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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine whether the variables of acculturation to the host culture, acculturation to the home culture, and hope predict career decision self-efficacy among international undergraduate students from South Korea. The secondary goal of this study was to examine the moderating roles of hope and post-graduation residency plans in the relationship between acculturation variables and career decision self-efficacy.

The final sample included 213 Korean international undergraduate students enrolled in U.S. universities. Two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to examine the research questions. The first regression analysis was performed to answer Research Question 1: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, the interaction between acculturation to the U.S. and hope, and the interaction between acculturation to Korea and hope predict career decision self-efficacy? The results revealed that hope, acculturation to the U.S., and acculturation to Korea accounted for 52.5% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy. Hope was the strongest predictor followed by acculturation to the U.S. Acculturation to Korea did not make a unique contribution to the prediction of career decision self-efficacy while controlling for hope and acculturation to the U.S. No interaction effects were found between hope and acculturation variables on career decision self-efficacy.

The second regression analysis was conducted to answer Research Question 2: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, post-graduation residency plans, the interaction between acculturation to the U.S. and post-graduation residency plans, and the interaction between the acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans predict career decision self-efficacy? Post-graduation residency plans were categorized into plans to reside in the United States and plans to reside in Korea. Sixteen participants that reported their desires to secure employment in countries other than Korea and the United States were excluded from this
analysis. The results indicated that acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea accounted for 19.3% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy. Both acculturation variables made unique contributions to predicting career decision self-efficacy while controlling for each other. Post-graduation residency plans did not significantly predict career decision self-efficacy controlling for the two acculturation variables, as expected. No interaction effects were found between post-graduation residency plans and the acculturation variables on career decision self-efficacy. Limitations of this study and implications for practice and future research are discussed.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

In the 2011–2012 academic year, 72,295 Korean international students attended U.S. higher institutions, constituting the third largest group (9.5%) of international students in the United States (Institute of International Education, 2012a). Many international students exhibit great career concerns and face unique challenges in their career development processes, such as cross-cultural adjustment and language barriers (Crockett & Hays, 2011). Researchers, however, have paid much less attention to the career development of international students than other American racial/ethnic minority populations. In particular, few studies have focused solely on the career development of international students from South Korea.

The career development of Korean international students can be better understood by examining various personal and contextual factors such as acculturation, hope, and post-graduation residency plans. Acculturation is one of the primary challenges that international students encounter in their career decision-making processes (Sangganjanavanich, Lenz, & Cavazos, 2011; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). International students’ career planning is also complicated by the fact that they must choose between returning to their home countries, remaining in their host countries, or going elsewhere as a part of making their post-education career decisions. In navigating cultural and career challenges, having a sense of hope can give international students psychological strength. This study selected career decision self-efficacy as the criterion variable of interest because career decision self-efficacy plays a crucial role in the career development process (Betz, Hammond, & Multon, 2005).
Purpose of the Study

This study examined the associations of acculturation, hope, and post-graduation residency plans with career decision self-efficacy among Korean international undergraduate students in the United States. Adapting the bilinear model of acculturation, acculturation to the host culture and acculturation to the native culture were used as separate predictor variables. The main goal of this study was to investigate the predictive abilities of: (a) acculturation to the U.S., (b) acculturation to Korea, and (c) hope for career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students. The secondary goal of the present study was to examine the moderating roles of hope and post-graduation residency plans in the relationship between the acculturation variables and career decision self-efficacy.

Background for the Study

During the college years, students make important decisions regarding their future careers (Blustein, Walbridge, Friedlander, & Palladino, 1991). In addition to common career decision-making tasks such as selecting a college major and identifying a career choice, international students face unique challenges during this time. These challenges include cultural adjustments, language barriers, lack of relevant knowledge and resources, and systemic factors that may limit access to employment opportunities (e.g., work authorization for non-U.S. citizens) (Arthur & Flynn, 2011; Bikos & Furry, 1999; Crockett & Hays, 2011; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Spencer-Rodgers, 2000; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). These unique challenges are likely to intensify international students’ career decision-making concerns. Several studies, however, have reported that international students tend to perceive career services as failing to meet their career needs in a culturally sensitive manner (Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Shen & Herr, 2004). For example, in Shen and Herr’s study, the majority of the international students viewed campus
career services as primarily U.S.-oriented. In another study, half of the participants mentioned that career counselors were not empathetic about international students' situations and did not have knowledge about resources relevant to international workers (Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011). These findings confirm the need for a better understanding of the career development process of international students in order to effectively meet their distinctive career needs.

Career decision self-efficacy, which refers to perceived capacity to perform tasks for career decision-making (Taylor & Betz, 1983), is an important variable in international students’ career development within the framework of social cognitive career theory (SCCT). SCCT was proposed by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) as an expansion of Bandura’s (1977, 1986, 1997) social cognitive theory to the career development context. In SCCT, self-efficacy plays a central role in linking personal and distal contextual factors to career choice behaviors. Specifically, personal (e.g., gender, ethnicity, predispositions) and distal contextual (e.g., culture, socio-economic background, perceived support) factors interact and influence the formation of self-efficacy through differential learning experiences (e.g., performance accomplishment, vicarious learning, social feedback, and psychological reactions). Self-efficacy, in turn, influences the development of career interests, goals, and behaviors both directly and indirectly via outcome expectations. Self-efficacy is a domain-specific construct that should be defined with reference to specific behavioral domains because self-efficacy in one specific domain may not be generalized to other behavioral domains (Betz & Hackett, 2006). In light of the fact that career decision-making is an important task that undergraduate students should achieve, it is crucial to understand self-efficacy with reference to career decision-making behaviors among international undergraduate students.

Career decision self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of various positive career development outcomes (Betz & Luzzo, 1996; Creed & Patton, 2003; Gianakos, 2001; Gloria & Hird, 1999; Gushue, Scanlan, Pantzer, & Clarke, 2006; Rogers et al., 2008; Taylor & Betz, 1983).
Therefore, illuminating the personal and background factors that contribute to international students’ career decision self-efficacy can ultimately help facilitate their adaptive career development. Further, Lent and Sheu (2010) emphasized the inclusion of culture-specific variables into the SCCT model when examining the career development of a particular racial/ethnic minority population. For example, Lent and Sheu noted that culture-specific factors such as acculturation and ethnic identity may affect certain domain-related self-efficacy development among cultural minority populations. In addition, sources of strengths (e.g., coping, perceived social support) can have a positive influence on career-related self-efficacy development (Gushue & Whitson, 2006; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000). In this sense, acculturation and hope deserve attention as culture-specific variables and personal strengths, respectively, in relation to international students' career decision self-efficacy.

International students undergo acculturation experiences upon entering a new culture. These acculturation experiences constitute a specific cultural context where international students shape their career decision self-efficacy. For instance, international students are required to adjust to new academic systems, foods, languages, and/or interpersonal relationships (Arthur, 2004; Pedersen, 1991; Sandhu, & Asrabadi, 1998). The experience of acculturative distress may hinder them from developing their career aspirations and plans (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007). At the same time, they need to negotiate their attitudes toward their own culture. Some may still maintain a strong identification with their own culture while others move away from their home culture (Arthur, 2003; Doh, 2011; Leong & Leung, 2004). Acculturation theories and research suggest that adjusting to a new culture and retaining one’s own culture occur independently; thus, adapting to the second culture does not necessarily interfere with maintaining ties with one’s original culture (Berry, 1989; Kim & Omizo, 2006). Adherence to one’s original culture is often called enculturation (Kim & Omizo, 2006).

International students’ acculturation experiences may affect the kinds of learning
experiences these students become involved in, which affect the development of career decision self-efficacy. For example, international students who are highly acculturated to the host culture may be more likely to engage in networking events, student activities, interactions with faculty and American peers, class projects, and career exploration opportunities in the host culture. As students successfully learn about themselves and the world of work as well as other career-decision-making skills through these activities, they are likely to gain confidence in taking steps for career decision-making. Likewise, students who maintain strong bonds with their home culture may gain more experiences related to that culture, such as interacting with peers from the same countries of origin, gaining work experiences back in their home countries during the summer, and participating in recruiting events hosted by employers in their home countries. They are also more likely to learn from observing career decision making activities of peers from their home countries and to receive encouragement and support from people from their same countries of origin. These experiences associated with home culture can also help international students develop their career decision self-efficacy.

Studies have demonstrated a significant association between acculturation to host culture and career decision self-efficacy among Vietnamese adolescents (Patel, Salahuddin, & Brien, 2008), Asian American college students (Wu, 2009), Latino middle school girls (Ojeda et al., 2012), and Mexican American high school students (Flores, Ojeda, Huang, Gee, & Lee, 2006) in a U.S. context. Yet, Ojeda et al. (2012) found no significant relationship between acculturation to the host culture and career decision self-efficacy among male Latino middle school students. Fewer studies have examined the links between retaining home cultures and career decision self-efficacy, and the findings have been mixed. Wu (2009) found that enculturation was the most significant predictor for the goal selection component of career decision self-efficacy among Asian American college students. Contrary to this, Spanish language-related enculturation was not a significant predictor of career decision self-efficacy for Latino middle school students.
(Ojeda et al., 2012). Overall, most of these studies have been conducted on immigrants and refugees, which limits the applicability of the findings to international students. In order to understand unique aspects of cross-cultural transitions and career concerns of international students, it is necessary to conduct research designed specifically for this population.

