a social skills or cultural learning paradigm. It is influenced by factors related to culture learning and social skills acquisition in the new culture, length of residence in the host culture, cultural knowledge, amount of interaction and identification with host nationals, cultural distance, language fluency, and choice of acculturation strategies (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Searle, 1991). Cultural distance refers to the extent to which one's culture of origin is different from the host culture (Ward et al., 1991; 1999).

Sociocultural adjustment frequently increases quickly among sojourners during the first months in a new culture, but gradually levels off as culturally appropriate skills are learned (Ward & Kennedy, 1999). Difficulties in socio-cultural adjustment are greater in sojourning groups (i.e., international students or expatriate employees of multinational organizations) compared to sedentary immigrant groups (Ward & Kennedy). Also, assimilated sojourners experience fewer sociocultural adjustment

problems than other acculturating groups (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Furthermore, Ward and Kennedy (1994) found that sojourners in New Zealand experience less difficulty with sociocultural adjustment when they identify strongly with host nationals (whether assimilated or integrated; separated individuals experienced the greatest amount of sociocultural difficulty).

Little attention has been given to the extent to which convergence between sojourners' personal and work values with perceptions of and actual values of the dominant host nationals relate to sojourners' level of sociocultural adjustment and to their adopted acculturation strategy. One exception is van Vianen and colleagues' (2004) work. They found that the greater the discrepancy between expatriates' universalism and benevolence values and their perceptions of locals' universalism and benevolence values, the lower their interaction adjustment and work adjustment. Further, these findings are supported by research linking values to well-being (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000).

The Present Study and Hypotheses

The purpose of this study is to examine congruence of international students' reported life and work values and their perceptions of U.S. students' personal and work values, in relation to international students' adjustment and acculturation to life in the United States. International students' value congruence and domestic students' value congruence in relation to adjustment and acculturation will be compared in order to determine if there are discernable differences that may result from coming from another culture. By making this comparison, this study will add to the body of cross-cultural research literature on acculturation and adjustment and potentially explain why

international students (particularly at SJSU) adjust (or do not adjust) to life in the United States. Results from this research are expected to be particularly useful for the International Programs and Services office at SJSU in both preparing international students for their studies at SJSU and for life in the United States and in dealing with international students seeking advice or counseling.

Hypothesis 1: The gap between international students' personal *life* values and their perceptions of U.S. life values will be greater than the gap between domestic (U.S.) students' personal life values and domestic students' perceptions of U.S. life values.

Hypothesis 2: The gap between international students' personal *work* values and their perceptions of U.S. work values will be greater than the gap between domestic (U.S.) students' personal work values and domestic students' perceptions of U.S. work values.

Previous studies have examined links between value congruence and work attitudes (Verquer et al., 2003), between values and acculturation to the dominant culture in minority college students (Castillo et al., 2004), between values and sociocultural adjustment in sojourning college students (Ward & Searle, 1991), between Schwartz' basic values and adjustment in expatriate workers (van Vianen et al., 2004), and between the length of time spent in the host culture and sociocultural adjustment (Ward & Searle; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). In their 2003 meta-analysis, Verquer and colleagues showed that value congruence between an employee and an organization positively relates to the person's job satisfaction and commitment to the organization, and

negatively relates to the employee's intent to turnover. Therefore, it stands to reason that a gap between international students' personal values and their perceptions of their hosts' personal values, as well as a gap between their own work values and their perceptions of their hosts' work values will relate to both their mode of acculturation to the host culture and to their levels of sociocultural adjustment to the host culture.

Hypothesis 3: International students who are separated or marginalized will have greater gap scores between their personal *life* values and their perceptions of U.S. *life* values than international students who are integrated and assimilated.

Hypothesis 4: International students who are separated or marginalized will have greater gap scores between their personal *work* values and their perceptions of U.S. *work* values than international students who are integrated and assimilated.

Hypothesis 5: As the gap between international students' personal *life* values and their perceptions of U.S. *life* values increases, sociocultural adjustment will decrease.

Hypothesis 6: As the gap between international students' personal *work* values and their perceptions of U.S. *work* values increases, sociocultural adjustment will decrease.

Ward and Kennedy (1999) found that sociocultural adaptation problems among diverse populations of both sojourning international students and expatriate workers are greatest during the early stages of transition and they decrease significantly over time. Based on this, it is hypothesized that

Hypothesis 7: As the amount of time international students have spent in the United States increases, sociocultural adjustment will also increase.

METHOD

Procedures

Two thousand one hundred and ninety-seven (2,197) SJSU undergraduate and graduate students (1,979 international students and 218 U.S. students) were contacted and asked to complete a questionnaire. This population was selected because of the interest that the International and Extended Studies office has in international student acculturation and adjustment.

Two similar surveys were developed, one for international students and one for U.S. students. The survey for international students (see Appendix B) did not include questions pertaining solely to U.S. students, and the survey for domestic students (see Appendix C) did not include questions pertaining solely to international students.

Participants were recruited in four ways. In the first way, international and exchange students at SJSU were contacted by mail; they received a mailing with the cover letter, survey, and stamped return envelope, addressed to the researcher. The International Programs and Services (IPS) office at SJSU provided addresses for international and exchange students. In the second way, U.S. students were contacted at the Psychology Department's Open Research Day held at SJSU on November 21, 2004. Open Research Day is a weekend day (or days) each semester when faculty or graduate students from the Psychology Department can collect data from student participants. Students received a cover letter and the U.S. student version of the survey. International students who came to the Open Research Day were given the cover letter and the international student survey. In the third way, the researcher distributed surveys to

students in classrooms. In the fourth way, the survey was posted online and an email was sent to all the international students at SJSU requesting that they complete the survey online if they had not yet responded to it in paper form.

Data were collected between November 2004 and March 2005. Locations for data collection included SJSU classrooms in November 2004 and the November 21, 2004 “Psychology Department Open Research Day.” The majority of participants received their surveys by mail between November 2004 and March 2005 and were asked (in the cover letter) to complete and return the survey via the U.S. Postal Service in the provided stamped addressed envelopes.

The International Programs and Services Office provided the researcher with two sets of address labels with the addresses of all the International Students enrolled at SJSU during both the Fall 2004 semester and the Spring 2005 semester so that the researcher could mail out a copy of the survey and a follow-up reminder postcard (one week after the survey had been sent out) to all International Students at SJSU. In follow-up postcards, students were asked if they had not already completed the survey that had been sent, that they do so immediately, as their data could help IPS better serve international students in the future.

Participants’ answers were kept completely anonymous; students’ names were not recorded on the survey, no follow-up interviews were performed, and no follow-up surveys were distributed.

Participants

A total of 523 surveys were returned, resulting in a 23.8% response rate. Of these, 305 surveys were from international students and 218 were from domestic U.S. students. International students' ages ranged from 17 to 41 years ($M = 25.37$, $S.D. = 4.69$) and U.S. students' ages ranged from 17 to 44 ($M = 20.02$, $S.D. = 3.73$). Among international students, 48.1% were female and 39.5% were male (12.4% declined to state). Among U.S. students, 59.5% were female and 38.7% were male (1.7% declined to state).

As can be seen in Table 1, the largest group of international students was born in East Asia or the Pacific Islands (53.2 %), 14.6% were born in West Asia, 9.0% were born in Europe, 5.6% were born in Latin America or the Caribbean. The majority (84%) of students who completed the U.S. student survey were born in the United States; 10.4% were born in East Asia or the Pacific Islands (see Tables 1 and 2). Students who were born outside of the United States but completed the U.S. student survey did so because they described themselves as U.S. students when given a choice of which survey to complete at the time of survey distribution at the Psychology Open Research Day or in the classroom setting.

Table 1. Region of the World Where Born

Region of the World	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
U.S.A./Canada	5	2.1	146	84.4
Latin America/ Caribbean	13	5.6	2	1.2
Europe	21	9.0	1	0.6
Africa	1	0.4		
Middle East	7	3.0	2	1.2
West Asia	34	14.6	2	1.2
East Asia/Pacific Islands	124	53.2	18	10.4

Table 2. *Country of Birth*

Country	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
U.S.A.	4	1.7	146	84.4
Argentina	1	0.4		
Belarus	1	0.4		
Brazil	2	0.9		
Bulgaria	2	0.9		
Canada	1	0.4		
China (People's Republic)/	23	9.9		
Hong Kong				
Colombia	2	0.9		
Cyprus	1	0.4		
El Salvador			1	0.6
Fiji Islands	1	0.4		
France	2	0.9		
Germany	1	0.4	1	0.6
Greece	1	0.4		
Guyana	1	0.4		
Honduras	1	0.4		
Hungary	1	0.4		
India	30	12.9		
Indonesia	7	3.0		
Iran	1	0.4	1	0.6
Japan	27	11.6		
Kenya	1	0.4		
Korea	10	4.3	1	0.6
Macau	1	0.4		
Malaysia	2	0.9		
Mexico	4	1.7		
Myanmar/Burma	2	0.9		
Nepal	1	0.4		
Nicaragua			1	0.6
Norway	1	0.4		
Pakistan	4	1.7	2	1.2
Palestine	2	0.9	1	0.6
Peru	2	0.9		
Philippines	6	2.6	4	2.3
Poland	2	0.9		
Russia	2	0.9		
Saudi Arabia	1	0.4		
Serbia and Montenegro	1	0.4		
Slovenia	1	0.4		

Table 2. Cont'd

Country	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Spain	2	0.9		
Sweden	2	0.9		
Taiwan	36	15.5	1	0.6
Thailand	3	1.3	1	0.6
Turkey	3	1.3		
U.K.	1	0.4		
Vietnam	5	2.1	11	6.4

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of international students described their ethnic identity as Asian; 9.9% described their ethnic identity as Caucasian/White/European American, and 4.3% described themselves as Latino/a (see Table 3 for more specific numbers and percentages regarding ethnic identity). Thirty-eight percent (38.7%) of U.S. students described themselves as Caucasian/White/European Americans; 19.1% described themselves as Asian; 12.7% described themselves as Latino/a; and 9.2% described themselves as Pacific Islander; (see Table 3 for more specific frequencies and percentages regarding ethnic identity).

Table 3. *Ethnic Identity*

Ethnic Identity	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
American	3	1.3	7	4.0
African/African American	1	0.4	8	4.6
Caucasian/White/European American	13	5.6	60	34.7
Arabic			1	0.6
Asian	137	58.8	33	19.1
European	10	4.3	7	4.0
Latino/a	10	4.3	22	12.7
Middle-Eastern	5	2.1	2	1.2
Native American	0	0	1	0.6
Pacific Islands	6	2.6	16	9.2

The length of time international students have spent in the United States varied from less than one year to 23 years ($M = 3.99$, $S.D. = 3.43$); the length of time international students have lived in the country in which they were born varied from less than one year to 36 years ($M = 19.88$, $S.D. = 6.87$).

As shown in Table 4, over one third (35.6%) of international students identify most with an East Asian or Pacific Island country, 23.2% identify most with the United States or Canada, 9.4% identify with a West Asian country, and 9.0% identify with a European country; 97.1% of U.S. students identify most with the United States or Canada.

<i>Table 4. Region of the World with Which Students Most Identify</i>				
Region of the World	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
U.S.A./Canada	54	23.2	168	97.1
Latin America/ Caribbean	7	3.0		
Europe	21	9.0	1	0.6
Africa	1	0.4		
Middle East	6	2.6		
West Asia	22	9.4	1	0.6
East Asia/Pacific Islands	83	35.6	3	1.7

Per Table 5, 26.2% of international students spoke a Chinese language as their first language; 11.6% spoke Japanese as their first language; 10.7% spoke an Indian or Pakistani language as their first language; 6.9% spoke English as their first language; and 5.6 percent spoke Spanish as their first language. As the primary language spoken in daily life at the time of this study, 25.3% of international students spoke English; 20.6% spoke a Chinese language; 9.9% spoke Japanese; and 8.8% spoke an Indian or Pakistani language. Nearly seventy-two percent (71.7%) of U.S. students reported that English was

their first language; 7.5% reported that Spanish was their first language; and 6.4% reported that Vietnamese was their first language.

Table 5. <i>First Language Spoken</i>				
Language	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
English	16	6.9	124	71.7
Arabic	2	0.9	2	1.2
Bengali	1	0.4		
Bosnian/Serbo-Croatian	1	0.4		
Bulgarian	2	0.9		
Burmese	2	0.9		
Cambodian			1	0.6
Chinese	61	26.2	4	2.3
Dutch	1	0.4		
Farsi/Persian	1	0.4	3	1.7
Filipino	6	2.6	5	2.9
French	2	0.9		
German	1	0.4	1	0.6
Greek	2	0.9	1	0.6
Hungarian	1	0.4		
Indian/Pakistani	25	10.7	2	1.2
Indonesian	6	2.6		
Japanese	27	11.6		
Korean	10	4.3	2	1.2
Nepali	1	0.4		
Norwegian	1	0.4		
Polish	2	0.9		
Portuguese	2	0.9		
Russian	3	1.3		
Slovenian	1	0.4		
Spanish	13	5.6	13	7.5
Swahili	1	0.4		
Swedish	2	0.9		
Thai	3	1.3		
Turkish	3	1.3		
Vietnamese	4	1.7	11	6.4

Nearly ninety-two percent (91.9%) of U.S. students reported that English is the primary language they spoke; 2.9% reported that Vietnamese was the primary language

they spoke; and 2.3% reported that Spanish was the primary language they spoke (see Tables 5 and 6 for more specific frequencies and percentages regarding first language and primary language spoken, respectively).