Hope is a promising personal factor that can strengthen the development of career decision self-efficacy among international students. According to Snyder’s hope theory, hope is a motivational-cognitive trait that consists of goals, pathways thinking, and agency thinking (Snyder et al., 1991). A person has high hope when s/he has a well-defined goal that s/he strives to achieve, pictures clear pathways to reach the goal, and voluntarily implements pathways toward the goal. While acknowledging temporal and domain or goal-specific hope, Snyder and colleague (2003) articulated that hope is a "relatively stable personality disposition" (p.123) that has a positive impact on various life domains as a human strength. In support of the applicability of hope into multiple life domains, decades of research have demonstrated that people with higher hope are more likely to achieve adaptive outcomes in schools (Onwuegbuzie & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, Feldman, Shorey, & Rand, 2002; Snyder & Shorey, 2002), physical health (Snyder, 2002), psychological adjustment (Kwon, 2002), and the workplace (Peterson & Byron, 2008; Tombaugh, Mayfield, & Wooten, 2011; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). However, because these studies have not used international student samples, little is known about the role of hope in international students’ lives. Moreover, few studies have explored the contribution of hope to the formation of career decision self-efficacy.

Empirical evidence supports the influence of personal traits on career decision self-efficacy, such as the big five personality traits (Bullock-Yowell, Andrews, & Buzzetta, 2011; Hartman & Bet, 2007; Wang, Jome, Haase, & Bruch, 2006) and core self-evaluation (Koumoundourou, Kounenou, & Siavara, 2012). Given that hope is a trait-like factor that involves positive self-beliefs in successful life goal attainment, it is reasonable to assume that
hope may serve as a personal factor that leads to individual differences in career decision self-efficacy. When individuals encounter impediments, hope enables them to identify multiple pathways to their goals. Hope also allows these individuals to maintain their willingness to move forward and to have confidence in doing so (Snyder, 2002). Therefore, it seems plausible that international students with higher hope would find and get involved with more opportunities to engage in the career decision-making processes rather than give up their efforts when faced with obstacles. High-hope international students would also tend to focus on successful experiences rather than failures and therefore to experience more positive emotions (Snyder et al., 1991). Active involvement in the career decision-making process and tendency to focus on successful experiences, in turn, are likely to raise their career decision self-efficacy.

Furthermore, acculturation and hope might interact with each other to affect career-decision self-efficacy. Specifically, in addition to the predicting role of hope for career decision self-efficacy, hope might moderate the link between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy. Studies support the crucial role of hope in enabling people to cope with challenging and stressful situations, and consequently in lessening the adverse impacts of barriers and stressors on psychological outcomes (Horton & Wallander, 2001; Jin & Shin, 2010; Ong, Edwards, & Bergeman, 2006; Valle, Huebner, & Suldo, 2006; Visser, Loess, Jeglic & Hirsch, 2012). Building on these findings, it is plausible that international students with high hope, compared to low hope, are likely to better cope with cultural hardship such as language barriers, unfamiliarity with cultural norms, and interpersonal difficulties. Therefore, hope, as a psychological strength, might lessen the adverse influences of low acculturation on career decision self-efficacy among international students.

Researchers have also emphasized the need for examining the moderating factors that strengthen or weaken the association between acculturative experiences and adaptation (Smith & Khawaja, 2011; Yoon, Langrehr, & Ong, 2011; Zhang & Goodson, 2011). This emphasis is
consistent with Berry’s (1997) acculturation model, which suggests that a variety of both group-level and individual-level factors moderate and/or mediate the influence of acculturative events on psychological and social adaptations. In light of this, the examination of a potential moderating role of hope may advance understanding of the complexity of international students’ acculturation experiences connecting to adaptive career development.

The need for a post-graduation residency plan is a factor that renders international students’ career situations distinct from other culturally diverse populations (Shen & Herr, 2004). International students’ residence in the host country is not permanent, so they have to decide whether they will stay in the host country, return to their home countries, or move to other countries after graduation. As international students have to adjust to the host culture, many of them also encounter cultural readjustment to their home cultures when they reenter their home countries (Arthur, 2003; Arthur, 2007; Leung, 2007). Reentry adjustment can be even harder than adjustment to foreign cultures because people usually expect to be comfortable with their home culture (Arthur, 2003). International students have reported various reentry concerns related to their career development, including value conflicts, transferability of language skills and academic knowledge gained in the host country, political and economic environments in their native country, and pressure to secure employment (Arthur, 2007).

To better comprehend the link between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy, researchers may benefit from specifying the context where international students’ future careers occur. Post-graduation residency plans may inform researchers about this future context. Fuhrman, Lee, and He (2007) noted that the international students who plan to go back to their native countries may need more job seeking resources relevant to their home countries, while those who plan to stay in the United States may need more knowledge of American occupational systems. Similarly, in order to develop their career decision self-efficacy, international students who desire to return to their home countries after graduation may need to gain confidence in
gathering resources relevant to their home country employment, whereas students who want to stay in the host country may need to be familiar with host-country specific occupational information. In this sense, the extent to which acculturation contributes to their career decision self-efficacy could be contingent upon international students’ post-graduation residency plans. That is, maintaining and learning a home culture might have a greater relation to career decision self-efficacy of international students whose final destination is their home country. Likewise, learning about the host culture could be more influential for those who desire to settle into the host country after graduation. Therefore, it is plausible to assume that post-graduation residency plans might moderate the relationship between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy among international students.

Finally, the current study targets Korean international undergraduate students. Although international students tend to confront common challenges, they are also heterogeneous based on different countries of origin (Arthur & Popadiuk, 2010; Heppner & Fu, 2010; Yoon & Portman, 2004). Acculturation and career patterns differ even among the Asian sub-cultures (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Jacob & Greggo, 2001; Kim & Omizo, 2006; Mahadevan, 2010). Therefore, it is worth researching Korean international undergraduate students, which are the third largest population among the international postsecondary students in the United States and have a unique culture that includes such things as education fever (Ghazarian, 2014; Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006; Seth, 2002), English fever (Ghazarian, 2014; Park, 2009), early study abroad for U.S. education (Lee & Koo, 2006), and traditional Confucian values (Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006; Lee & Koro-Ljungberg, 2007; Seth, 2002)

**Research Questions**

The present study explored the roles of cross-cultural adjustment experiences and hope in
predicting career decision self-efficacy among Korean international undergraduate students. This study also examined the possible moderating roles of hope and post-graduation residency plans in the associations between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy. Research questions are the following.

Research Question 1: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, the acculturation to the U.S. × hope interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × hope interaction predict career decision self-efficacy?

Research Question 2: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, post-graduation residency plans, the acculturation to the U.S. × post-graduation residency plans interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans interaction predict career decision self-efficacy?

I expected that greater levels of acculturation to the U.S., greater levels of acculturation to Korea, and higher levels of hope respectively would each be associated with higher levels of career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students studying in the United States. I also expected that there would be no significant relationship between post-graduation residency plans and career decision self-efficacy. With regard to the moderating role of hope, higher levels of hope were expected to attenuate the association between low acculturation and low career decision self-efficacy. Put another way, I anticipated that levels of career decision self-efficacy would decrease less sharply as acculturation levels decreased among high hope students compared to low hope students. Lastly, I expected the interaction effect between post-graduation residency plans and acculturation to be significantly associated with career decision self-efficacy. Higher levels of acculturation to the U.S. were expected to be more strongly associated with higher levels of career decision self-efficacy among students who desire to secure U.S.-based jobs after completing their education. Higher levels of acculturation to Korea were expected to be more strongly associated with higher levels of career decision self-efficacy among students who
desire to return to Korea after completing their education.

**Definition of Terms**

The terms used in this study are defined as follows:

**Korean international student** refers to an individual who is originally from South Korea and enrolls in an undergraduate program in a U.S. university on a temporary visa to achieve his/her educational goals.

**Acculturation to the host culture** involves the process by which an individual adjusts to new dominant culture (Berry, 1997). In this study, it refers to Korean international students’ engagement in U.S. culture in terms of identification and interaction with Americans, English usage, knowledge and practice of U.S. culture, and American food consumption.

**Acculturation to the home culture** involves the process by which an individual maintains and learns one's home culture (Berry, 1997). In this study, it refers to Korean international students’ engagement in Korean culture in terms of identification and interaction with Koreans, Korean language usage, knowledge and practice of Korean culture, and Korean food consumption. The term enculturation is understood within this study to have the same meaning as acculturation to the home culture.

**Hope** refers to “the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals, and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathways” (Snyder, 2002, p.249). In other words, hope consists of the following three components: (a) a goal, (b) thoughts regarding how to achieve the goal (i.e., pathways thinking), and (c) the motivation or willingness to accomplish the goal (i.e., agency thinking). Hope used in this study specifically refers to dispositional hope that is applied across situations and is relatively stable over time. The term global hope also indicates dispositional hope.
Post-graduation residency plan refers to a desire regarding which country an international student will secure his/her employment in after graduation. Post-graduation residency plans were categorized in a binary fashion: plans to reside in the United States and plans to reside in Korea. Plans to move to countries other than the United States and Korea were excluded from this study.

Career decision self-efficacy refers to an individual’s belief that he or she can successfully engage in tasks necessary for making career decisions (Betz & Hackett, 2006). Career decision self-efficacy is one’s perceived capability with a specific reference to the career decision-making domain.

**Significance of the Study**

This study provides unique contributions to the career development literature, in that it explored cultural and personal factors contributing to Korean international students’ career decision self-efficacy. First, few studies have examined the career issues of international students, and most of these studies have examined the career situations of international students from multiple countries collectively (e.g., Leong & Sedlacek, 1989; Liu, 2009; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011). Researchers have noted that few studies have taken heterogeneity among international students into account, and thus the research findings have been over-generalized to all international students (Arthur & Popadiuk, 2010; Crockett & Hays, 2011; Heppner & Fu, 2010; Yoon & Portman, 2004). By focusing specifically on international students from South Korea, this study can enhance our understanding of this particular group of students’ career development in their unique cultural context.

Second, this study examined the links between acculturative experiences and career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students, as acculturation constitutes a cultural context where these students carry out their career development tasks. In particular, this study
adopted a bilinear model of acculturation, which acknowledges that adjustment to a new culture and retention of a home culture can occur simultaneously. Most studies have studied only acculturation to host cultures among international students and overlooked their experiences in relation to home cultures. Consequently, little is known about the role of home culture in international students’ career development. This study explored how both acculturation to host culture and acculturation to home culture are related to international students’ self-efficacy in performing career decision-making-related tasks.

Third, this study examined how hope, as a positive psychological strength, contributes to predicting career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students. Studies have examined the positive associations between hope and desired outcomes in many life realms, but few studies have examined the associations between hope and career decision self-efficacy. Beyond addressing challenges that international students face, understanding their sense of hope will help to empower international students and to give them confidence in navigating career decision-making processes.

Fourth, many international students will return to their home countries while others will stay in the U.S. after graduation. By giving attention to Korean international students’ post-graduation residency plans, this study can advance understanding of how post-graduation residency plans are related to career decision-making processes within the context of cultural transitions.

Limitations

The limitations of this study include the following:

1. The cross-sectional design of this study makes it difficult to draw causal conclusions. Because variables were not manipulated, and all variables were measured simultaneously at one
point in time, we cannot infer causal relationships.

2. The convenience sampling method used in this study may limit representativeness of the participants. That is, the participants in this study might not be representative of entire Korean international undergraduate students studying in the United States.

3. Because all variables were measured using self-report surveys, this might introduce potential limitations of social desirability and mono-method bias. Students might have responded to the items based upon what they believed is socially desirable, and the shared variance among the variables might be partially due to the common method variance.

4. Because the participants are Korean international undergraduate students in the United States, this limits the generalizability of the findings to other international students with different countries of origin, different levels of education, and/or different host countries.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to career decision self-efficacy, acculturation, hope, and post-graduation residency plans among Korean international students. First, this chapter describes the trends and cultural characteristics of international students in general and of Korean international students in particular. Second, concerning the criterion variable, theories and empirical work regarding career decision self-efficacy are reviewed. Third, this chapter addresses acculturation theory and research findings on the association between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy. Fourth, this chapter discusses hope theories as well as empirical findings about the role of hope in coping, career development, and more specifically, career decision self-efficacy development. Lastly, studies on international students’ post-graduation residency plans are reviewed.

Cultural Characteristics of International Students

International students are generally defined as individuals who temporarily reside in a foreign country in order to achieve their academic goals (Lin & Yi, 1997; Mori, 2000). Focusing on the post-secondary students in the United States, Institute of International Education (2012b) defines an international student as an individual studying at a higher education level in the United States on a temporary visa. In 2011-2012, 764,495 international students enrolled in the U.S. higher education institutions, an increase of 31.1% over the previous decade (Institute of International Education, 2012a). These students came from 217 countries, and the majority of them were from Asia (64.10%), followed by Europe (11.17%), and Latin America (8.37%). The
top three countries were China (25.4%), India (13.1%), and South Korea (9.5%), accounting for 48% of the total international students (Institute of International Education, 2012a).

Upon arrival at the host country, international students have to deal with not only academic demands as do domestic students, but also the simultaneous demands of adjusting to a new culture (Arthur, 2004). The common adjustment difficulties that international students experience include language barriers, academic concerns, interpersonal challenges, lack of social support, homesickness, worries about family, financial concerns, and differences in social and cultural norms (Arthur, 2004; Pedersen, 1991; Sandhu, & Asrabadi, 1998). Studies have reported that international students encounter substantial challenges adapting to cultural norms and social customs in a new culture, which often result in psychological, social, academic, and/or career difficulties (Cemalcilar & Falbo, 2008; Lee, Koeske, & Sales, 2004; Sandhu, & Asrabadi, 1998).

International students’ acculturation experiences are distinguished from those of other types of racial/ethnic minorities in the U.S. in several ways (Yoon & Portman, 2004). International students are faced with various cultural differences as a result of transition to a new culture and tend to have more English difficulty than do other racial/ethnic minority populations (Yoon & Portman, 2004). These students also experience status change from members of a majority group to that of a minority population (Yoon & Portman, 2004). Their status as a minority in a foreign country is typically temporary (Heppner & Fu, 2010) because many of them will return to their home countries. Many, but not all, international students may be academically high-achieving students in their home countries, and thus, not being able to articulate their knowledge due to language and cultural barriers may cause a great deal of distress (Heppner & Fu, 2010). Their social support systems are often quite limited due to their families and friends living away from them (Mori, 2000). These unique characteristics of international students highlight that the research findings on other racial/ethnic minority groups might not be directly applicable to international students. Hence, research on international students is necessary to produce
culturally appropriate knowledge of this particular population.

Despite significant cultural challenges that international students encounter, studying and living abroad enables them to develop unique strengths such as multilingualism, international perspectives, biculturalism (Yoon & Portman, 2004), courage, resilience, and adaptability to a new culture (Heppner & Fu, 2010). They are often highly motivated to succeed in studies and careers (Heppner & Fu, 2010). One study showed that international students were aware of their unique strengths such as multilingual abilities and cross-cultural perspectives during their job seeking processes; accordingly, they sought career opportunities in which they could utilize these strengths (e.g., companies that are developing their international branches) (Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011). Beyond addressing challenges and concerns of foreign students, identifying and empowering these personal strengths are important (Heppner & Fu, 2010; Yoon & Portman, 2004; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011).

In sum, a growing number of international students come to the United States to realize their educational and career goals, and they have unique features that are different from other minority populations in the United States. As these students make huge cross-cultural transitions, they are confronted with cultural adjustment challenges. International students, however, also demonstrate unique assets such as multilingualism, global perspective, and adaptability. To understand international students’ situations, exploring their acculturative experiences and strengths are important.

Korean International Students in the United States

Korean students have been consistently ranked the third largest international student group in the U.S. higher education setting since 2001-2002 (Institute of International Education, 2012a). In the 2011-2012 academic year, 72,295 students from South Korea attended U.S.
colleges and universities. The majority of these students were undergraduates, comprising 52.9% of the total, 29.4% were graduate students, and 8.0% were in Optional Practical Training (Institute of International Education, 2012a). Some Korean students come to the United States to attend colleges after completing high schools in Korea while others move to the U.S. for receiving American education as young as the first grade and spend their adolescence in the U.S. either with or without their parents (Doh, 2011). After completing their degrees, some Korean students start their careers in the United States while others return to Korea.