Table 6. *Primary Language Spoken*

Language	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
English	59	25.3	159	91.9
Arabic	2	0.9		
Bosnian/Serbo-Croatian	1	0.4		
Bulgarian	2	0.9		
Burmese	2	0.9		
Chinese	48	20.6	1	0.6
Dutch	1	0.4		
Farsi/Persian	1	0.4	1	0.6
Filipino	2	0.9		
French	2	0.9		
Greek	2	0.9		
Hungarian	1	0.4		
Indian/Pakistani	19	8.2	1	0.6
Indonesian	5	2.1		
Japanese	23	9.9		
Korean	9	3.9		
Nepali	1	0.4		
Norwegian	1	0.4		
Polish	2	0.9		
Russian	1	0.4		
Slovenian	1	0.4		
Spanish	9	3.9	4	2.3
Thai	3	1.3		
Turkish	3	1.3		
Vietnamese	3	1.3	5	2.9

Most of the international student respondents (71.7%) were single; 14.2% were married, remarried, or living with a partner. Ninety percent (90.2%) of U.S. students were single; 4.0% were married, remarried or living with a partner; 4.0% reported the

unspecified “other” category (see Table 7 for more specific frequencies and percentages regarding marital status).

Table 7. Marital Status, Major, Primary Caregiver, and Secondary Caregiver

Marital Status	International Students		U.S. Students	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Single	167	71.7	156	90.2
Married/Remarried/Living with Partner	33	14.2	7	4.0
Legally Separated/Divorced	1	0.4	3	1.7
Other	4	1.7	7	4.0
Major				
Applied Science and Arts	34	14.6	44	25.4
Humanities and the Arts	21	9.0	14	8.1
Business	28	12.0	10	5.8
Education	8	3.4	7	4.0
Engineering	53	22.7	6	3.5
Science	27	11.6	8	4.6
Social Science	22	9.4	48	27.7
Undeclared	4	1.7	24	13.9
Primary Caregiver				
First Generation U.S. born	2	0.9	21	12.1
Second Generation U.S. born			26	15.0
Third Generation U.S. born	1	0.4	50	28.9
Immigrant to the U.S.	22	9.4	74	42.8
Never Immigrated to the U.S.	170	73.0		
Secondary Caregiver				
First Generation U.S. born			19	11.0
Second Generation U.S. born			11	6.4
Third Generation U.S. born	1	0.4	54	31.2
Immigrant to the U.S.	19	8.2	61	35.3
Never Immigrated to the U.S.	149	63.9		

Nearly one quarter (22.7%) of international students were majoring in Engineering. The remainder were studying in the College of Applied Science and the Arts (14.6%), College of Business (12.0%), College of Science (11.6%), College of

Social Science (9.4%), and College of Humanities and Arts (9.0%). In contrast, over one quarter (27.7%) of U.S. students were majoring in Social Sciences, one quarter (25.4%) were studying in the College of Applied Science and Arts, and 13.9 % had not yet declared a major (see Table 7 for more specific numbers and percentages regarding major). The difference in major is likely due to the sampling technique.

Measures

Participants completed a 10-page paper survey or an equivalent online survey on basic values, work values, acculturation, socio-cultural adjustment, and demographics.

Schwartz's Values Survey (SVS, 1992; see Appendices B and C, Section I: Culture Values, items 1 to 57). Using a nine-point scale ranging from *not important* (0) to *of supreme importance* (7) with an option of “I am opposed to it” (-1), respondents rated 57 values three times. Once they rated the values on the extent to which they constitute “a *guiding principle in my life*.” A second time, respondents rated values on the extent to which they constitute “a *guiding principle*” in the lives of people from their home country. The third time they rated the extent to which they constitute “a *guiding principle*” in the lives of people from the United States.

Based on Schwartz' (1992) analyses, 45 of these values were used to calculate ten value types. The reliability coefficients for each value type are consistent with previous studies (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz, Sagiv, & Boehnke, 2000) that found alphas ranging from 0.70 to 0.78 (universalism value), 0.63 to 0.73 (benevolence value), 0.39 to 0.58 (tradition value), 0.54 to 0.73 (conformity value), 0.52 to 0.72 (security value), 0.61 to 0.70 (power value), 0.58 to 0.68 (achievement value), 0.67 to 0.76 (hedonism value),

0.46 to 0.71 (stimulation value), and 0.52 to 0.61 (self-direction value). In this study, value types are reliable, ranging from 0.59 (stimulation value) to 0.78 (universalism value) for students from the United States and ranging from 0.51 (security value) to 0.74 (universalism value) among the international student sample (see Table 8).

Work Values Questionnaire (WVQ; see Appendices B and C, Section II: Work Values, items 1 to 24). Twenty-four items from the Work Values Questionnaire (Elizur, 1994) were used to assess participants' personal work values, international students' perceptions of work values that people from their home country and people from the United States endorse, and U.S. students' perceptions of work values that people from the United States endorse. Only items pertaining to Facet A (modality of work outcome) were analyzed. Facet A includes affective outcomes (items 7, 8, 18, 20, and 22), cognitive outcomes (items 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, and 23), and instrumental or material outcomes at work (items 3, 6, 14, 19, and 24). Respondents were asked to rate each work value on the extent to which it was "*a guiding principle in my life*" on a nine-point scale ranging from *not important* (0) to *of supreme importance* (7) with an option of "I am opposed to it" (-1). International students did the same for their perceptions of the values as "*a guiding principle*" in the lives of people from their home country. Both international and domestic students also rated values as guiding principles for people from the United States. Reliabilities for the WVQ are not typically reported in the literature. In the present study reliabilities were good, ranging from 0.72 (instrumental work values) to 0.88 (cognitive work values) among U.S. students and from

0.72 (affective work values) to 0.88 (cognitive work values) among the international students (see Table 8).

<i>Table 8. Cronbach Alpha Reliabilities for Personal Value Types, Work Values, Acculturation, and Sociocultural Adaptation for International and Domestic Students</i>		
Schwartz Values Survey	International Students	U.S. Students
Universalism	0.74	0.78
Power	0.68	0.75
Hedonism	0.61	0.65
Self-Direction	0.60	0.62
Security	0.51	0.63
Stimulation	0.70	0.59
Conformity	0.69	0.72
Achievement	0.64	0.60
Tradition	0.66	0.62
Benevolence	0.73	0.70
<i>Work Values Questionnaire</i>		
Affective	0.72	0.77
Cognitive	0.88	0.88
Material/Instrumental	0.78	0.72
<i>Acculturation Index</i>		
Co-national Identification	0.91	0.86
Host National Identification	0.91	
<i>Sociocultural Adaptation Scale</i>		
Cultural Empathy and Relatedness	0.93	0.94
Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils	0.86	0.86

Acculturation Index (AI; see Appendices B and C, Section III: Acculturation to the United States, items 1 to 21). Twenty-one items in Ward and Kennedy's (1994) Acculturation Index (AI; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999) assess two independent dimensions of acculturation (co-national identification and host national identification) and four modes of acculturation (separation, integration, assimilation, and marginalization). Co-

national identification is the extent to which the individual who is acculturating to a new dominant or host culture identifies with others from his or her own culture, and host-national identification is the extent to which the acculturating individual identifies with others from the dominant or host culture (Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Rana-Deuba). Respondents were asked to indicate on a scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7) the extent to which they believe that their daily life experiences are similar to those of people from their home country and to those of people from the United States.

Based on respondents' answers to cognitive and behavioral items measuring the dimensions of co-national and host national identification, respondents were placed into one of Berry's (1989) four modes of acculturation using a median-split to create the four nominal categories. On the basis of a mid-scale split, more students were integrated ($n = 146$) and separated ($n = 42$) than assimilated ($n = 7$) and marginalized ($n = 5$). Because these cell sizes would be too small to perform meaningful analyses and because other studies (i.e., Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Rana-Deuba) have used a median-split technique to create the categories, the median-split technique was used here. High host national and high co-national identification leads to a classification of integration, high host national and low co-national identification leads to a classification of assimilation, low host national and high co-national identification leads to a classification of separation, and low national and low co-national identification leads to a classification of marginalization (Ward & Kennedy; Ward & Rana-Deuba).

Both measures of co-national identification and of host national identification were reliable (international student alpha = 0.91 and 0.91, respectively; U.S. student alpha for co-national identification alpha = 0.86; see Table 8). Previous studies (Ward & Kennedy, 1994; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999; 2000) found similar levels of reliability; typical reliabilities for co-national identification range from 0.91 to 0.93 and typical reliabilities for host-national identification range from 0.89 to 0.96.

Socio-cultural Adaptation Scale (SCAS; see Appendices B and C, Section IV: Socio-cultural Adaptation, items 1 to 40). This version of Searle and Ward's (1990) Socio-cultural Adaptation Scale (SCAS) has forty items that assess respondents' amount of difficulty with behavioral and cognitive aspects of intercultural competence. Respondents rated each item on a five-point scale ranging from *no difficulty* (1) to *extreme difficulty* (5). In this study, two factors (Cultural Empathy and Relatedness, and Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils) were determined on the basis of factor analysis (see Table 9). Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients further indicate items measuring the factors are consistent; for international students, alpha coefficients were $\alpha = 0.93$ for Cultural Empathy and Relatedness, and $\alpha = 0.86$ for Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils; for U.S. students, alphas were 0.94 and 0.86, respectively (see Table 8). Ward and Kennedy's (1999) version of the SCAS, which used the same two dimensions used in this study, showed good internal consistency (with alphas ranging from 0.75 to 0.91).

Demographics (see Appendix B, Section V: Demographic Information, items 1 to 14, and Appendix C, Section V: Demographic Information, items 1 to 13). Both surveys included questions regarding age, sex, country of origin, ethnic identity, first language,

Table 9. *Factor Analysis of Sociocultural Adaptation Scale*

	Factor I	Factor II
Understanding the local value system	0.76	
Taking a local perspective on the culture	0.72	
Understanding the locals' world view	0.72	
Adapting to local accommodation	0.72	
Seeing things from the locals' point of view	0.70	
Following rules and regulations	0.70	
Adapting to local etiquette	0.68	
Understanding cultural differences	0.67	
Getting used to the pace of life	0.65	0.47
Dealing with people in authority	0.63	0.45
Dealing with people of higher status	0.62	0.52
Communicating with people of a different ethnic group	0.60	0.58
Relating to older people	0.57	0.47
Finding your way around	0.57	0.56
Getting used to the population density	0.57	
Understanding what is required of you at university	0.57	0.55
Dealing with foreign staff at the university	0.56	0.47
Accepting/Understanding the local political system	0.56	
Being able to see two sides of and intercultural issue	0.56	0.51
Worshipping in your usual way	0.55	
Getting used to the local foods/finding food you enjoy	0.54	
Dealing with the climate	0.53	
Dealing with people staring at you	0.53	
Relating to members of the opposite sex	0.50	0.50
Going shopping	0.50	
Going to coffee shops/restaurants/fast food	0.49	
Using the transportation system	0.49	0.45
Dealing with the bureaucracy	0.49	
Living away from family members/independently from your parents	0.48	
The expectation that you express your ideas in class		0.77
Expressing your ideas in class		0.76
Making yourself understood	0.49	0.69
Understanding the local accent/language	0.54	0.64
Understanding jokes and humor	0.48	0.64
Going to social events/gatherings/functions	0.48	0.62
Dealing with someone who is unpleasant/angry/aggressive		0.60
Making friends		0.60
Talking about yourself with others	0.46	0.58
Coping with academic work		0.58
Dealing with unsatisfactory service	0.55	0.56

primary language spoken, marital status, college major, origin of their caregivers, and country with which they identify.

Demographic items on the U.S. students' questionnaire (Appendix C) not included in the international students' questionnaire (Appendix B), were whether the student was born in the United States, how long he/she had lived in the United States if not born in the United States, country of origin if not born in the United States, if he/she ever lived outside the United States and, if so, the names of other countries in which he/she had lived and the amount of time in residence. International students, but not domestic students, were asked questions regarding length of time lived in the country of origin, length of time living in the United States during current stay, if he/she had lived in the United States prior to their current stay and, if so, length of time in the United States prior to their current stay, or residence of spouse or partner.

Data Analysis

Prior to testing hypotheses, value gap scores were calculated. Mean scores on each of the ten personal life values and the three work values were subtracted from the corresponding mean scores for perceived U.S. life and work values. This calculation was converted to an absolute score. The higher the score, the greater the value gap. The closer the score to zero, the more the students' personal values and perceived U.S. values are congruent.