Korean society’s heavy emphasis on educational achievement and advancement of social status play an important role in why many Korean students choose to study abroad. In Korea, education is highly valued, and entering a top-tier university is viewed as the key to success (Ghazarian, 2014; Seth, 2002). The term, “education fever” reflects this nation-wide preoccupation with education (Seth, 2002). The Korean primary and secondary education system is weighted toward the college entrance exam, which creates a competitive environment. Confucianism, which is embedded in Korean culture, stresses the value of education, and Korea’s rapid economic growth has contributed to Koreans’ pursuit of achieving high levels of education for upward social mobility (Lee, & Carrasquillo, 2006; Lee & Koro-Ljungberg, 2007; Seth, 2002). Although Korean society has been criticized for an education system that over-concentrates on the college entrance exam, this phenomenon has yet to be ameliorated (Seth, 2002). By contrast, the American education system is regarded as less stressful and competitive to many Korean students and parents, and this attracts them to pursue U.S. education. Studying overseas is often viewed by Korean parents and students as a way to advance their educational and professional achievement and social standing (Lee & Koo, 2006). Additionally, many regard that studying abroad in English-speaking countries is an opportunity to improve English skills and consequently, to make themselves more competitive in Korea and a global job market (Lee & Koo, 2006; Park, 2009).
Korean international students encounter cross-cultural adjustment issues when they relocate to a new host culture. Mahadevan (2010) reported that the acculturation levels of Korean international college students in the U.S. were the lowest compared to students from China and India. This lowest level of acculturation among Korean students could be partially due to differences in cultural norms and languages between the United States and Korea. For example, the different word order between Korean and English makes it hard for many Koreans to listen and speak in English (Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006). Further, Korean culture has been traditionally collectivistic, which values filial piety, harmony, group cohesion, and group goals, whereas American culture is individualistic, which emphasizes independence, autonomy, competition, personal achievement, and individual goals (Hofstede, 2001).

Studies have shown that cultural adjustment plays an important role in Korean students’ psychological adaptation. For example, Lee et al. (2004) demonstrated that Korean international students with higher acculturative stress were more likely to have mental health symptoms. In Lee and colleagues’ study, social support lessened the adverse effects of acculturative stress on mental health symptoms. Another study demonstrated that a greater level of acculturation to both host and home culture was associated with a lower level of depressive symptoms and loneliness and a higher level of resilience among Korean international students (Doh, 2011). Doh (2011) also found that Korean international students who resided in the United States or Canada during their adolescence exhibited significantly higher levels of acculturation to these host cultures than the students who came to these countries after their adolescence. In terms of maintaining Korean culture, no significant differences were found among these Korean international student groups.

In addition to challenges of adjustment to the host culture, students who return to Korea after studying abroad experience readjustment difficulties as well. Park (2011) examined reentry cultural shock experiences of returned Korean students who had studied in English speaking foreign countries for more than five years. All participants expressed some kinds of challenges to
readjusting to a new life back in Korea, which encompasses cultural, familial, and career domains. For instance, participants reported that they experienced difficulties in protecting their privacy, securing their personal space, and dealing with family expectations on them. They also had to deal with the challenge that their identities had changed, but those of their families and friends had not. Finally, in their vocational lives, they struggled to get desired jobs and adjust to Korean work cultures such as hierarchism, collectivism, and communication style.

In summary, Korean international students have unique cultural and societal backgrounds based on their country of origin, such as Korean society’s great desire for educational achievement, a competitive education system, and collectivistic culture. Previous findings suggest that Korean international students go through cultural adjustment difficulties while studying abroad, and this cultural transition partially reshapes their cultural values and identities. As a result, those who return to Korea experience readjustment difficulties once again in their home country. This highlights the importance of exploring the roles of both learning about a new host culture and maintaining a home culture in Korean international students’ lives either in a host country or back in their home country.

Career Decision Self-Efficacy

Self-Efficacy in Social Cognitive Theory

The construct of career decision self-efficacy is based on Bandura's (1977, 1986, 1997) social cognitive theory of self-efficacy (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (p.3). Individuals with high self-efficacy within a specific task domain are likely to have a greater interest in engaging in the task, persist with it, and
successfully accomplish the task. Conversely, individuals with low self-efficacy are inclined to avoid challenging tasks, and consequently to experience failure to complete the task (Bandura, 1977, 1986, 1997).

According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy varies based on three dimensions. The first dimension involves the level of task difficulty an individual believes s/he can perform. An individual may perceive tasks as easy or difficult to accomplish, and one’s perceived self-efficacy could be limited to easy tasks or extended to challenging tasks. The second dimension involves the extent to which the expectation is generalized to various situations. Self-efficacy expectation can be very specific to a narrowly defined particular domain or applied to relatively broader domains. The third dimension is the strength of self-efficacy beliefs. An individual may hold a strong self-efficacy belief related to certain domains of behaviors, and this strong belief will continues even in the face of hardship. Conversely, a person may have a weak self-efficacy belief that easily diminishes.

Self-efficacy is a task- and situation- specific state-like aspect of human functioning rather than an enduring trait (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Although self-efficacy can be applied across several domains that require similar sub-skills, Bandura (2006) articulated that “the efficacy belief system is not a global trait but a differentiated set of self-beliefs linked to distinct realms of functioning” (p. 307). For example, a high school math teacher may have high self-efficacy in teaching math to 10th graders, but low self-efficacy in parenting a three-year-old. Aligned with Bandura’s point, Betz and Hackett (2006) contended that researchers must clearly define the domains of behaviors related to self-efficacy, and that there is no concept of self-efficacy without a specific domain.

Bandura (1977) identified four sources of self-efficacy information: “performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states” (p.195). First, performance accomplishment has the most significant influence on the development of self-
efficacy among these four sources of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). An individuals’ subjective appraisal of his/her performance outcomes is more important than the objective performance itself. Successful performance usually enhances self-efficacy. Failure, especially repeated failure despite one’s effort, reduces it. Second, observation of others (role modeling) also influences self-efficacy formation. Similar to performance attainment, observing others’ successes in certain tasks raises one’s self-efficacy, and observing others’ failures lowers it. This vicarious experience is particularly influential when one lacks experiences in a given task. Third, realistic verbal persuasion affects self-efficacy. When others verbally persuade an individual that s/he is capable of performing designated tasks, this can facilitate his/her self-efficacy. Lastly, the physiological response to an activity may decrease or raise self-efficacy. For example, fear or anxiety reactions to the given task activity could negatively affect a sense of self-efficacy.

**Self-Efficacy within Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)**

Bandura’s self-efficacy theory was expanded to the career development context originally by Hackett and Betz (1981) in order to explain women’s career development. Hackett and Betz found that female undergraduate students reported lower levels of self-efficacy for traditionally male-dominated occupations (e.g., math-related occupations) than traditionally female-occupations, and that this low self-efficacy may explain women’s underrepresentation in math professions. Since its original application to women’s career paths, career-related self-efficacy has been one of the widely researched factors to understand the career development of varied populations including women and minorities (Betz & Hackett, 2006; Choi et al., 2012).

Incorporating self-efficacy as a key construct, Lent et al. (1994) proposed the Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) based on Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory. SCCT highlights that personal and contextual factors interact to influence career choice-related behaviors. Self-
efficacy plays a central role in linking an individual's personal and distal contextual factors to his/her career choice behaviors including interest development, goal setting, actual actions, and performance accomplishment. Personal factors include predispositions, gender, race, ethnicity, ability, and health status. Contextual factors include both objective and perceived environmental features such as culture, socio-economic status, perceived social support, and perceived barriers. These personal inputs and contextual factors influence the development of self-efficacy via one’s learning experiences. That is to say, in accordance with Bandura's (1977) sources of self-efficacy, personal and background factors affect types of activities that an individual engages in, appraisal of the results of performance, opportunities to learn from others' performance and feedback, and psychological reaction when performing various activities. These experiential sources, in turn, affect self-efficacy and outcome expectations (i.e., beliefs about what will happen as a consequence of performing certain behaviors; Lent et al., 1994). Subsequently, both self-efficacy and outcome expectations influence career choice behaviors. Self-efficacy also affects outcome expectations, which in turn, influences career choice behaviors. For instance, self-efficacy has a direct influence on interest development, goal selection, and actions because a person is likely to develop interests, goals, and actions in activities which s/he is confident in performing.

Given the critical role of self-efficacy over the course of career development, it is important to examine factors that contribute to shaping career-related self-efficacy. In particular, by exploring culture-specific factors, researchers can advance understanding of the career-related self-efficacy of culturally diverse populations. In this line, Lent and Sheu (2010) emphasized that researchers should fine-tune SCCT for a particular population by integrating experiential and cultural factors that are specifically relevant to the career development of that population. Studies have supported the utility of SCCT for culturally diverse populations (e.g., Alberta & Jeffrey, 1999; Ojeda et al., 2012; Patel et al., 2008; Quimby & O’Brien, 2004; Rivera, Blumberg, Chen, Ponterotto, & Flores, 2007; Wu, 2009), but no studies have examined Korean international
students’ career development using a SCCT framework in their unique cultural context.

**Definition and Significance of Career Decision Self-Efficacy**

Career decision self-efficacy refers to the individual’s belief that s/he can perform the tasks that are necessary for making career decisions (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Because of the crucial role of self-efficacy in SCCT, a number of researchers have examined self-efficacy in relation to specific domains of career development such as Holland themes, specific occupational titles, mathematics, and career decision-making (Betz et al., 2005). Compared to self-efficacy for other domains of career behaviors, self-efficacy for the domain of career decision making has gained the greatest research attention (Betz et al., 2005). Drawing upon Crites’s (1978) model of career maturity, Taylor and Betz (1983) originally proposed five task domains of career decision making, including accurate self-appraisal, occupational information gathering, career goal-setting, planning for the career, and problem solving related to the career. The results of the factor analysis, however, did not support these five sub-domains, and suggested the generalized career decision self-efficacy.

Extensive studies have demonstrated that career decision self-efficacy is positively associated with adaptive career behaviors and outcomes such as career exploration (Rogers et al., 2008), vocational identity (Gushue et al., 2006), career adjustment (Betz & Luzzo, 1996), and career maturity (Creed & Patton, 2003; Luzzo, 1995). Low levels of career decision self-efficacy have been associated with high levels of career indecision (Betz & Luzzo; Gianakos, 2001; Gloria & Hird, 1999; Taylor & Betz, 1983). These results from previous research substantiate the idea that strengthening career decision self-efficacy is critical for successful career development.

Researchers have examined career decision self-efficacy among college students within specific cultural/contextual backgrounds. Alberta and Jeffrey (1999) found that racial/ethnic
minority undergraduate students (e.g., Asian, international, Native American, and African American students) exhibited lower levels of career decision self-efficacy than did their White counterparts. Among the ethnic variables, positive orientation toward other ethnic groups was the strongest predictor of career decision-making self-efficacy of minority students. These results could be interpreted as saying that actual and perceived discrimination, sociocultural barriers, and a lack of role models with the same ethnicity in the White-predominant world of work may impede the development of career decision self-efficacy among minority college students. Further, positive attitudes toward the dominant ethnic group (i.e., White) may help minority students feel capable of navigating the career decision-making process in the White culture-dominant environment. Unlike Alberta and Jeffrey’s study, however, Chung (2002) found that Black, compared to White, undergraduate students in a Southern university displayed significantly higher career decision self-efficacy. Studies have also looked at contextual factors beyond race and ethnicity. For example, Quimby and O’Brien (2004) found that perceived career barriers and social support predicted career decision-making self-efficacy for nontraditional college women aged 25 or above at a large mid-Atlantic university. These findings highlight that career decision self-efficacy can be bolstered or hampered by cultural and contextual factors of diverse college student sub-populations, although the research findings have been somewhat mixed.

Choi et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of the empirical studies on the relationships between career decision self-efficacy and personal, contextual, and career-related variables. The results of this meta-analysis showed that career decision self-efficacy is significantly associated with vocational identity, self-esteem, vocational outcome expectation, peer support, and career indecision. In particular, self-esteem and vocational identity showed the strongest associations with career decision self-efficacy, suggesting significant links between self-concept-related variables and career decision self-efficacy. On the other hand, such demographic variables as gender and age as well as career barriers did not demonstrate significant effects on career
decision self-efficacy. Choi and colleagues suggested that these results may imply that the associations between career decision self-efficacy and these demographic and career barrier variables may be mediated or moderated by other factors. Taken together, previous findings suggest that personal and background variables are linked to career decision self-efficacy and that it may be necessary to examine the moderating or mediating models of career decision self-efficacy development with personal and background variables.

**Theory of Acculturation**

**Conceptualization of Acculturation**

Acculturation was initially defined as ‘‘those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups’’ (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149). Later, Graves (1967) proposed the concept of psychological acculturation, which focuses on the individual level changes rather than the group-level changes in a culture contact situation. Berry (2005) recognized the benefit of distinguishing cultural (i.e., group-level) and psychological (i.e., individual-level) acculturation, and defined acculturation as ‘‘the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members’’ ( p. 698). According to Berry’s definition of acculturation, changes take places at an individual level and at a group level in both dominant and minority cultures.

In terms of the linearity of the acculturation process, unilinear and bilinear conceptual models have been proposed (Miller & Kerlow-Myers, 2009; Smith & Khawaja, 2011). Traditionally, acculturation was conceptualized using a unilinear model wherein individuals
move away from their native cultures as they adapt to the dominant culture (Gordon, 1964). In this unilinear model, the ultimate goal of acculturation is adopting the host-culture, which inevitably results in departing from the culture of origin (Flannery, Reise, & Yu, 2001). In more recent years, researchers have proposed a bilinear model of acculturation, which suggests that engagement with host culture and native culture are two separate processes, and one does not necessarily require the sacrifice of the other (Kim & Abreu, 2001; Miller, 2007). According to the bilinear model, individuals can adjust to a new culture while maintaining bonds with their home culture. To clarify these two distinctive processes, the retention of the culture of origin is often referred to as enculturation, whereas acculturation indicates the process of adapting to the dominant culture (Kim & Abreu, 2001).

Research has found that the bilinear model is more appropriate than the unilinear model of acculturation (Lee, Yoon, & Hsin-Tine, 2006; Kim & Abreu, 2001; Miller 2007; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000). Despite this finding, the majority of studies (73.1%) published between 1990 and 2008 employed a unilinear measure of acculturation when examining acculturation in the context of career development (Miller & Kerlow-Myers, 2009). Miller and Kerlow-Myers (2009) suggested that the mixed findings regarding the relationship of acculturation to career-related variables may be partially due to this inappropriate operationalization of acculturation. They recommended that researchers use bilinear measures to capture the complex acculturation process.

The combination of degrees of acculturation to the host culture and to the culture of origin yields four different acculturation strategies (Berry, 1997; Berry, 2005): Integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization. Integration involves maintaining adherence to and competence in both the host culture and the culture of origin. Assimilation involves internalizing the host culture and rejecting the maintenance of the culture of origin. Separation corresponds to the status in which a person retains and identifies with the culture of origin and rejects learning
the host culture. Lastly, marginalization involves avoiding both the culture of origin and the host
culture. Berry (2005) contended that individuals experience different levels of acculturative stress
and adaptation depending on their acculturation strategies. Berry viewed integration as the
healthiest acculturation strategy that results in optimal adaptations of individuals. In Berry’s view,
individuals who use the marginalization approach are likely to experience highest levels of stress
compared to those who use the other three acculturation strategies. Assimilation and separation
are generally linked to intermediate levels of stress and adaptation.

Individuals also experience varying levels of acculturation across multiple dimensions
(e.g., behaviors, values, identities) or domains of life (e.g., language, food, affiliation) (Kim &
Abreu, 2001; Miller, 2007; Rivera, 2010; Szapocznik, Scopetta, Kurtines, & Aranalde, 1978). For
example, Miller (2007) found that Asian-American college students’ levels of behavioral
engagement in Asian cultures was not significantly related to their levels of adherence to Asian
cultural values, suggesting one’s level of acculturation in one dimension does not necessary
explain his/her level of acculturation in other dimensions. In terms of types of dimensions or
domains of acculturation, Szapocznik et al. (1978) contended that there are broadly behavioral
and values dimensions. Kim and Abreu (2001) analyzed acculturation and enculturation measure
items and identified behaviors, knowledge, values, and identity dimensions of acculturation and
enculturation. Although types of acculturation dimensions have been identified somewhat
differently among scholars, it seems clear that acculturation occur across various dimensions and
life domains (Miller, 2007).

Moderators between Acculturation Experiences and Adaptations

According to Berry’s (1997) acculturation framework, the long-term outcome of
psychological acculturation is adaptation, which indicates “the relatively stable changes that take
place in an individual or group in response to environmental demands” (p. 20). Ward and colleagues proposed two types of related but distinct adaptations: psychological and sociocultural adaptation (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). Psychological adaptation involves psychological and physical well-being, whereas sociocultural adaptation involves managing daily situations in a new culture. Sociocultural adaptation is likely to be achieved as an individual gains cultural learning and social skills in a new culture (Searle & Ward, 1990; Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001).

Berry (1997, 2005) suggested that various group- and individual-level factors moderate and/or mediate the relationships between the acculturation experiences and adaptation. These factors include (a) the nature of the larger society (e.g., the degree of cultural pluralism in the host society), (b) the type of acculturation group (e.g., immigrants, refugees, sojourners, and native people), (c) acculturation attitudes or strategies (i.e., integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization), (d) demographic and social characteristics of the individual (e.g., gender, age, SES), and (e) psychological characteristics of the individual (e.g., personality, coping style). These moderating factors also can be categorized as the ones that exist prior to the acculturation process and those that emerge during acculturation (Berry, 1997). Factors that exist before the acculturation include demographic variables (e.g., age, gender), personal factors (e.g., locus of control, personality), education, length of residence in a new culture, reasons for migrating, and cultural distance between host and home cultures. Those emerging during acculturation include social support, acculturation strategies, coping strategies, and perceived prejudice and discrimination.