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1 stated that the gap between international students' personal life values and perceived U.S. life values would be greater than the gap between domestic students' personal life values and their perceptions of U.S. life values. International and domestic students' gap scores for each of the ten life values were compared using *t*-tests. Hypothesis 1 was partially supported. The gap between international students' stimulation value and perceived U.S. values ($M = -0.81$, $SD = 1.60$) was greater than the domestic students' stimulation value gap ($M = 0.31$, $SD = 1.46$, $p \leq .05$). However, contrary to the hypothesis, the gap between domestic students' power value and perceived U.S. power value was greater ($M = -1.92$, $SD = 1.57$) than the gap between international students' power value and perceived U.S. power value ($M = -1.33$, $SD = 1.64$, $p \leq .01$). Although both international and domestic students endorsed benevolence value more than they perceived people from the United States to endorse it, the gap between personal and perceived benevolence value was greater for domestic students ($M = 1.55$, $SD = 1.22$) than for international students ($M = 1.00$, $SD = 1.15$, $p \leq .01$). Similarly, domestic and international students reported greater personal universalism value than perceived U.S. value for universalism, but the gap between personal and perceived universalism value was slightly greater for domestic students ($M = 0.83$, $SD = 1.28$) than for international students ($M = 0.58$, $SD = 1.30$, $p \leq .10$, see Tables 10 and 11).

Post hoc analyses revealed significant differences in mean scores between international and domestic students' values scores in relation to their perceptions of U.S. values. U.S. students endorsed universalism ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 1.00$), self-direction ($M =$

Table 10. *Mean Gap Between Personal Values and Perceived Values of People from the United States.*

Value Type	International Students ($n \approx 230$)		U.S. Students ($n = 173$)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Universalism [†]	0.56	1.30	0.83	1.28
Power**	-1.33	1.64	-1.92	1.57
Hedonism	-0.71	1.45	-0.32	1.50
Self-Direction	-0.36	1.14	0.30	1.07
Security	0.11	1.02	0.14	0.96
Stimulation*	-0.81	1.60	0.31	1.46
Conformity	1.38	1.39	1.39	1.25
Achievement	-0.19	1.10	0.05	1.10
Tradition	0.86	1.37	0.61	1.27
Benevolence**	1.00	1.15	1.52	1.22

** $p \leq 0.01$.

* $p \leq 0.05$.

[†] $p \leq 0.10$.

4.93, $SD = 0.91$), security ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 0.99$), stimulation ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.17$), conformity ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.11$), tradition ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.19$), and benevolence ($M = 5.19$, $SD = 0.97$) values more than they perceived other Americans to endorse universalism ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.17$, $p \leq .01$), self-direction ($M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.98$, $p \leq .01$), security ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 0.95$, $p \leq .05$), stimulation ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.25$, $p \leq .01$), conformity ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 1.17$, $p \leq .01$), tradition ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.12$, $p \leq .01$), and benevolence ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.13$, $p \leq .01$) values. However, they perceived Americans to emphasize power ($M = 5.29$, $SD = 1.07$) and hedonism ($M = 5.02$, $SD = 1.16$) values more than they endorsed power ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 1.38$, $p \leq .01$) and hedonism ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.13$, $p \leq .01$) values. Similarly, international students reported greater universalism ($M = 4.82$, $SD = 0.90$), conformity ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.05$), tradition ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 1.28$), and benevolence ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 0.97$) values than they perceived

people from the United States endorsed universalism ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 1.11$, $p \leq .01$), conformity ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.18$, $p \leq .01$), tradition ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.18$, $p < .01$), and benevolence ($M = 3.91$, $SD = 1.17$, $p \leq .01$) values. However, international students perceived people in the United States to endorse power ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.14$), hedonism ($M = 5.19$, $SD = 1.04$), self-direction ($M = 5.28$, $SD = 0.93$), stimulation ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 1.12$), and achievement ($M = 4.81$, $SD = 1.06$) values more than they (the international students) endorsed power ($M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.29$), hedonism ($M = 4.49$, $SD = 1.21$), self-direction ($M = 4.92$, $SD = 0.88$), stimulation ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.39$), and achievement ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 0.99$, $p \leq .01$) values (see Table 11).

International and U.S. students also differed on their perceptions of U.S. values. U.S. students perceived people from the United States to endorse universalism, self-direction, stimulation, and benevolence values less than international students perceived Americans to endorse universalism, self-direction, stimulation, and benevolence values. U.S. students perceived people from the U.S.A. to endorse power and tradition values more than international students perceived Americans to value power and tradition values. Finally, U.S. students and international students' personal life values differed, too. U.S. students endorsed benevolence and achievement values more than international students endorsed benevolence and achievement values (see Table 11 and Figure 4).

Hypothesis 2 stated that the gap between international students' personal work values and their perceptions of U.S. work values would be greater than the gap between domestic students' personal work values and their perceptions of U.S. work values. International and domestic students' work values gap scores were compared using *t*-tests.

Hypothesis 2 was not supported. International students' personal work values were more congruent with their perception of U.S. work values than the domestic students' work values in relation to domestic students' perceptions of U.S. work values. Domestic students' gaps on cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 0.44$, $SD = 0.96$) and affective outcomes at work values ($M = 0.56$, $SD = 0.98$) were greater than the international students' cognitive and affective values gaps ($M = -0.10$, $SD = 0.88$ and $M = 0.17$, $SD = 1.00$, $p \leq 0.05$, respectively) (see Tables 12 and 13).

Table 11. *Within Sample Life Values Gaps*

Value Type	International Students ($n \approx 219$)				U.S. Students ($n = 179$)			
	Personal Values		Perceived U.S. Values		Personal Values		Perceived U.S. Values	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Universalism ^{abc}	4.82	0.90	4.26	1.11	4.67	1.00	3.83	1.17
Power ^{abc}	3.40	1.29	4.73	1.14	3.37	1.38	5.29	1.07
Hedonism ^{bc}	4.49	1.21	5.19	1.04	4.71	1.13	5.02	1.16
Self-Direction ^{abc}	4.92	0.88	5.28	0.93	4.93	0.91	4.63	0.98
Security ^b	4.82	0.88	4.71	0.94	4.86	0.99	4.72	0.95
Stimulation ^{abc}	3.93	1.39	4.74	1.12	4.14	1.17	3.83	1.25
Conformity ^{bc}	4.85	1.05	3.47	1.18	4.95	1.11	3.56	1.17
Achievement ^{cd}	4.62	0.99	4.81	1.06	4.85	0.93	4.81	1.02
Tradition ^{abc}	4.01	1.28	3.15	1.18	4.04	1.19	3.43	1.12
Benevolence ^{abcd}	4.91	0.97	3.91	1.17	5.19	0.97	3.67	1.13

^a = significant difference between the means for International students' perceptions of U.S. Life Values and U.S. students' perceptions of U.S. Life Values, $p \leq 0.01$ (with the exception of tradition and benevolence values, $p \leq 0.05$).

^b = significant difference between the means for U.S. students' Personal Life Values and U.S. students' perceptions of U.S. Life Values, $p \leq 0.01$ (with the exception of security value, $p \leq 0.05$).

^c = significant difference between the means for International students' Personal Life Values and International students' perceptions of U.S. Life Values, $p \leq 0.01$.

^d = significant difference between the means for International students' Personal Life Values and U.S. students' Personal Life Values (achievement value, $p \leq 0.05$; benevolence value, $p \leq 0.01$).

Although the work values gap scores did not support the hypothesis, *post hoc* analyses showed that U.S. students endorsed cognitive outcomes at work values ($M =$

Figure 3. International and domestic students' personal life values and perceived U.S. life values.

Table 12. *Gap Between Personal Work Values and Perceived U.S. Work Values*

Value	International Students ($n \approx 205$)		U.S. Students ($n = 173$)	
	<i>M</i>	SD	<i>M</i>	SD
Cognitive*	-0.10	0.88	0.44	0.96
Affective*	0.17	1.00	0.56	0.98
Instrumental	-0.27	1.03	-0.05	1.11

* $p \leq 0.05$.

4.72, $SD = 0.95$) and affective outcomes at work values ($M = 4.88$, $SD = 1.09$) more than they perceived people from the United States to endorse cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.99$, $p \leq 0.01$) and affective outcomes at work values ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.11$, $p \leq 0.01$). Similarly, international students endorsed affective outcomes at work values ($M = 4.85$, $SD = 1.00$) more than they perceived people from the United States to endorse affective outcomes at work values ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.06$, $p \leq 0.01$). In contrast, international students endorsed cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.00$) and instrumental outcomes at work values ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.19$) less than they perceived people from the United States to endorse cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 0.93$, $p \leq 0.10$) and instrumental outcomes at work values ($M = 5.01$, $SD = 0.94$, $p \leq 0.01$).

Further, international and domestic students did not perceive people from the United States as endorsing work outcomes values in the same way. International students perceived Americans to endorse cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 4.65$, $SD = 0.93$) and affective outcomes at work values ($M = 4.68$, $SD = 1.06$) more than domestic students perceived Americans to endorse cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 0.99$, $p \leq 0.01$) and affective outcomes at work values ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 1.11$, $p \leq 0.01$). Finally, students from the United States endorsed cognitive outcomes at work

values ($M = 4.72$, $SD = 0.96$) and instrumental outcomes at work values ($M = 5.01$, $SD = 1.02$) more than international students endorsed cognitive outcomes at work values ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 1.00$, $p \leq 0.10$) and instrumental outcomes at work values ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 1.19$, $p \leq 0.05$) (see Table 13 and Figure 4).

Table 13. *Within Sample Work Values Gaps*

Value	International Students ($n \approx 205$)				U.S. Students ($n = 173$)			
	Personal Values		Perceived U.S. Values		Personal Values		Perceived U.S. Values	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Cognitive ^{abcd}	4.55	1.00	4.65	0.93	4.72	0.96	4.28	0.99
Affective ^{abc}	4.85	1.00	4.68	1.06	4.88	1.09	4.32	1.11
Instrumental ^{cd}	4.73	1.19	5.01	0.94	5.01	1.02	5.06	1.00

^a = significant difference between the means for International students' perceptions of U.S. Work Values and U.S. students' perceptions of U.S. Work Values, $p \leq 0.01$.

^b = significant difference between the means for U.S. students' Work Values and U.S. students' perceptions of U.S. Work Values, $p \leq 0.01$.

^c = significant difference between the means for International students' Work Values and International students' perceptions of U.S. Work Values, $p \leq 0.01$ (except on cognitive values at work, $p \leq 0.10$).

^d = significant difference between the means for International students' Work Values and U.S. students' Work Values, $p \leq 0.05$ (except on cognitive values at work, $p \leq 0.10$).

Hypothesis 3 stated that international students who were separated or marginalized would have greater gaps between their personal life values and their perceptions of U.S. life values than international students who were integrated and assimilated. Analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were performed for the four values (i.e., universalism, stimulation, benevolence, and power values) between which the gap between international students' life values and their perceptions of U.S. life values significantly differed from the gap between domestic students' life values and their perceptions of U.S. life values. The extent to which value gaps differed across the four acculturation modes was examined. After controlling for age and region of origin,

Figure 4. International and domestic students' personal work values and perceived U.S. work values

hypothesis 3 was marginally supported (see Table 14). The benevolence value gap was greater for marginalized ($M = 1.20$, $SD = 0.93$) and separated international students ($M = 1.30$, $SD = 1.18$) than integrated international students ($M = 0.55$, $SD = 1.15$; $p \leq .05$ and $p \leq .10$, respectively).

In a *post hoc* analysis, international students' life values were examined in relation to acculturation mode (see Table 15). Assimilated international students endorsed achievement value ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 1.02$) more than marginalized international students ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.89$, $p \leq .10$). Both integrated ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.14$) and separated ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.21$) international students endorsed tradition value more than marginalized students ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.29$, $p \leq .01$ and $p \leq .05$, respectively). Assimilated international students endorsed security value ($M = 5.10$, $SD = 0.87$) more than marginalized students ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 0.96$, $p \leq .01$). Integrated ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 0.92$), assimilated ($M = 5.12$, $SD = 0.95$), and separated ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 1.03$) international students endorsed conformity value more than marginalized international students ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.15$, $p \leq .10$, $p \leq .01$, and $p \leq .05$, respectively). Integrated international students ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.17$) endorsed stimulation value more than separated international students ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.60$, $p \leq .01$). Integrated international students ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.13$) endorsed power value more than marginalized international students ($M = 3.04$, $SD = 1.19$, $p \leq .10$).

Hypothesis 4 stated that international students who were separated or marginalized would have greater value gaps between their work values and their perceptions of U.S. people's work values than integrated or assimilated international

students. ANOVAs were performed, controlling for age and region, for the two work values (i.e., cognitive outcomes at work and affective outcomes at work) between which the gap between international students' work values and their perceptions of U.S. work values significantly differed from the gap between domestic students' work values and their perceptions of U.S. work values. Hypothesis 4 was not supported; none of the groups differed significantly on the value gap scores (see Table 16).