Researchers have emphasized the need for examining the moderating factors that strengthen or weaken the associations between acculturative life changes and adaptation (Smith & Khawaja, 2011; Yoon, Langrehr, & Ong, 2011; Zhang & Goodson, 2011). Yoon and colleagues (2011) examined acculturation studies that were published over 22 years. In this content analysis
study, Yoon et al. noted that increasing interest is being given to the mediating/and moderating factors although many studies have investigated a direct association between acculturation and outcome variables thus far. Similarly, in a review of the studies of international students’ acculturation experiences, Smith and Khawaja (2011) noted that such factors as cognitive appraisal of life changes, coping strategies, and social supports influence the degrees of acculturative stress, which in turn influence the degrees of psychological and sociocultural adaptation that international students achieve. For example, utilizing positive coping strategies such as unconditional positive regard for oneself was associated with reduced acculturative stress among international students (Lin & Betz, 2009). Conversely, maladaptive coping strategies such as maladaptive perfectionism were linked to increased acculturative stress (Wei et al., 2007). Avoidance of coping and denial of problems strengthened the association between greater perceived discrimination and greater depressive symptoms among Asian international students (Wei, Ku, Russell, Mallinckrodt, & Liao, 2008). Taken together, various factors interact with acculturative experiences to result in psychological and sociocultural adaptations. Considering career decision self-efficacy as an indicator of adaptation in the domain of career development, it seems worth examining how various factors interact with acculturation experiences to contribute to developing career decision self-efficacy.

The Role of Acculturation in the International Students' Career Development Process

Career planning and decision making is complicated for international students due to unfamiliarity with American cultures and academic/occupational systems and even with those in their home country (Arthur, 2007). Studies have consistently shown that language barriers and a lack of familiarity with U.S. culture and are substantial challenges that international students encounter in their career planning and employment seeking processes (Arthur & Flynn, 2011;
Bikos & Furry, 1999; Crockett & Hays, 2011; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). In Sangganjanavanich et al.’s qualitative study (2011), all international student participants expressed that their unfamiliarity with U.S. culture and language barriers would make them less competitive than their U.S. counterparts. Participants reported that cultural differences often rendered them uncertain about how to behave and communicate with employers during a job interview. For instance, students who came from a country where direct eye contact and self-promotion are considered rude worried that they might not be successful in their job interviews in the United States due to these cultural differences (Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). Moreover, participants expressed that their imperfect English or foreign accents made them feel vulnerable to discrimination during a job search process and deterred them from applying to positions that specify English proficiency (Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011). Another group of international students raised such questions about cultural differences throughout the sessions of a job search club, showing that coping with cultural differences is an important career need of international students (Bikos & Furry, 1999).

A lack of knowledge about the American occupational system, job seeking strategies, and employment regulations and rules is another main concern of international students. International students expressed the desires to learn about American style resume writing, interviewing, and networking skills (Arthur & Flynn 2011; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). In addition, many international students revealed a strong interest in obtaining Optional Practical Training (OPT), a 1-year temporary work experience (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000). This reinforces the need to educate international students about relevant employment rules and regulations. International students reported that their limited knowledge of employment policies concerning foreign workers would adversely affect their career decisions, and that they did not know where they could gain information about the rights of workers, including affirmative action and equal employment opportunities (Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011).
Reynolds and Constantine’s (2007) quantitative study revealed that difficulties in cultural adjustment may dissuade international undergraduate students from having high career aspirations and expecting positive outcomes for their career decision-making. The results of this study indicated that international students with greater intercultural competence concerns (i.e., concerns regarding cultural, social, academic, and career competence) were likely to have both lower career aspirations and career outcome expectations. Students with higher acculturative stress were also likely to have lower career outcome expectations.

On the other hand, a study by Shih and Brown (2000) showed that lower levels of acculturation were associated with higher levels of vocational identity among Taiwanese international postsecondary students. Based on the unilinear model of acculturation, Shih and Brown viewed low acculturation as an indication of high bonds with their home culture, and inferred that retaining one's own culture of origin may help international students feel connected and supported, which, in turn, may facilitate these students in developing a clear vocational identity. These findings, however, should be interpreted cautiously. Because no participants scored high on the acculturation scale (Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale), it is difficult to draw conclusions regarding the link between high acculturation and vocational identity (Shih & Brown, 2000). Moreover, according to a bilinear model of acculturation, low levels of acculturation to a host culture are not simply equal to high levels of identification with a native culture (Miller & Kerlow-Myers, 2009). Despite these limitations of Shin and Brown’s study, the importance of international students’ own cultural identity is noteworthy. Supporting the positive role of the identification with the home culture, Asian international doctoral students in Sato and Hodge's (2009) case study reported that studying abroad experiences at U.S. universities made them appreciate their own cultural identities including values, languages, and religious beliefs, and this helped them persist in their studies even when they felt isolated from others.
Collectively, the literature suggests that it is important for international students to acculturate to the host country's language, general and work-specific cultures, and work systems and legal issues in their career development process. In addition, identification with the home culture seems to be conducive to international students’ vocational and academic development, but further research is necessary to clarify the role of the home culture in the career development of international students.

**Acculturation and Career Decision Self-Efficacy**

As cultural sensitivity has been emphasized in the career development field, researchers have given their attention to the role of acculturation in forming career decision self-efficacy in racial/ethnic minority populations. Miller and Kerlow-Myers (2009) analyzed the empirical research findings on the linkage between acculturation and career development and found consistently positive relationships between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy across studies. Most of these studies have used population samples from American minorities such as Asian Americans and Latino/as. For example, Patel and colleagues (2008) found that English language acculturation and peer support predicted career decision-making self-efficacy of Vietnamese adolescents living in the United States. Similarly, acculturation to the United States and English language was positively related to career self-efficacy among Latino adults (Miranda & Umhoefer, 1998). In Wu’s (2009) study, acculturation to the U.S. culture was found to be the most important predictor of the career decision self-efficacy of Asian American college students out of acculturation, enculturation, and parenting styles.

Fewer studies have examined the links between retaining home cultures (i.e., enculturation) and career decision self-efficacy, and the findings have been somewhat mixed. Wu (2009) found that enculturation was significantly associated with overall career decision self-
efficacy among Asian American undergraduate students. In addition, enculturation emerged as the most significant predictor of the goal selection component of career decision self-efficacy, compared to the predictive powers of acculturation to the host culture and parenting styles. Wu suggested that Asian American students who maintain strong bonds with their native culture may have positive self-concepts and family relationships, which positively influence their overall career decision self-efficacy and especially, career goal selection-related self-efficacy. In contrast, in a study of Latino middle school students, Spanish language-related enculturation was not a significant predictor of career decision self-efficacy for both gender groups while acculturation to the host culture’s language was predictive of career decision self-efficacy for girls (Ojeda et al., 2012). With regard to these results, Ojeda et al. (2012) inferred that use of Spanish may not be a critical factor for performing various tasks necessary for making career decisions in the United States where English is the primary language. Although the language aspect of enculturation was not predictive of career decision self-efficacy, ethnic identity was the strongest predictor of career decision self-efficacy for both female and male students (Ojeda et al., 2012).

Acculturation experiences of international students have distinctive aspects from those of other minority populations. International students have to quickly adjust to new academic systems (Mori, 2000) and readjust to their original home culture upon returning to their native countries (Lin & Yi, 1997). Few studies, however, have examined how acculturation influences the career development of international students. Among those few studies, Liu (2009) found that high levels of acculturation to the host culture were associated with high levels of career decision self-efficacy in international graduate students in the United States. Especially, behavioral (i.e., social interaction with the host culture), cognitive (i.e., language and understanding of the host culture), and psychological (i.e., attitudes toward the host culture) aspects, but not educational experience (i.e., engagement in class and other learning opportunities) aspects of acculturation predicted the students’ self-efficacy in career decision making. Liu, however, did not examine the effect of
enculturation on career decision making self-efficacy. Retaining their native cultures may be important to international students given the fact that many international students eventually go back to their home countries, and that people from the same country of origin are an important source of social support. This warrants research attention to the role of enculturation in international students’ careers.

Collectively, it seems that acculturation to the host culture is associated with career decision self-efficacy among minority populations. Concerning the relationship between acculturation to the home culture and career decision self-efficacy, a limited number of studies have shown mixed findings. However, because these studies have concentrated on other American racial/ethnic minority populations, little is known about how international students’ acculturative experiences contribute to their perceived capacity for career decision-making. Liu’s (2009) study demonstrated the link between acculturation to the host culture and career decision self-efficacy among international graduate students, but this study did not examine the role of acculturation to the home culture. In addition, Liu’s study used only a graduate student sample, which limits its generalizability to international undergraduate students. Therefore, further research is warranted to understand the roles of acculturation to both host and home culture in the context of career development among international undergraduate students.

**Hope Theory**

**The Conceptualization of Hope**

With the emergence of positive psychology, researchers have studied hope as a strength-based construct (Snyder, Lopez, Shorey, Rand, & Feldman, 2003). These studies have mostly drawn upon Snyder's conceptualization of hope as a cognitive-motivational factor. Snyder et al.
(1991) defined hope as "a cognitive set that is based on a reciprocally-derived sense of successful agency (goal-directed determination) and pathways (planning to meet goals)" (p.571). Pathways thinking and agency thinking are equally important and essential components of hope (Snyder et al., 1991). Agency thinking is the motivational component that propels an individual to initiate and sustain movement toward reaching desired goals. Agency thinking is also called willpower reflecting its nature as mental energy toward a goal. Pathways thinking refers to an individual's perceived capacity to devise multiple strategies to achieve the goals. Thus, pathways thinking is also called waypower (Snyder, 1994). Hope theory posits that emotions are a by-product that comes from one’s goal-directed thoughts (Snyder, 2002). Perceived success in goal-pursuit likely yields positive emotions and perceived failures in the goal pursuit yields negative emotions.