Table 14. *ANOVA of Universalism, Stimulation, Benevolence, and Power Gap on Acculturation Mode*

Category	N	M	SD	Categories		
				1	2	3
<i>Universalism</i> ($F = 0.89, p = 0.45, \eta^2 = 0.01$)						
1 Integration	52	0.28	1.51	-		
2 Assimilation	49	0.35	0.82		-	
3 Separation	52	0.75	1.46			-
4 Marginalization	45	0.73	1.30			
<i>Stimulation</i> ($F = 0.74, p = 0.53, \eta^2 = 0.01$)						
1 Integration	52	-0.92	1.48	-		
2 Assimilation	49	-1.01	1.23		-	
3 Separation	52	-0.81	1.84			-
4 Marginalization	45	-0.77	1.59			
<i>Benevolence</i> ($F = 3.20, p = 0.03, \eta^2 = 0.05$)						
1 Integration	52	0.55	1.15	-		
2 Assimilation	49	0.93	1.05		-	
3 Separation	52	1.29	1.18	†		-
4 Marginalization	45	1.20	0.93	*		
<i>Power</i> ($F = 0.97, p = 0.41, \eta^2 = 0.02$)						
1 Integration	52	-1.13	1.58	-		
2 Assimilation	49	-1.25	1.62		-	
3 Separation	52	-1.27	1.75			-
4 Marginalization	45	-1.59	1.59			

* $p \leq 0.05$.

† $p \leq 0.10$.

Table 15. ANOVA of International Students' Personal Values on Acculturation Mode

Category	N	M	SD	Categories		
				1	2	3
<i>Hedonism</i> ($F = 1.69, p = 0.17, \eta^2 = 0.03$)						
1 Integration	52	4.75	1.02	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.76	1.13		-	
3 Separation	52	4.24	1.33			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.31	1.31			
<i>Self-Direction</i> ($F = 1.86, p = 0.14, \eta^2 = 0.03$)						
1 Integration	52	4.94	0.86	-		
2 Assimilation	49	5.03	0.73		-	
3 Separation	52	4.70	0.91			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.78	0.90			
<i>Achievement</i> ($F = 2.16, p = 0.09, \eta^2 = 0.03$)						
1 Integration	52	4.68	1.04	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.80	1.02		-	
3 Separation	52	4.58	1.07			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.32	0.89		†	
<i>Tradition</i> ($F = 4.36, p = 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.07$)						
1 Integration	52	4.33	1.14	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.01	1.21		-	
3 Separation	52	4.06	1.21			-
4 Marginalization	46	3.51	1.29	**		*
<i>Security</i> ($F = 4.12, p = 0.01, \eta^2 = 0.06$)						
1 Integration	52	4.86	0.80	-		
2 Assimilation	49	5.09	0.87		-	
3 Separation	52	4.70	0.81			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.56	0.96		**	
<i>Conformity</i> ($F = 5.21, p = 0.00, \eta^2 = 0.08$)						
1 Integration	52	4.91	0.92	-		
2 Assimilation	49	5.12	0.96		-	
3 Separation	52	4.91	1.03			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.42	1.15	†	**	*
<i>Universalism</i> ($F = 1.10, p = 0.35, \eta^2 = 0.02$)						
1 Integration	52	4.85	0.84	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.87	0.87		-	
3 Separation	52	4.75	0.87			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.64	0.97			

Table 15. Cont'd

Category	N	M	SD	Categories		
				1	2	3
<i>Stimulation</i> ($F = 3.40, p = 0.02, \eta^2 = 0.05$)						
1 Integration	52	4.13	1.17	-		
2 Assimilation	49	3.93	1.11		-	
3 Separation	52	3.43	1.60	**		-
4 Marginalization	46	3.93	1.43			
<i>Benevolence</i> ($F = 1.32, p = 0.27, \eta^2 = 0.02$)						
1 Integration	52	4.94	0.94	-		
2 Assimilation	49	5.07	0.88		-	
3 Separation	52	4.79	1.05			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.78	0.87			
<i>Power</i> ($F = 2.76, p = 0.04, \eta^2 = 0.04$)						
1 Integration	52	3.70	1.13	-		
2 Assimilation	49	3.58	1.36		-	
3 Separation	52	3.31	1.32			-
4 Marginalization	46	3.04	1.19	†		

** $p \leq 0.01$.* $p \leq 0.05$.† $p \leq 0.10$.

Table 16. ANOVA of Cognitive Outcomes at Work and Affective Outcomes at Work Gap on Acculturation Mode

Category	N	M	SD	Categories		
				1	2	3
<i>Cognitive Outcomes at Work</i> ($F= 1.31, p = 0.27, \eta^2 = 0.02$)						
1 Integration	52	-0.10	0.67	-		
2 Assimilation	49	-0.28	0.83		-	
3 Separation	51	0.07	0.78			-
4 Marginalization	44	-0.04	1.16			
<i>Affective Outcomes at Work</i> ($F= 1.01, p = 0.39, \eta^2 = 0.02$)						
1 Integration	52	-0.04	0.76	-		
2 Assimilation	49	0.14	0.96		-	
3 Separation	51	0.42	0.99			-
4 Marginalization	44	0.23	1.29			

A *post hoc* analysis amongst international students' work values in relation to their acculturation mode showed one significant difference on values scores (see Table 17). Marginalized international students endorsed instrumental outcomes at work values ($M = 4.31$, $SD = 1.44$) less than integrated international students endorsed them ($M = 5.04$, $SD = 1.03$, $p \leq .05$).

Hypothesis 5 stated that as the gap between international students' life values and their perceptions of U.S. life values increased, sociocultural adjustment would decrease. After controlling for the number of years international students had been in the United States, hypothesis 5 was marginally supported. Difficulty with interpersonal endeavors and perils in the United States negatively correlated with self-direction value gap ($r = -0.19$, $p \leq 0.01$). Difficulty with cultural empathy and relatedness in the United States partially correlated with conformity value gap ($r = 0.12$, $p \leq 0.10$) and benevolence value gap ($r = 0.13$, $p \leq 0.10$). No other significant correlations between sociocultural adjustment and gaps between international students' personal values and their perceptions of U.S. personal values were found (see Table 18).

Hypothesis 6 stated that as the gap between international students' work values and their perceptions of U.S. work values increased, sociocultural adjustment would decrease. After controlling for the number of years international students had been in the United States, hypothesis 6 was mostly supported for the cultural empathy and relatedness subscale of the sociocultural adjustment scale, but marginally supported for the interpersonal endeavors and perils subscale (see Table 19). Difficulty with cultural empathy and relatedness significantly correlated with affective outcomes at work value

gap ($r = 0.18, p \leq 0.01$). It positively correlated with cognitive outcomes at work value gap ($r = 0.18, p \leq 0.10$). Difficulty with interpersonal endeavors and perils in the United States positively correlated with affective outcomes at work value ($r = 0.15, p \leq 0.01$).

Table 17. ANOVA of International Students' Work Values on Acculturation Mode

Category	N	M	SD	Categories		
				1	2	3
<i>Cognitive Outcomes at Work</i> ($F = 2.20, p = 0.09, \eta^2 = 0.03$)						
1 Integration	52	4.85	0.89	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.57	0.95		-	
3 Separation	51	4.49	0.84			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.39	1.12			
<i>Affective Outcomes at Work</i> ($F = 0.64, p = 0.59, \eta^2 = 0.01$)						
1 Integration	52	5.02	1.00	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.89	0.90		-	
3 Separation	51	4.77	0.92			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.75	1.19			
<i>Instrumental-Material Outcomes at Work</i> ($F = 2.95, p = 0.03, \eta^2 = 0.05$)						
1 Integration	52	5.04	1.03	-		
2 Assimilation	49	4.87	1.09		-	
3 Separation	51	4.65	1.05			-
4 Marginalization	46	4.31	1.44	*		

* $p \leq 0.05$.

† $p \leq 0.10$.

Hypothesis 7 stated that as the amount of time international students had spent in the United States increased, sociocultural adjustment would also increase. This hypothesis was not supported, given that there was no significant correlation between each of the two subscales of the Sociocultural Adaptation Scale (Cultural Empathy and Relatedness and Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils) with the number of years that international students had lived in the United States (see Table 20). The Cultural

Empathy and Relatedness subscale and the Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils subscale

positively correlated ($r = 0.77, p \leq 0.01$)

Table 18. *Partial Correlations between Values Gap (Between Personal Values and Perceived Values of People from the United States) and Sociocultural Adjustment to the United States among International Students (n = 200)*

	M	SD	Cultural Empathy and Relatedness	Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils
1. Cultural Empathy and Relatedness	1.87	0.58	-	-
2. Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils	2.22	0.71	-	-
3. Self-Direction	-0.36	1.15	-0.08	-0.19**
4. Stimulation	-0.87	1.57	-0.02	-0.10
5. Hedonism	-0.66	1.45	0.01	0.07
6. Tradition	0.81	1.34	0.07	0.05
7. Conformity	1.41	1.33	0.12 [†]	0.04
8. Security	0.12	1.03	0.06	0.06
9. Power	-1.31	1.65	0.03	0.09
10. Achievement	-0.16	1.09	0.07	0.03
11. Universalism	0.56	1.29	-0.03	-0.07
12. Benevolence	1.01	1.13	0.13 [†]	-0.02

** $p \leq 0.01$

[†] $p \leq 0.10$

Table 19. *Partial Correlations between Work Values Gap (Personal Work Values and Perceived Work Values of People from the United States) and Sociocultural Adjustment to the United States among International Students (n = 198)*

	M	SD	Cultural Empathy and Relatedness	Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils
1. Cultural Empathy and Relatedness	1.87	0.58	-	-
2. Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils	2.22	0.71	-	-
3. Cognitive Outcomes at Work	-0.92	0.88	0.13 [†]	0.05
4. Affective Outcomes at Work	0.18	1.01	0.18**	0.15**
5. Instrumental Outcomes at Work	-0.30	1.03	0.07	0.03

** $p \leq 0.01$

[†] $p \leq 0.10$

Table 20. *Correlations between Values, Sociocultural Adjustment, and Time in the U.S.A. among International Students*

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Cultural Empathy and Relatedness (<i>N</i> = 206 <i>M</i> = 1.87 <i>SD</i> = 0.58)	Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils (<i>N</i> = 206 <i>M</i> = 2.22 <i>SD</i> = 0.71)	Time in the U.S. (<i>N</i> = 202 <i>M</i> = 4.34 <i>SD</i> = 3.61)
Universalism – personal	233	4.82	0.90	-0.16*	-0.13	0.02
Power – personal	230	3.40	1.29	0.05	0.09	-0.02
Hedonism – personal	231	4.49	1.21	-0.01	0.10	0.70
Self-Direction – personal	231	4.93	0.88	-0.17*	-0.15*	-0.02
Security – personal	231	4.82	0.88	-0.02	-0.01	0.08
Stimulation – personal	231	3.93	1.39	-0.08	-0.10	-0.14*
Conformity – personal	231	4.85	1.05	0.02	-0.01	0.03
Achievement – personal	221	4.62	1.00	-0.07	-0.11	-0.02
Tradition – personal	231	4.01	1.28	0.06	0.02	0.12
Benevolence – personal	221	4.91	0.96	-0.02	-0.06	0.06
Universalism – perceived	233	4.26	1.11	-0.12	-0.02	0.04
Power – perceived	230	4.73	1.14	0.03	-0.04	0.04
Hedonism – perceived	231	5.19	1.04	-0.03	0.02	-0.09
Self-Direction – perceived	231	5.28	0.93	-0.08	0.07	0.12
Security – perceived	231	4.71	0.94	-0.08	-0.08	0.16*
Stimulation – perceived	231	4.74	1.12	-0.06	0.02	0.05
Conformity – perceived	231	3.48	1.18	-0.12	-0.05	-0.00
Achievement – perceived	220	4.81	1.06	-0.13	-0.13	0.01
Tradition – perceived	231	3.15	1.18	-0.00	-0.02	0.15*
Benevolence – perceived	219	3.91	1.17	-0.15*	-0.04	0.06
Cognitive – personal	207	4.55	1.00	0.03	0.03	0.02
Affective – personal	206	4.85	1.00	0.07	0.16*	0.06
Instrumental – personal	207	4.74	1.18	0.04	0.04	0.10
Cognitive – perceived	205	4.65	0.93	-0.08	-0.00	0.18*
Affective – perceived	204	4.68	1.06	-0.09	0.01	0.18*
Instrumental – perceived	205	5.01	0.94	-0.03	0.02	0.18*
Cultural Empathy and Relatedness	206	1.87	0.58	-	0.77**	0.06
Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils	206	2.22	0.71	0.77**	-	-0.00