Snyder (1994) argued that “hope is an enduring pattern of thinking about oneself in relation to life goals” (p.68). According to Snyder, hope develops from a very early age in childhood based on one’s attachment with caregivers, experiences in coping with developmental tasks and challenges, and other life experiences. Snyder contended that hope is established by the age of 20 and remains relatively stable in adulthood for most people. While emphasizing the enduring nature of hope, Snyder also suggested the concept of state hope, which is momentary and attached with given context and time. Different scales were developed to measure enduring dispositional hope (The Dispositional Hope Scale; Snyder et. al., 1991) and state hope (The State Hope Scale: Snyder et al., 1996). An individual's dispositional hope sets a range within which state hope changes responding to specific situations (Snyder et al., 1996).

Furthermore, Snyder, Feldman, et al. (2002) theorized that hope is a "hierarchically organized system of beliefs" (p.299), which is organized into global or dispositional (trait) hope, domain-specific hope, and goal-specific hope. The terms global hope, dispositional hope, and trait hope are used interchangeably in Snyder’s theory. Global or dispositional hope indicates an individual's overall perceptions of their capabilities to generate multiple goal-directed routes and
motivations about their overall life goals. As noted above, this global or dispositional hope is relatively consistent across time and context, whereas an individual's levels of domain-specific hope and goal-specific hope could vary. Although global hope is closely related to domain- or goal-specific hope, it is possible for an individual with high global hope to lack hope in the family domain (domain-specific hope) or in achieving a grade of A in a math course (goal-specific hope). The present study’s focus is on global or dispositional hope. While global or dispositional hope is a trait-like characteristic that is established based on early life experiences, individuals can also learn hopeful thinking and cultivate hope at any age through interventions or self-exercises (Marques, Lopez, & Pais-Ribeiro, 2011; Pedrotti, Edwards, & Lopez, 2008).

**Hope and Self-Efficacy**

Hope is distinct from self-efficacy in several significant ways despite common features between the two constructs. Both agency and pathways are essential components of hope. In contrast, self-efficacy focuses on perceived capability to complete particular tasks, which relates more to agency than pathways (Snyder, Rand, & Sigmon, 2002). Self-efficacy and agency thinking, however, are not identical because the agency component of hope indicates willingness and motivation to perform goal-pursuit behaviors, while self-efficacy indicates perceived ability to achieve a goal (Snyder, Rand, et al., 2002). Concerning this difference, Snyder (2002) articulated that “an important difference here lies with the words can and will, with the former referring to the capacity to act and the latter reflecting the intention to act-with intention being more willful” (p. 58). Consistently, Bandura (2006) also contended that statements that reflect self-efficacy should be worded “in terms of can do rather than will do (p.308)” because self-efficacy is concerned with a judgment of capability, which is distinguished from intention.

Furthermore, according to Snyder (2002), hope, especially global or dispositional hope,
is a relatively enduring personal characteristic that is applied across situations and goals, whereas self-efficacy is situation-specific. Although several researchers proposed generalized self-efficacy (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001; Sherer et al., 1982), the concept of self-efficacy is primarily related to a specific task in a given situation (Bandura, 1977). Thus, self-efficacy can be measured most accurately when a particular task and situation are clearly defined. From this perspective, Betz and Hackett (2006) stressed the importance of clearly defining the domain in which self-efficacy plays a role. Snyder et al. (1991) suggested that hope may predict a wider range of goal-related behaviors and self-efficacy may predict situation-specific behaviors. The evidence from empirical research supports the conceptual distinctions between hope and self-efficacy. Magaletta and Oliver (1999) found that the factor structures of hope and self-efficacy varied, and both the overall hope and agency component of hope explained unique variance in well-being over and above self-efficacy.

In summary, the construct of hope incorporates both will power (agency) and way power (pathways), and self-efficacy focuses on perceived capability for particular tasks. In addition, dispositional hope is a global strength that is applied across situations and times. In contrast, self-efficacy is based on specific goals and tasks. In this present study, hope indicates global or dispositional hope that is generalized across various domains, and career decision self-efficacy indicates perceived confidence specifically in the domain of career-decision making.

**Hope as a Moderator in Coping with Obstacles and Achieving Adaptation**

The difference between high-hope individuals and low-hope individuals does not lie in the nature and the amount of obstacles that they experience (Rodriguez-Hanley & Snyder, 2000). In fact, individuals with high hope suffer losses and goal blockages as do others (Snyder, 1998). High-hope individuals, however, more effectively cope with the blockages by using positive self-
referential beliefs, exhibiting fewer negative emotional responses, and generating alternative
goals and strategies (Rodriguez-Hanley & Snyder, 2000). When confronting adversity, high-hope
individuals tend to encourage themselves with internal statements such as “I will make it”
(Snyder, LaPointe, Crowson, & Early, 1998). They also tend to focus on successes rather than
failures (Snyder et al., 1991). In addition, when they encounter roadblocks, high-hope individuals
identify alternative pathways to reach goals rather than giving up (Snyder et al., 2003). Similarly,
high-hope individuals set multiple goals in each life role (e.g., career, family, and interpersonal
relationships) so that they can be flexible in their pursuit of goals (Snyder, Feldman, et al., 2002).
These features of high-hope persons enable them to actively cope with barriers and difficulties,
whereas low-hope persons tend to avoid or disengage from stressors (Snyder, 2002).

Several studies have found positive associations between hope and healthy coping
strategies. Chang and DeSimonea (2001) found that hope was positively associated with positive
secondary appraisal (i.e., appraisal of one’s resources for dealing with the situation) and engaged
coping strategies, and inversely associated with disengaged coping strategies in college students.
Hope also inversely predicted dysphoria controlling for appraisals and coping. In addition,
Roesch, Duangado, Vaughn, Aldridge, and Villodas (2010) found that pathways thinking was
positively associated with overall coping use as well as various adaptive coping strategies (e.g.,
direct problem solving, positive thinking) and agency thinking was associated with greater use of
support among low-income ethnic and racial minority adolescents.

Researchers have also demonstrated that hope serves as a buffer between stressors and
negative psychological outcomes in individuals (Horton & Wallander, 2001; Jin & Shin, 2010;
Ong et al., 2006; Valle et al., 2006; Visser et al., 2012). Valle et al. (2006) found that high hope
lessened the negative effect of stressful life events on life satisfaction and psychopathology one-
year later among adolescents in the United States. Similarly, another study demonstrated that
higher levels of hope lessened the relationship between greater negative life events and greater
depressive symptoms across ethnically diverse college students (Visser et al., 2012). In addition to effecting these young populations, hope was also found to moderate the associations between daily stress and negative emotions with a European-American sample aged 62-80 years (Ong et al., 2006). Lastly, Horton and Wallander (2001) found that hope moderated the association between stress and maladjustment among mothers of children with chronic physical conditions. When encountering disability-related stress in the course of care-giving, mothers with high hope exhibited less distress than those with low hope.

Although the research evidence indicates that hope lessens the adverse effects of stressors on psychological adjustment, this line of research has not been expanded to the context of career development. In addition, little research has been conducted regarding international students who experience significant difficulties in their cross-cultural transitions. Only one study was found regarding the role of hope in international students’ acculturation processes. James (2005) demonstrated that international students with high hope experienced lower levels of distress associated with acculturation ($r = -.374, p < .01$). These findings may indicate that high-hope international students more effectively cope with acculturation-related stressors and consequently experience less distress related to cultural adjustment.

The Role of Hope in Career Development

Hope has been found to be associated with a wide range of work-and career-related indexes. With respect to the links between hope and workplace variables, research findings have indicated that hope positively correlates with high levels of job performance (Combs, Clapp-Smith, & Nadkarni, 2010; Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007; Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Li, 2005; Peterson & Byron, 2008), job satisfaction (Luthans et al., 2007; Tombaugh et al., 2011; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), organizational commitment (Ozag, 2006;
Tombaugh et al., 2011; Youssef & Luthans, 2007), creativity (Rego et al., 2009), and workplace happiness (Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

Studies have also supported the positive role of hope in the career development process outside of a workplace context. Several researchers gave their attention to the relevance of hope to career development, especially for minority populations (Diemer & Blustein, 2007; Jackson & Neville, 1998; Juntunen & Wettersten, 2006). Jackson and Neville (1998) examined racial identity development in relation to hope and vocational identity among African American students. They found that higher internalization of a healthy Black identity was associated with both higher levels of hope and vocational identity in African American college students, supporting the importance of cultural and racial factors in shaping hope and self-understanding of vocational interests, talents, and goals. The results of this study also showed the significant association between higher hope and higher vocational identity both in male \( (r = .31, p < .05) \) and female \( (r = .51, p < .001) \) African American college students. Diemer and Blustein’s (2007) study of urban high school students highlights the importance of vocational hope in marginalized adolescents. The results of this study suggest that a main feature of vocational hope is “a resilient connection to one’s vocational future in the face of barriers” (p.112). The findings indicate that vocational hope plays an important role in urban adolescents’ career development processes, and potentially contributes to the development of vocational goals and career adaptability.