* $p \leq 0.05$

Table 21. *Correlations between Values and Sociocultural Adjustment among Domestic Students (n = 173)*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Cultural Empathy and Relatedness (<i>n</i> = 173 <i>M</i> = 1.84 <i>SD</i> = 0.60)	Interpersonal Endeavors and Perils (<i>n</i> = 173 <i>M</i> = 1.94 <i>SD</i> = 0.65)
Universalism – personal	4.67	1.00	-0.01	-0.05
Power – personal	3.37	1.38	0.18*	0.09
Hedonism – personal	4.71	1.13	0.12	0.10
Self-Direction – personal	4.93	0.91	-0.11	-0.15*
Security – personal	4.86	1.00	-0.06	-0.03
Stimulation – personal	4.14	1.17	0.13	0.08
Conformity – personal	4.95	1.11	-0.02	0.01
Achievement – personal	4.85	0.93	-0.08	-0.09
Tradition – personal	4.04	1.19	0.14	0.07
Benevolence – personal	5.19	0.97	-0.17*	-0.14
Universalism – perceived	3.83	1.17	0.13	0.06
Power – perceived	5.29	1.07	0.10	0.10
Hedonism – perceived	5.02	1.16	-0.15*	-0.04
Self-Direction – perceived.	4.63	0.98	-0.03	0.03
Security – perceived	4.72	0.95	0.05	0.04
Stimulation – perceived	3.83	1.25	-0.01	-0.02
Conformity – perceived	3.56	1.17	0.14	0.03
Achievement – perceived	4.81	1.02	-0.04	-0.05
Tradition – perceived	3.43	1.12	0.12	-0.01
Benevolence – perceived	3.67	1.13	0.05	-0.05
Cognitive – personal	4.72	0.96	-0.13	-0.10
Affective – personal	4.88	1.09	-0.12	-0.11
Instrumental – personal	5.01	1.02	-0.09	-0.13
Cognitive – perceived	4.28	0.99	0.30	0.02
Affective – perceived	4.32	1.11	0.01	-0.00
Instrumental – perceived	5.06	1.00	-0.09	-0.11

* $p \leq 0.05$

DISCUSSION

This study compared San José State University international students' life and work values and their perceptions of U.S. values to U.S. students' life and work values and perceived U.S. values. Furthermore, congruence between international students' life and work values and perceived life and work values of people from the U.S.A. were examined to see how they related to adjustment and acculturation of international students at SJSU. Finally, the relationship between SJSU international students' acculturation to the United States and the amount of time they have lived in the United States was examined. Overall, it can be concluded that international students at SJSU are well-adjusted and most have integrated, as will be seen later in this discussion.

Value Congruence

It was expected that the gap between international students' life and work values and their perceptions of U.S. life and work values would be greater than the gap between domestic students' life and work values and their perceptions of U.S. life and work values. Of the 13 (10 life and 3 work) values, the hypothesis was supported only for stimulation value. Otherwise, domestic students had larger gaps (i.e., greater disparity) between their personal power, benevolence, and universalism values and their perceptions of Americans in these life values than did international students. Likewise, the gap between domestic students' work values and their perceptions of Americans' work values related to cognitive and affective outcomes at work was greater than international students' work values and their perceptions of Americans' work values. Domestic students rated other people from the United States as endorsing cognitive and

affective outcomes at work values much less than they personally do. Perhaps domestic students, when gauging their perceptions of these values as “guiding principle[s] in the lives of people from the United States,” accounted for the values of the diverse population that makes up the United States. Another related possibility is that psychology students may not be representative or comparable to the international students that were surveyed, as the international students’ majors were primarily in engineering and science, whereas domestic students’ majors were primarily in humanities, arts, and social sciences; few were majoring in engineering and sciences. Perhaps international students developed their ideas about the values of people from the United States from the values they have seen portrayed in the media (movies, books, TV, news, etc.). Perhaps that international students’ personal values were similar to their perceptions of U.S. values suggests that these international students self-selected precisely because they identify with their perceptions of U.S. values. In contrast, domestic students’ personal values likely differed from their perceptions of U.S. values because Americans like to view themselves as unique and different from others; indeed, the cultural norm in the United States is to prefer uniqueness and to deviate from the norm (Kim & Markus, 1999). Finally because nearly 20% of SJSU’s student body is made up of international students, perhaps they perceive more similarities with others than they might have if they were attending a university with fewer international students.

Both international and domestic students endorse universalism, conformity, tradition, and benevolence values more than they perceive that people from the United States do. However, both groups of students endorse power and achievement values less

than they perceive Americans to endorse those values. Perhaps convergence of perceptions by both groups of students is related to media portrayals of U.S. values, given that mass media frequently represents societal beliefs, cultural values and attitudes, and aspects emphasized in a given culture (Caillat & Mueller, 1996; Kim & Markus, 1999), and that the international students may not have had much experience with Americans. Another possibility, as mentioned before, is that U.S. Arts and Humanities and Social Science majors may be more like international students (2/3 of whom were from an Asian nation) than U.S. students of business or engineering backgrounds. Indeed, Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) found that psychology students (vs. business students) held greater self-transcendence values (vs. self-enhancement values endorsed among business students).

U.S. students value instrumental outcomes at work, and both domestic and international students perceive people from the United States to value instrumental outcomes at work much more than international students value instrumental outcomes at work. Apparently, although international students don't endorse instrumental outcomes at work as much as domestic students do, both groups of students correctly perceive the extent to which people from the United States endorse instrumental outcomes. This suggests that Americans are perceived as more materially-oriented rather than socially-oriented or intellectually-oriented..

Acculturation

In this study, mode of acculturation was calculated using a median-split. Based on such a categorization, it was found that marginalized and separated international students had greater gap scores for benevolence value than did integrated and assimilated

international students. This implies that international students who feel marginalized while living in the United States or only associate with people from their home culture might do so because they believe that people from the United States endorse benevolence value less than they do. In contrast, international students who assimilated or integrated themselves into U.S. culture might do so because they perceived people from the United States to endorse benevolence value to a similar degree that they do.

Although hypothesis 3 was mostly not supported, other interesting findings emerged from the analyses on personal life values and acculturation modes. Assimilated international students endorse achievement and security values more than marginalized international students do. Perhaps assimilated students felt they have achieved more and felt a greater sense of security by associating with the culture of the United States while they live in the United States. This is in line with past research that has found assimilated expatriates and sojourners to show better social adjustment and adaptation than marginalized expatriates and sojourners (Berry, 2005; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). Assimilated, integrated, and separated international students endorse conformity value more than marginalized international students. Indeed, marginalized international students do not conform either with their home culture or with U.S. culture (Berry, 1989; Berry, et al., 1989; Krishnan & Berry, 1992; Ward & Kennedy, 1994). Both integrated and separated international students endorse tradition value more than marginalized international students. Integration and separation acculturation modes by definition suggest a desire to maintain one's own cultural traditions, whereas marginalization suggests a lack of desire to maintain cultural affiliations and traditions. Finally,

integrated international students endorse power value more than marginalized international students. Thus, a value of power may be driving international students to integrate by forming relationships with both members of their home culture and with people from the United States.

Relevant findings also emerged from the analyses on work values and acculturation modes. Integrated international students endorsed instrumental outcomes at work values more than marginalized international students do. Thus, valuing material things (i.e., pay, benefits, work hours, and work conditions; Elizur, 1984, 1994) makes the integrated international students more in line with the hetero-stereotype of Americans, thereby making acculturation easier. It is notable that both power and instrumental outcomes at work values are materialistic; integrated international students' endorsement of both of these values are likely to aid them in reaching the "American Dream."

Acculturation mode in this study is based on a median split. However, on the basis of a mid-scale split, most international students (73%) felt integrated. This suggests that the results need to be read with caution because, based on this categorization, the majority of international students are integrated to life in the United States. However, previous studies that relied on a scalar-midpoint split for categorization revealed similar results (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999).

Sociocultural Adjustment

Overall, international students reported relatively high levels of sociocultural adjustment, as they indicated only slight difficulty with both cultural empathy and relatedness in the United States and with interpersonal endeavors and perils in the United

States. When analyzing the relationship between sociocultural adjustment and personal values, international students who perceived that people from the United States endorse (1) conformity values, and (2) benevolence values, (3) cognitive outcomes at work values, and (4) affective outcomes at work values similarly to themselves had greater cultural empathy and relatedness in the United States. This is in line with van Vianen and colleagues (2004), who showed that the greater the discrepancy between expatriates' benevolence value and their perceptions of the benevolence values of locals in their host organization, the lower their adjustment. Apparently, that international students perceive that people from the United States endorse benevolence and conformity values as well as cognitive and affective outcomes at work values as they do creates empathy with the host culture and therefore fewer problems in sojourners' daily lives in the United States.

Cultural empathy and relatedness to the United States did not correlate with the amount of time international students had spent in the United States. Ward and Kennedy (1999) suggested that sociocultural adjustment usually increases quickly during the first months in a new culture but levels off after a few months as culturally appropriate skills are acquired. In this study, international students spent an average of four years in the United States, indicating a potentially insufficient number of new students to the U.S.A.

Applications for Programs

There are numerous applications of this study for the International Programs and Services Department at San José State University, international students at SJSU and other California universities, and organizations that employ international students. International students perceive that people from the U.S. endorse life (power,

benevolence, and universalism) and work values (cognitive outcomes at work and affective outcomes at work) to a similar degree as they do, and the congruence of values is greater for international students than domestic students. International students who come to SJSU to study might self-select because they already perceive their values to be close to the values of people from the United States.

Marginalized international students place less value on conformity, tradition, power, and instrumental outcomes at work than other international students. Further, marginalized students perceive that people from the United States endorse benevolence values less than they do. Therefore, perhaps by making international students more aware that U.S. students self-report a high endorsement of benevolence values, and explaining what benevolence means to Americans, fewer international students would reject maintaining contact with U.S. culture. Further, having these students meet domestic students could help. Because one's values guide one's attention, activities, and the evaluation of one's own and others' behaviors (Earley & Peterson, 2004), implementation of a cultural intelligence training program focused on benevolence, conformity, tradition, power, and instrumental outcomes at work values should be considered. Cultural intelligence training programs incorporate metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral training. This type of program offers participants who are dealing with people from different cultures strategies to observe and understand what occurs around them, to feel motivated to persist in their new environment by offering them the tools to make sense of their experience, and to perform the appropriate behaviors in response (Earley & Peterson).

Additionally, international students who perceive that people from the United States do not endorse conformity and benevolence values and cognitive and affective outcomes at work as much as they do appear to have problems with sociocultural adjustment to the United States in terms of cultural empathy and relatedness. Previous studies have found measures of cultural empathy to be related to greater intercultural effectiveness and more effective functioning among individuals in highly culturally diverse societies (Herfst, van Oudenhoven, & Timmerman, 2008). Intercultural effectiveness training, which focuses on intercultural competencies by presenting cross-cultural “critical incidents” (descriptions of situations in which individuals from different cultures experience misunderstandings due to their different cultural backgrounds) for trainees to consider and reflect on, is based on the culture assimilator technique (Herfst, van Oudenhoven, & Timmerman). Intercultural effectiveness training (as part of a cultural intelligence training program) that relates to how conformity, benevolence, cognitive outcomes at work, and affective outcomes at work values are manifested by people from the United States would likely benefit international students studying at SJSU, as it could lead them to greater feelings of cultural empathy and relatedness in the United States.

Further, that international students do not perceive that people from the United States endorse affective outcomes at work (i.e., interpersonal relations with others) as they do yields sociocultural adjustment problems to the United States in terms of interpersonal endeavors and perils. Perhaps increasing international students’ awareness that U.S. students do share similar values through participation in a cultural intelligence

training program will help more international students to experience greater ease in their cognitive and communicative adaptation to the United States as well as to deal better with difficult situations and people in the United States.

Although the importance of life value types and work values are similar among domestic and international students, how people act upon those values differ by normative practices in each culture (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). The goal of cultural (self) awareness training is to educate people about their own cultural values and norms so they better appreciate cultural differences between the host and home countries and become, presumably, more effective abroad (Earley & Peterson, 2004; Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley, & Riedel, 2006). Perhaps an introspective cultural awareness training program could be offered to international students upon arrival to SJSU as part of a cultural intelligence training program. Such a program could help international students make sense of U.S. cultural values and beliefs by first examining their own cultural values and beliefs.

Future orientation programs for international students might include information about U.S. life and work values and U.S. university students' values. Such training could then be considered an intervention, and pre- and post-assessments of international students' acculturation mode and level of sociocultural adjustment could be ascertained. The intervention would be considered successful if international students assimilate or integrate into the host culture and experience greater sociocultural adjustment post-training in comparison to pre-training.

Limitations

Although this study demonstrates that value congruence relates to socio-cultural adaptation and acculturation, there are noteworthy limitations. First, the sampled U.S. students at SJSU do not represent the student body; over 25% majored in the Social Sciences and 25% majored in Applied Science and Arts. This sampling bias occurred because only those students who participated in the Psychology Open Research Day (most psychology majors and students in an introductory psychology course) and those in selected psychology courses were given the opportunity to complete this survey. This sampling bias is probably reflected in the reported values. Indeed, Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) found significant differences between psychology majors' values and business administration majors' values. Thus, international students' values in this study may have differed more from those of domestic students if the domestic student sample was more representative of the university's domestic student body.

Second, because all the data used in this study were obtained through participants' self-reports, common source bias may be an issue, although the point of this research, in part, was to understand source bias in perceptions of others' values. Thus, different response options to the surveys and alternatives to the self-report format for data gathering might not be useful for this type of study on personal values, perceived values, acculturation modes, and sociocultural adjustment. After all, who better to judge one's adjustment and acculturation than the person going through it?

Third, mode of acculturation was calculated using the median-split technique instead of the scalar-midpoint split technique. The median split is the preferred technique for use with sojourner samples (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999), because among sojourners,

co-national identification is usually greater than host-national identification, which would likely lead to difficulty making meaningful cross-group comparisons. However, this relativistic categorization by median split does not represent a pure measurement of acculturation mode, which limits the ability to compare results across samples. In the present study, the overarching majority of international students would have been categorized as integrated if the scalar-midpoint split technique had been used when analyzing data, which would have made subsequent analyses impossible due to low cell sizes.

Future Research

Future studies should attempt to survey U.S. students from all areas of study at SJSU and other U.S. universities. This would give a more realistic picture of the life and work values of the SJSU student body as a whole; results of such a study would likely differ from those of the present study, as they would provide more data from domestic students majoring in the areas that higher percentages of international students major in, such as engineering, business, and science.

Future research might also analyze international students by country or region of origin and upbringing, as international students in the United States are a diverse group and their values and perceptions of U.S. values are likely to vary depending upon where they originated and grew up. Previous research has studied basic life values (Dolan, et al., 2004; Schwartz, 1992; 1994; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001; Schwartz & Bilsky, 1990; Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995), work values (Dolan et al.; Elizur, 1994; Elizur et al., 1991), acculturation (Castillo et al., 2004; Krishnan & Berry, 1992) and adjustment (Li &

Gasser, 2005; Nilsson & Anderson, 2004; Searle & Ward, 1990; Swagler & Ellis, 2003; Ward & Kennedy, 1994) in sojourner, expatriate, and minority samples from specific countries or regions, with clear results. However, none of these variables have been studied together.

Future studies should take into account the issues of common source bias when considering data-gathering techniques. Common source bias can be avoided in future studies by gathering data from sources other than self-report questionnaires. Other source reports of focal person's adjustment and acculturation may be helpful comparisons for ensuring students' self reports on the well-being-type measures. Common method bias could be avoided by using diary analyses or interviews as means of determining acculturation and socio-cultural adaptation.

If the aim of future studies is to compare sojourners' acculturation across multiple locations, then data from the AI should be analyzed using the scalar-midpoint-split technique instead of the median-split technique (Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999) that was used in the present study. The scalar-midpoint split offers the most consistent way to compare data between populations.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to examine the congruence of (1) SJSU international students' and domestic students' reported life and work values, (2) international students' perceptions of Americans' life and work values, in relation to their own, and (3) the relationship between congruence (for international students) and adjustment and acculturation to life in the U.S.A. It was expected that domestic students would have greater value congruence between both personal life values and perceived U.S. life values and personal work values and perceived U.S. work values than would international students. However, domestic students show only greater personal and perceived stimulation value congruence than international students. International students actually have greater value congruence for personal and perceived power, benevolence, and universalism values as well as affective and cognitive outcomes at work. This suggests that many international students at SJSU perceive themselves to be similar to people from the United States, and indeed, this may be a reason why they come to the United States to study. Domestic students at SJSU, however, perceive themselves to be different from other Americans, perpetuating the American socio-type of individualism and uniqueness (Kim & Markus, 1999).

Further, it was hypothesized that as international students' personal life and work values increase, their acculturation and sociocultural adjustment to the United States would also increase. Findings show that international students who value benevolence more than they perceive people from the United States to value it were more likely be marginalized or separated. In contrast, international students who perceived greater

congruence between the extent to which they value benevolence and the extent to which they perceive people from the United States to value benevolence were more likely integrated. Additionally, international students who perceive that people from the United States endorse conformity and benevolence values, as well as cognitive and affective outcomes at work similarly to themselves experience greater cultural empathy and relatedness in the United States.

Recommended applications of this study for the International Programs and Services Department at San José State University, international students at California universities, and organizations that employ international students include implementation of a cultural intelligence training program (with metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral components) focused on benevolence, conformity, tradition, power, and instrumental outcomes at work values. The metacognitive component of the intercultural effectiveness training should relate to how conformity and benevolence values and cognitive and affective outcomes at work are manifested by people from the United States. The motivational component of the intercultural effectiveness training should include introspective cultural and self-awareness training that would be aimed at helping international students to analyze their own cultural values and beliefs so they would have a context for understanding U.S. cultural values and beliefs. Pre-training assessments of international students' acculturation mode and level of sociocultural adjustment should be compared to post-training assessments to discern the success of the training program.

Increased awareness of U.S. life and work values might help international students to better acculturate and adjust to the United States. This could improve their

experiences while living in the United States. It could also maximize their social, academic, and future career potential, whether in their home country or in the U.S. Finally, it could serve to foster greater understanding and integration of SJSU's student body, which would further enrich the lives of domestic students at SJSU.

REFERENCES

- Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1207-1220.
- Berry, J. W. (1989). Acculturation and psychological adaptation. In J. P. Forgas & J. M. Innes (Eds.), *Recent Advances in Social Psychology: An International Perspective* (pp. 511-519). North-Holland: Elsevier.
- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in Plural Societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 38, 185-206.
- Burke, P. J. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 836-849.
- Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1991). An identity theory approach to commitment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 54, 239-251.
- Burke, P. J., & Stets, J. E. (1999). Trust and commitment through self-verification. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 62, 347-366.
- Cable, M. D., & Edwards, J. R. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 822-834.
- Caillat, Z., & Mueller, B. (1996). Observations: The influence of culture on American and British advertising: An exploratory comparison of beer advertising. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 36, 79-88.
- Castillo, L. G., Conoley, C. W., & Brossart, D. F. (2004). Acculturation, white marginalization, and family support as predictors of perceived distress in Mexican American female college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51, 151-157.
- Dolan, S. L., Diez-Pinol, M., Fernandez-Alles, M., Martin-Prius, A., & Martinez-Fierro, S. (2004). Exploratory study of within-country differences in work and life values: The case of Spanish business students. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 4, 157-180.
- Earley, P. C., & Peterson, R. S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. *Academy of Management, Learning, and Education*, 3, 100-115.

- Elizur, D. (1984). Facets of work values: A structural analysis of work outcomes. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 379-389.
- Elizur, D. (1994). Gender and work values: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 201-212.
- Elizur, D., Borg, I., Hunt, R., & Magyari Beck, I. (1991). The structure of work values: A cross cultural comparison. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12, 21-38.
- Elizur, D., & Sagie, A. (1999). Facets of personal values: A structural analysis of life and work values. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 73-87.
- Ellis, A. (1991). The revised ABC's of rational-emotive therapy (RET). *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 9, 139-172.
- Enrollment and Academic Services Department (2005). San José State University.
- Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., Tsaousis, I., Pappas, K., & Garrod, D. (2005). A cross-cultural investigation into the relationships between personality traits and work values. *The Journal of Psychology*, 139, 5-32.
- Herfst, S. L., van Oudenhoven, J. P., & Timmerman, M. E. (2008). Intercultural effectiveness training in three Western immigrant countries: A cross-cultural evaluation of critical incidents. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 67-80.
- Kalliath, T. J., Bluedorn, A. C., & Strube, M. J. (1999). A test of value congruence effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 1175-1198.
- Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 785-800.
- Kosic, A., Kruglanski, A. W., Pierro, A., & Mannetti, L. (2004). The social cognition of immigrants' acculturation: Effects of the need for closure and the reference group at entry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 796-813.
- Krishnan, A., & Berry, J. W. (1992). Acculturative stress and acculturation attitudes among Indian immigrants to the United States. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 4, 187-212.
- Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurements, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, 49, 1-49.

- Li, A., & Gasser, M. B. (2005). Predicting Asian international students' sociocultural adjustment: A test of two mediation models. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 561-576.
- Littrell, L. N., Salas, E., Hess, K. P., Paley, M., & Riedel, S. (2006). Expatriate preparation: A critical analysis of 25 years of cross-cultural training research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5, 355-388.
- Nilsson, J. E., & Anderson, M. Z. (2004). Supervising international students: The role of acculturation, role ambiguity, and multicultural discussions. *International Issues in Professional Training*, 35, 306-312.
- Open Doors (2005). *Report on international educational exchange: International student and total U.S. enrollment*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- O'Reilly, C., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, 487-516.
- Ros, M., Schwartz, S., & Surkiss, S. (1999). Basic individual values, work values, and the meaning of work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 49-71.
- Sagie, A., Elizur, D., & Koslowsky, M. (1996). Work values: A theoretical overview and a model of their effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17, 503-514.
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (1995). Value priorities and readiness for out-group social contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 437-448.
- Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2000). Value priorities and subjective well being: direction relations and congruity effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 177-198.
- San José State University (2003). *Points of Pride*. Retrieved January 21, 2007, from the San José State University Web site: <http://www.sjsu.edu/comm/docs/pride03.pdf>
- San José State University International House: Home to American and international students from around the world. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from the SJSU International House Web site: <http://www2.sjsu.edu/ihouse/>
- San José State University MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center. Retrieved March 16, 2006, from the SJSU MOSAIC Cross Cultural Center Web site: <http://sa.sjsu.edu/mosaic/index.jsp>

San José State University Psychology Department. Retrieved February 18, 2007, from the SJSU Psychology Department Web site: <http://psych.sjsu.edu>

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40, 437-453.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1-65). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Studying human values. In A.-M. Bouvy, F.J.R. van de Vijver, P. Boski, & P. Schmitz (Eds.), *Journeys into cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 239-254). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 268-290.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a psychological structure of human values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 550-562.

Schwartz, S. H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of values: Extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 878-891.

Schwartz, S. H., & Boehnke, K. (2004). Evaluating the structure of human values with confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 230-255.

Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.

Schwartz, S. H., Sagiv, L. & Boehnke, K. (2000). Worries and values. *Journal of Personality*, 68, 309-346.

Searle, W., & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14, 449-464.

Spony, G. (2003). The development of a work-value model assessing the cumulative impact of individual and cultural differences on managers' work-value systems: Empirical evidence from French and British managers. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14, 658-679.

Stryker, S., & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 284-297.

- Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57, 16-35.
- Swagler, M., & Ellis, M. (2003). Crossing the distance: Adjustment of Taiwanese Graduate students in the United States. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 420-437.
- Van Vianen, A. E. M., de Pater, I. E., Kristof-Brown, A. L., & Johnson, E. C. (2004). Fitting in: Surface- and deep-level cultural differences and expatriates' adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 697-709.
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of relations between person-organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 473-489.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1994). Acculturation strategies, psychological adjustment, and socio-cultural competence during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 18, 329-343.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23, 659-677.
- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (1999). Acculturation and adaptation revisited. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 30, 422-442.
- Ward, C., & Rana-Deuba, A. (2000). Home and host culture influences on sojourner adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 291-306.
- Ward, C., & Searle, W. (1991). The impact of value discrepancies and cultural identity on psychological and sociocultural adjustment of sojourners. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15, 209-225.

APPENDIX A**Signed IRB Approval Letter**

Office of the Academic
Vice President
Academic Vice President
Graduate Studies and Research
San José State University
One University Circle
San José, CA 95128-1400
Phone: (408) 924-2400
Fax: (408) 924-2400

To: Heather Simonovich

From: Pam Stacks, *Pam Stacks*
Interim AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: November 3, 2004

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request to use human subjects in the study entitled:

"Assessment of Personal Values, Work Values, Acculturation, and Adjustment to the USA."

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project, and with regard to all data that may be collected from the subjects. The approval includes continued monitoring of your research by the Board to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. immediately. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information. This approval for the human subjects portion of your project is in effect for one year, and data collection beyond November 3, 2005 requires an extension request.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2400.

cc: Dr. Sharon Glazer

The University of the Pacific
San Francisco, CA 94132-0900
Phone: (415) 774-2000
Fax: (415) 774-2000
Email: info@uopacific.edu
Web: <http://www.uopacific.edu>

Appendix B
International Students Survey

**Assessment of Personal Values, Work Values,
Acculturation and Adjustment to the U.S.A.**

Informed Consent for Survey Questionnaire

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information about international and U.S. students' personal values, work values, acculturation and adjustment to the U.S.A. This information is being acquired for research purposes, as well as to provide feedback to SJSU's International Programs and Services Department so that they can have insight into experiences of international students like you and better serve you. Your responses will remain **anonymous**. The researcher will not have access to personal information about potential participants; no one will be able to identify you and San José State University will not receive raw data, only aggregated results.

This questionnaire is divided into 5 sections. The first two sections of the survey ask questions that are related to both life and work values. The third and fourth sections ask questions about how you see yourself in relation to people from your home country and to people from the U.S.A., and about your experiences with life in the U.S.A. The last section asks questions about you so that we can later describe the sample on which these data were obtained; however, the information will not be used to identify you or what you say.

Completion of the survey is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. Choosing not to participate in completion of this survey will not affect your relations with San José State University or your organization. Questions in this survey are not expected to cause harm or discomfort to any participant. Overall results of this study may be published.

Included with the questionnaire is a stamped envelope addressed to me (via my research advisor). Please seal your questionnaire in this envelope and send it through the U.S. postal mail system within **one week**. Please **return only the questionnaire** in the enclosed envelope.

Finally, the questionnaire will take about 25-30 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions, comments, or concerns about this research, please call me, Heather Simonovich, at (408) 996-7893. For further information or questions you may also contact Dr. S. Glazer, thesis research advisor, at: (408) 924-5639. Questions about research subjects' rights, or research-related injury may be presented to Pam Stacks, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, at (408) 924-2480.

Your time and effort is much appreciated.

Heather Simonovich
Masters Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
San José State University
San José, California 95192-0120
heather_simonovich@hotmail.com

Research	Sharon Glazer, Ph.D.
Advisor:	Assistant Professor
	Department of Psychology,
	San José State University
	San José, California 95192-0120
	sglazer@email.sjsu.edu

Interim Vice President	Pam Stacks, Ph.D.
For Graduate Studies:	(408) 924 2480

Section I: Culture Values

In this section you are to ask yourself the following three questions:

- 1) What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?
- 2) What values are generally important to PEOPLE IN MY HOME COUNTRY as guiding principles in THEIR lives, and what values are less important to them?
- 3) What values are generally important to PEOPLE FROM THE USA as guiding principles in THEIR lives, and what values are less important to them?

There are two lists of values on the following pages. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for YOU as a guiding principle in your life, how important each value is generally to PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY, and how important each value is generally to PEOPLE FROM THE USA. Use the rating scale below:

- 0—means the value is not at all important; it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you, for people from your home country, or for people from the USA.
 3—means the value is important.
 6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life, in PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY'S lives, or in PEOPLE FROM THE USA's lives.

- 1—is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you, people from your home country, or people from the USA.
 7—is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life, in the lives of people from your home country, or in the lives of people from the USA; **ordinarily there are no more than two such values.**

Under each column (**in the parentheses**) write the number (-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7) that indicates the importance of that value for you personally, then for people from your home country, and then for people from the USA. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using the whole range of numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is **most important** to YOU, to PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY in general, and to PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is **most opposed** to your values, to the values of people from your home country in general, and to the values of people from the USA in general, and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you, to people from your home country, and to people from the USA, and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, IN THE LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, OR IN THE LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:

Opposed to my values, or to those of people from my home country, or to those of people from the USA

-1

Not important

0

1 2

Important

3

4 5

Very important

6

Of supreme importance

7

CULTURAL VALUES LIST I

	YOUR VALUES	YOUR HOME COUNTRY'S VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
1. EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)	()	()	()
2. INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)	()	()	()
3. SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)	()	()	()
4. PLEASURE (gratification of desires)	()	()	()
5. FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)	()	()	()
6. A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)	()	()	()
7. SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)	()	()	()
8. SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)	()	()	()
9. AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)	()	()	()
10. MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)	()	()	()
11. POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)	()	()	()
12. WEALTH (material possessions, money)	()	()	()
13. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)	()	()	()
14. SELF RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)	()	()	()
15. RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)	()	()	()

Opposed to my
values, or to those
of people from my
home country, or to
those of people from
the USA

-1

Not
important

0

1 2

Important

3

4 5

Very
important

6

Of supreme
importance

7

	YOUR VALUES	YOUR HOME COUNTRY'S VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
16. CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)	()	()	()
17. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)	()	()	()
18. RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)	()	()	()
19. MATURE LOVE (deep emotional & spiritual intimacy)	()	()	()
20. SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)	()	()	()
21. PRIVACY (the right to have a private sphere)	()	()	()
22. FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)	()	()	()
23. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)	()	()	()
24. UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)	()	()	()
25. A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)	()	()	()
26. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)	()	()	()
27. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)	()	()	()
28. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)	()	()	()
29. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)	()	()	()
30. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)	()	()	()

CULTURAL VALUES LIST II

These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for YOU, for PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY, or for PEOPLE FROM THE USA. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is **most important** to YOU, to PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY in general, and to PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is **most opposed** to YOUR values, to the values of people from YOUR HOME COUNTRY in general, and to the values of PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to YOU, to PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY, or to PEOPLE FROM THE USA, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, IN THE LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, OR IN THE LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:

Opposed to my
values, or to those
of people from my
home country, or to
those of people from
the USA

-1

Not
important

0

1 2

Important

3

4 5

Very
important

6

Of supreme
importance

7

	YOUR VALUES	YOUR HOME COUNTRY'S VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	()	()	()
32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling & action)	()	()	()
33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)	()	()	()
34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)	()	()	()
35. BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)	()	()	()
36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)	()	()	()
37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)	()	()	()
38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)	()	()	()

Opposed to my values, or to those of people from my home country, or to those of people from the USA

Not
important

Important

Very
important

Of supreme importance

-1

0

1

2

3

4

6

7

	YOUR VALUES	YOUR HOME COUNTRY'S VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)	()	()	()
40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)	()	()	()
41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)	()	()	()
42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)	()	()	()
43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)	()	()	()
44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)	()	()	()
45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)	()	()	()
46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")	()	()	()
47. OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)	()	()	()
48. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)	()	()	()
49. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)	()	()	()
50. ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)	()	()	()
51. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith & belief)	()	()	()
52. RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)	()	()	()
53. CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)	()	()	()
54. FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)	()	()	()
55. SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)	()	()	()
56. CLEAN (neat, tidy)	()	()	()
57. SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)	()	()	()

Section II: Work Values

In this section you are to ask yourself the following three questions:

- 1) What values are important to ME?
- 2) What values are generally important to PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY?
- 3) What values are generally important to PEOPLE FROM THE USA?

Your task is to rate how important each value is for YOU, for PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY in general, and for PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, regarding work. Use the rating scale below:

- 0—means the value is not at all important; it is not relevant as a guiding principle for YOU, for PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY, or for PEOPLE FROM THE USA.
- 3—means the value is important.
- 6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life, in the lives of PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY in general, or in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general.

- 1—is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you, people from your home country, or people from the USA.
- 7—is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life, in the lives of people from your home country, or in the lives of people from the USA; **ordinarily there are no more than two such values.**

In the columns next to each value (in the parentheses) write the number (-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7) that indicates the importance of that value for you personally, then for people from your home country, and then for people from the USA. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once (with the exception of the number 7).

Before you begin, read all the values listed, choose the one that is **most important** to YOU, to PEOPLE FROM YOUR HOME COUNTRY, and to PEOPLE FROM THE USA, and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is **most opposed** to your values, to the values of people from your home country, and to the values of people from the USA, and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in the list.

List begins on next page

Opposed to my values, or to those of
people from my home country, or to
those of people from the USA

-1

Not
important
0

Important

Very
important
6

Of supreme
importance
7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	YOUR VALUES		YOUR HOME COUNTRY'S VALUES			USA VALUES	
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:		As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM MY HOME COUNTRY, this value is:			As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:	
1. Achievement in work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
2. Advancement (chances for promotion)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
3. Benefits (vacation, sick leave, pension, insurance etc.)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
4. Company (be employed by company for which you are proud to work)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
5. Contribution to society	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
6. Convenient hours to work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
7. Co-workers (fellow workers who are pleasant and agreeable)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
8. Esteem (that you are valuable as a person)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
9. Feedback (concerning the results of your work)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
10. Independence (in work)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
11. Influence (in the organization)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
12. Influences in work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
13. Job interest (to do work which is interesting to you)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
14. Job security (permanent job)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
15. Job status	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
16. Meaningful work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
17. Opportunity for personal growth	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
18. Opportunity to meet people and interact with them	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
19. Pay (the amount of money you receive)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
20. Recognition for doing a good job	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
21. Responsibility	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
22. Supervisor (a fair and considerate boss)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
23. Use of ability and knowledge in your work	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
24. Work conditions (comfortable and clean)	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

Section III: Acculturation to the USA

Instructions: This section is concerned with how you see yourself in relation to other people from your home country and in relation to people from the USA. You are asked to consider two questions about your current life style:

- 1) Are your experiences and behaviors generally similar to people from your home country?
- 2) Are your experiences and behaviors generally similar to people from the USA?

Use the following scale to indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that your various experiences of daily life are similar to those of people from **your home country** and to those of people **from the USA**.

Enter your responses (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7) in the parentheses. Please respond to all the items.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

My experiences and behaviors regarding	are similar to most:	
	People from my home country	People from the USA
1. Clothing	()	()
2. Pace of life	()	()
3. General knowledge	()	()
4. Food	()	()
5. Religious beliefs	()	()
6. Material comfort (standard of living)	()	()
7. Recreational activities	()	()
8. Self-identity	()	()
9. Family life	()	()
10. Accommodations/residence	()	()
11. Values	()	()
12. Friendships	()	()
13. Communication styles	()	()
14. Cultural activities	()	()
15. Language	()	()
16. Perceptions of co-nationals	()	()
17. Perceptions of host nationals	()	()
18. Political ideology	()	()
19. World view	()	()
20. Social customs	()	()
21. Employment activities	()	()

Section IV: Sociocultural Adaptation

Instructions: This section measures the extent to which you feel you fit in with U.S. culture and with your life in the USA. Use the following scale to indicate the amount of difficulty you experience in different areas of your life in the USA.

Enter your responses (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in the parentheses. Please respond to all the items.

No difficulty Slight difficulty Moderate difficulty Great difficulty Extreme difficulty
1 2 3 4 5

	Amount of difficulty you experience in the USA			Amount of difficulty you experience in the USA
1. Making friends	()		21. Using the transportation system	()
2. Going to coffee shops/restaurants/fast food	()		22. Understanding the local accent/language	()
3. Making yourself understood	()		23. Relating to older people	()
4. Getting used to the pace of life	()		24. Adapting to local etiquette	()
5. Going shopping	()		25. Worshipping in your usual way	()
6. Going to social events/gatherings/functions	()		26. Dealing with people staring at you	()
7. Getting used to the population density	()		27. Dealing with people of higher status	()
8. Talking about yourself with others	()		28. Understanding what is required of you at university	()
9. Understanding jokes and humor	()		29. Coping with academic work	()
10. Dealing with someone who is unpleasant/angry/aggressive	()		30. Dealing with foreign staff at the university	()
11. Getting used to the local foods/finding food you enjoy	()		31. The expectation that you express your ideas in class	()
12. Following rules and regulations	()		32. Expressing your ideas in class	()
13. Dealing with people in authority	()		33. Dealing with the bureaucracy	()
14. Accepting/understanding the local political system	()		34. Understanding the locals' world view	()
15. Adapting to local accommodation	()		35. Taking a local perspective on the culture	()
16. Communicating with people of a different ethnic group	()		36. Understanding the local value system	()
17. Relating to members of the opposite sex	()		37. Seeing things from the locals' point of view	()
18. Dealing with unsatisfactory service	()		38. Understanding cultural differences	()
19. Finding your way around	()		39. Dealing with the climate	()
20. Being able to see two sides of an intercultural issue	()		40. Living away from family members over seas/independently from your parents	()

Section V: Demographic Information

Instructions: For purposes of statistical analysis *only*, please answer the following questions about yourself. Your answers will remain *anonymous*. Please write **clearly and legibly**.

1. Age (as of November 1, 2004) _____ years. 2. Sex: **1 male 2 female**
3. In which country were you born? _____
4. How long did you live in the country where you were born? _____ months _____ years
5. How long have you been living in the USA during the current stay? _____ months _____ years
6. Have you ever lived in the USA prior to the current stay? **1 no 2 yes**
 - 6a. If yes, please indicate how long you have lived in the USA in total (prior to your current stay)

? _____ months _____ years
7. In which country have you lived most of your life? _____
8. How would you describe your ethnic identity? _____
9. What is your first language? _____
10. What is the primary language you speak? _____

<p>11a. What is your marital status?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Single 2 Married/Remarried/Living with Partner 3 Legally Separated/Divorced 4 Widow/Widower 5 Other _____ <p>If you responded: Married/Remarried/Living with Partner, please go to 11b</p>	<p>11b. If you are married or living with a partner, please circle as many that apply</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 My partner is in my home country 2 My partner is from the USA 3 My partner has lived in the USA longer than I have, but not from the USA 4 My partner has lived in the USA less time than I have 5 My partner and I have been in the USA for the same amount of time 6 My partner and I came to the USA together
---	--

12. What is your college major? _____
13. Are your caregivers (the people who raised you) (please circle):

<p>Caregiver 1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 First Generation U.S. born 2 Second Generation U.S. born 3 Third Generation U.S. born 4 Immigrant to the U.S. 5 Never immigrated to the U.S. 	<p>Caregiver 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 First Generation U.S. born 2 Second Generation U.S. born 3 Third Generation U.S. born 4 Immigrant to the U.S. 5 Never immigrated to the U.S.
--	--
14. With which country do you most identify? Please circle.

1 USA
2 Other (Please write clearly) _____

THANK YOU very much for your participation in filling out the questionnaire. We hope that you have found it interesting and not too demanding of your time.

Appendix C
U.S. Students' Survey

**Assessment of Personal Values, Work Values,
Acculturation and Adjustment to the U.S.A.
Informed Consent for Survey Questionnaire**

The purpose of this survey questionnaire is to obtain information about international and U.S. students' personal values, work values, acculturation and adaptation to the U.S.A. This information is being acquired for research purposes, as well as to provide feedback to SJSU's International Programs and Services Department so that they can have insight as to how to better serve international students. Your responses will remain **anonymous**. The researcher will not have access to personal information about potential participants; no one will be able to identify you and San José State University will not receive raw data, only aggregated results.

This questionnaire is divided into 5 sections. The first two sections of the survey ask questions that are related to both life and work values. The third and fourth sections ask questions about how you see yourself in relation to people the U.S.A., and about your experiences with life in the U.S.A. The last section asks questions about you so that we can later describe the sample on which these data were obtained; however, the information will not be used to identify you or what you say.

Completion of the survey is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time. Choosing not to participate in completion of this survey will not affect your relations with San José State University or your organization. Questions in this survey are not expected to cause harm or discomfort to any participant. Overall results of this study may be published.

Included with the questionnaire is a stamped envelope addressed to me (via my research advisor). Please seal your questionnaire in this envelope and send it through the U.S. postal mail system within **one week**. Please **return only the questionnaire** in the enclosed envelope.

Finally, the questionnaire will take about 25-30 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions, comments, or concerns about this research, please call me, Heather Simonovich, at (408) 996-7893. For further information or questions you may also contact Dr. S. Glazer, thesis research advisor, at: (408) 924-5639. Questions about research subjects' rights, or research-related injury may be presented to Pam Stacks, Ph.D., Associate Vice President, Graduate Studies and Research, at (408) 924-2480.

Your time and effort is much appreciated.

Heather Simonovich
Masters Candidate
Industrial/Organizational Psychology
San José State University
San José, California 95192-0120
heather_simonovich@hotmail.com

Research Advisor:	Sharon Glazer, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Department of Psychology, San José State University San José, California 95192-0120 sglazer@email.sjsu.edu
----------------------	--

Interim Vice President For Graduate Studies:	Pam Stacks, Ph.D. (408) 924 24
---	-----------------------------------

U.S. Students' Survey

Section I: Culture Values

In this section you are to ask yourself the following two questions:

- 1) What values are important to ME as guiding principles in MY life, and what values are less important to me?
- 2) What values are generally important to PEOPLE FROM THE USA as guiding principles in THEIR lives, and what values are less important to them?

There are two lists of values on the following pages. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for YOU as a guiding principle in your life, and how important each value is generally to PEOPLE FROM THE USA. Use the rating scale below:

- 0—means the value is not at all important; it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you, or for people from the USA.
 3—means the value is important.
 6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life, or in PEOPLE FROM THE USA'S lives.

- 1—is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you, or people from the USA.
 7—is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life, or in the lives of people from the USA; **ordinarily there are no more than two such values.**

Under each column (in the parentheses) write the number (-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) that indicates the importance of that value for you personally, and then for people from the USA. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using the whole range of numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is **most important** to YOU, and to PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is **most opposed** to your values, and to the values of people from the USA in general, and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you, and to people from the USA, and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, OR IN THE LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:

Opposed to my
values or to
those of people
from the USA

-1

Not
important

0

1

2

Important

3

4

5

Very
important

6

Of supreme
importance

7

CULTURAL VALUES LIST I

	YOUR VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
1. EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)	()	()
2. INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)	()	()
3. SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)	()	()
4. PLEASURE (gratification of desires)	()	()
5. FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)	()	()
6. A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)	()	()
7. SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)	()	()
8. SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)	()	()
9. AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)	()	()
10. MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)	()	()
11. POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)	()	()
12. WEALTH (material possessions, money)	()	()
13. NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)	()	()
14. SELF RESPECT (belief in one's own worth)	()	()
15. RECIPROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)	()	()

Opposed to my
values or to
those of people
from the USA

-1

Not
important

0

1

2

Important

3

4

5

Very
important

6

Of supreme
importance

7

	YOUR VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
16. CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)	()	()
17. A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)	()	()
18. RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)	()	()
19. MATURE LOVE (deep emotional & spiritual intimacy)	()	()
20. SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)	()	()
21. PRIVACY (the right to have a private sphere)	()	()
22. FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)	()	()
23. SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)	()	()
24. UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)	()	()
25. A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)	()	()
26. WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)	()	()
27. AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)	()	()
28. TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)	()	()
29. A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)	()	()
30. SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)	()	()

CULTURAL VALUES LIST II

These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for YOU, or for PEOPLE FROM THE USA. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is **most important** to YOU, and to PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is **most opposed** to YOUR values, and to the values of PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, or—if there is not such value—choose the value least important to you, or to people from the USA, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN MY LIFE, OR IN THE LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:

Opposed to my
values or to
those of people
from the USA

Not
important
0

1

2

Important
3

4

5

Very
important
6

Of supreme
importance
7

	YOUR VALUES	USA VALUES
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
31. INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)	()	()
32. MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling & action)	()	()
33. LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)	()	()
34. AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)	()	()
35. BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)	()	()
36. HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)	()	()
37. DARING (seeking adventure, risk)	()	()
38. PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)	()	()

Opposed to my
values or to
those of people
from the USA

-1

Not
important
0

1

2

Important
3

4

5

Very
important
6

Of supreme
importance
7

	YOUR VALUES	USA Values
	As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:	As a guiding principle in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:
39. INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)	()	()
40. HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)	()	()
41. CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)	()	()
42. HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)	()	()
43. CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)	()	()
44. ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)	()	()
45. HONEST (genuine, sincere)	()	()
46. PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")	()	()
47. OBEDIENT (dutiful, meeting obligations)	()	()
48. INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)	()	()
49. HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)	()	()
50. ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)	()	()
51. DEVOUT (holding to religious faith & belief)	()	()
52. RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)	()	()
53. CURIOUS (interested in everything, exploring)	()	()
54. FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)	()	()
55. SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)	()	()
56. CLEAN (neat, tidy)	()	()
57. SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)	()	()

Section II: Work Values

In this section you are to ask yourself the following two questions:

- 1) What values are important to ME?
- 2) What values are generally important to PEOPLE FROM THE USA?

Your task is to rate how important each value is for YOU, and for PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general, regarding work. Use the rating scale below:

0—means the value is not at all important; it is not relevant as a guiding principle for YOU, or for PEOPLE FROM THE USA.

3—means the value is important.

6—means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle in YOUR life, or in the lives of PEOPLE FROM THE USA in general.

-1—is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you, or people from the USA.

7—is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your life, or in the lives of people from the USA; **ordinarily there are no more than two such values.**

In the columns next to each value (**in the parentheses**), write the number (-1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) that indicates the importance of that value for you personally, and then for people from the USA. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once (with the exception of the number 7).

Before you begin, read all the values listed, choose the one that is **most important** to YOU, and to PEOPLE FROM THE USA, and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is **most opposed** to your values, and to the values of people from the USA, and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in the list.

List begins on next page

Opposed to my
values or to
those of people
from the USA

Not
important
0

1

2

Important
3

4

5

Very
important
6

Of supreme
importance
7

	<i>YOUR VALUES</i>	<i>USA Values</i>
	<i>As a guiding principle in MY LIFE, this value is:</i>	<i>As a guiding principle in the LIVES OF PEOPLE FROM THE USA, this value is:</i>
1. Achievement in work	()	()
2. Advancement (chances for promotion)	()	()
3. Benefits (vacation, sick leave, pension, insurance etc.)	()	()
4. Company (be employed by company for which you are proud to work)	()	()
5. Contribution to society	()	()
6. Convenient hours to work	()	()
7. Co-workers (fellow workers who are pleasant and agreeable)	()	()
8. Esteem (that you are valuable as a person)	()	()
9. Feedback (concerning the results of your work)	()	()
10. Independence (in work)	()	()
11. Influence (in the organization)	()	()
12. Influences in work	()	()
13. Job interest (to do work which is interesting to you)	()	()
14. Job security (permanent job)	()	()
15. Job status	()	()
16. Meaningful work	()	()
17. Opportunity for personal growth	()	()
18. Opportunity to meet people and interact with them	()	()
19. Pay (the amount of money you receive)	()	()
20. Recognition for doing a good job	()	()
21. Responsibility	()	()
22. Supervisor (a fair and considerate boss)	()	()
23. Use of ability and knowledge in your work	()	()
24. Work conditions (comfortable and clean)	()	()

Section III: Acculturation to the USA

Instructions: This section is concerned with how you see yourself in relation to other people from the USA. You are asked to consider the following question about your current life style: Are your experiences and behaviors generally similar to people from the USA?

Use the following scale to indicate to what extent you agree or disagree that your various experiences of daily life are similar to those of people from the USA.

Enter your responses (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7) in the parentheses. Please respond to all the items.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

My experiences and behaviors regarding _____ are similar to those of most people from the USA:

1. Clothing	()
2. Pace of life	()
3. General knowledge	()
4. Food	()
5. Religious beliefs	()
6. Material comfort (standard of living)	()
7. Recreational activities	()
8. Self-identity	()
9. Family life	()
10. Accommodations/residence	()
11. Values	()
12. Friendships	()
13. Communication styles	()
14. Cultural activities	()
15. Language	()
16. Perceptions of co-nationals	()
17. Perceptions of host nationals	()
18. Political ideology	()
19. World view	()
20. Social customs	()
21. Employment activities	()

Section IV: Sociocultural Adaptation

Instructions: This section measures the extent to which you feel you fit in with U.S. culture and with your life in the USA. Use the following scale to indicate the amount of difficulty you experience in different areas of your life in the USA.

Enter your responses (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5) in the parentheses. Please respond to all the items.

No difficulty	Slight difficulty	Moderate difficulty	Great difficulty	Extreme difficulty
1	2	3	4	5

	Amount of difficulty you experience in your daily life			Amount of difficulty you experience in your daily life
1. Making friends	()		21. Using the transportation system	()
2. Going to coffee shops/restaurants/fast food	()		22. Understanding the local accent/language	()
3. Making yourself understood	()		23. Relating to older people	()
4. Getting used to the pace of life	()		24. Adapting to local etiquette	()
5. Going shopping	()		25. Worshipping in your usual way	()
6. Going to social events/gatherings/functions	()		26. Dealing with people staring at you	()
7. Getting used to the population density	()		27. Dealing with people of higher status	()
8. Talking about yourself with others	()		28. Understanding what is required of you at university	()
9. Understanding jokes and humor	()		29. Coping with academic work	()
10. Dealing with someone who is unpleasant/angry/aggressive	()		30. Dealing with foreign staff at the university	()
11. Getting used to the local foods/finding food you enjoy	()		31. The expectation that you express your ideas in class	()
12. Following rules and regulations	()		32. Expressing your ideas in class	()
13. Dealing with people in authority	()		33. Dealing with the bureaucracy	()
14. Accepting/understanding the local political system	()		34. Understanding the locals' world view	()
15. Adapting to local accommodation	()		35. Taking a local perspective on the culture	()
16. Communicating with people of a different ethnic group	()		36. Understanding the local value system	()
17. Relating to members of the opposite sex	()		37. Seeing things from the locals' point of view	()
18. Dealing with unsatisfactory service	()		38. Understanding cultural differences	()
19. Finding your way around	()		39. Dealing with the climate	()
20. Being able to see two sides of an intercultural issue	()		40. Living away from family members/independently from your parents	()

Section V: Demographic Information

Instructions: For purposes of statistical analysis *only*, please answer the following questions about yourself. Your answers will remain *anonymous*. Please write **clearly and legibly**.

1. Age (as of November 1, 2004) _____ years. 2. Sex: 1 male 2 female
3. Were you born in the USA?
1 No 2 Yes
4. If you were not born in the USA, please indicate which country you were born in (Please write **clearly**).

How long did you live in the country where you were born?
_____ months _____ years
- If not, how long have you lived in this country?
_____ months _____ years.
5. In which country have you lived most of your life? _____
6. Have you ever lived outside the USA? 1 no 2 yes
6a. If yes, please list countries and total duration in each:
_____ country _____ months _____ years
_____ country _____ months _____ years
_____ country _____ months _____ years
7. How would you describe your ethnic identity? _____
8. What is your first language? _____
9. What is the primary language you speak? _____
10. What is your marital status?
1 Single
2 Married/Remarried/Living with Partner
3 Legally Separated/Divorced
4 Widow/Widower
5 Other _____
11. What is your college major? _____
12. Are your caregivers (the people who raised you) (please circle):
Caregiver 1: 1 First Generation U.S. born Caregiver 2: 1 First Generation U.S. born
 2 Second Generation U.S. born 2 Second Generation U.S. born
 3 Third+ Generation U.S. born 3 Third+ Generation U.S. born
 4 Immigrant to the U.S. 4 Immigrant to the U.S.
13. With which country do you most identify (Please circle)?
1 USA 2 Other (Please write clearly) _____

THANK YOU very much for your participation in filling out the questionnaire. We hope that you have found it interesting and not too demanding of your time.