Juntunen and Wettersten (2006) contended that Snyder's hope theory can be applied to career counseling and research and proposed the construct of work hope, which consists of "work-related goals and both the agency and the pathways for achieving those goals" (p.97). Juntunen and Wettersten found that work hope strongly correlated with career decision-making self-efficacy \( (r = .75) \) and vocational identity \( (r = .65) \) among ethnically diverse U.S. individuals. The findings also revealed that the degrees of work hope were lower for both youths and adults from low-economic status than for college students, suggesting that the development of a sense of
hope may be intertwined with socio-economic contexts. Juntunen and Wettersten argued that it is crucial to explore work hope in order to understand motivational factors for the vocational development of underprivileged populations. In another study of Ukrainian college students, Yakushko and Sokolova (2010) found that students' degrees of work hope were higher when they perceived either themselves or their friends as influential sources in making their career choices as opposed to their parents, relatives, teachers, or news media sources. Moreover, the overall work hope and the goals, agency, and pathways components significantly correlated with self-esteem ($r = .44$ to $.55$) and beliefs in the importance of good education, skills, or self-confidence in obtaining good work ($r = .12$ to $.22$). There were no significant correlations between work hope and beliefs in the importance of personal contacts, good looks, family connections, or money, which are generally less likely to be acquired through individual efforts compared to education, skills, and self-confidence.

Recently, Niles, Amundson, and Neault (2011) proposed the Hope-Centered Model of Career Development. In this model, hope is a necessary precondition that enables individuals to envision future possibilities, take action to achieve the goals, and be vigilant and flexible about ever-changing self and environment even when encountering adversity. Consistent with their theoretical proposition, studies have found that higher hope is related to higher levels of vocational identity among post-secondary students (Niles, Yoon, Balin, & Amundson et al., 2010; Yoon et al., in press).

The findings of two studies are suggestive of a positive feedback loop between hope and career/vocational outcomes. Sung, Turner, and Kaewchinda (2012) found that the agency component of hope both predicted and was predicted by a composite of educational and career development skills (e.g., career exploration, self-regulated learning, and goal setting) as well as a set of outcomes (e.g., self-efficacy, positive self-attributions, and vocational identity) among undergraduate students in the United States. In contrast, pathways thinking was not significantly
related to educational and career development skills and outcomes. It appears that students with high will power (i.e., agency thinking) are likely to engage in educational and vocational activities and thus to achieve positive career development outcomes. These acquired skills and outcomes, in turn, may reinforce students' sense of hope. One 3-year longitudinal study adds evidence for a reciprocal relationship between hope and vocational competency. Wandeler and Bundick's (2011) study of 414 Swiss polymechanic trainees found that the levels of self-perceived vocational competency in the first year predicted the second-year levels of hope, which in turn predicted levels of vocational competency in the third year of vocational training.

In sum, studies have demonstrated that hope is associated with a wide range of productive workplace performances, behaviors, and attitudes, and adaptive career development indexes across diverse cultural contexts. Several studies emphasized the importance of hope in the career development of marginalized and/or minority populations (Diemer & Blustein, 2007; Jackson & Neville, 1998; Juntunen & Wettersten, 2006). A very limited number of studies, however, have applied the concept of hope to international students. In fact, an extensive review of the literature found only one dissertation study (James, 2005) examining the sense of hopefulness in international students. Given that international students’ unique cross-cultural experiences are different from other minority populations, it is necessary to research the role of hope in the career development of international students.

Hope and Career Decision Self-Efficacy

Hope, as a global motivational construct, can be applied to the career decision-making domain and enable individuals to develop confidence in performing various tasks related to career decision-making. Given that various personal factors influence career decision self-efficacy and that global hope is a personal trait-like characteristic, hope has the potential to serve as a personal
variable that may help to build confidence in career decision-making. Furthermore, according to Lent et al. (1994), “experiential source data may be filtered via various cognitive screens (e.g., confirmatory bias), affecting the way such data are perceived, weighted, and incorporated into self-efficacy judgments” (p. 102). For example, Lent et al. posited that an individual with a negative affective disposition may tend to attend to failure and ignore success experiences, which would hinder self-efficacy development. Conversely, it is possible that individuals with high hope are inclined to evaluate the results of their performance positively and focus on successes rather than failures while performing career decision-making-related activities, which, in turn, would help them cultivate career decision self-efficacy. To date, however, few studies have examined hope as an antecedent factor to career decision self-efficacy.

Robust correlations have been found between hope and career decision self-efficacy. In Betz et al.’s (2005) study, low to moderate correlation between career decision self-efficacy and hope was found among university students in the United States. Specifically, career decision self-efficacy showed a correlation of .52 with the agency component of hope and a correlation of .43 with the pathways component. Similarly, Suk (2011) found that agency thinking and pathways thinking accounted for 47% of the career decision self-efficacy variance, and that agency thinking was a stronger predictor of career decision self-efficacy than was pathways thinking in a sample of 305 Korean college students. The stronger association of career decision self-efficacy with agency than with pathways is consistent with the conceptualization that self-efficacy is more closely related to the agency aspect of hope than the pathways component. Controlling for ego-identity, dispositional hope accounted for an additional 8% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy. In another study of high school seniors in Turkey, hope, along with locus of control, was a significant predictor of career decision self-efficacy (Sari & Şahin, 2013). Several studies used work-domain specific hope and demonstrated the strong correlations between career decision self-efficacy and work hope ($rs = .63$ to $75$) (Duffy, Allan, & Dik, 2011; Juntunen & Wettersten,
Although correlation does not equal causation, we can infer that having a general sense of hope can be a source of self-efficacy in accomplishing tasks necessary for career decision-making.

In addition to the predictive role of hope for career decision-self-efficacy, hope might interact with acculturative experiences to affect career decision self-efficacy. Although no studies have investigated this topic to date, studies have demonstrated the moderating role of hope between stressful circumstances and psychological health as reviewed above. One study examined whether hope moderates the effects of a career workshop on improving career decision self-efficacy (Schemmel, 2000). This study hypothesized that individuals with pre-treatment high hope, compared to low hope, would achieve greater improvement in career decision self-efficacy after completing a career decision-making workshop. Contrary to the hypothesis, the results revealed no difference in the levels of post-treatment career decision self-efficacy between the pre-treatment high versus low hope groups. This study, however, has limitations in that the sample size was small (n = 61) and the participants were predominantly White adults in the United States. In addition, participants who exhibited high degrees of hope prior to the workshop also tended to have higher levels of pre-treatment career decision self-efficacy, and thus there was little room for improvement in career decision self-efficacy (Schemmel, 2000). No other studies have investigated the moderating role of hope in the career development process, especially with populations who face challenges in their career development process. In light of the significance of hope in minority populations who are confronted with barriers (Diemer & Blustein, 2007; Juntunen & Wettersten, 2006), it is necessary to investigate how hope can be helpful for international students to maintain high levels of confidence in career decision making while navigating cross-cultural challenges.
Post-Graduation Residency Plans and Career Development of International Students

International students have varied desires and plans about whether they will return to their home countries, remain in the United States, or choose another option altogether after completing their education (Shen & Herr, 2004). Diverse factors have been found to affect their post-graduation residency plans. Those factors include career-related opportunities, work and life environment, sense of security, political stability, family bonds and expectations, salary, communication difficulties, cultural barriers, immigration status, and/or restriction against non-U.S. citizen workers (Arthur & Flynn, 2011; Shen & Herr, 2004). Some studies showed that many international students desire to obtain U.S.-based work experiences regardless of their long-term post-graduation residency plans in order to make themselves more competitive in either host or home countries' job markets (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000; Spencer-Rodgers and Cortijo, 1998). For instance, in Spencer-Rodgers’s (2000) study, overall international students reported greater need for the U.S.-based as opposed to home country-based job seeking skills and training experiences even if they planned to return home in the end.

Studies, however, have also found that students who plan to return home display greater need to learn about home country work cultures compared to those who plan to stay in host country, and they often need re-entry preparation. An early study by Leong and Sedlacek (1989) suggested that international students may have lower interests in U.S.-based job opportunities and job seeking skills than do American students due to their home country-oriented career plans. In addition, the findings of Spencer-Rodgers’s study (2000) indicated that return-oriented international students demonstrated a higher need for employment preparation for their home countries such as planning for reentry, preparing for an interview, and learning about the home country job markets than did U.S.-oriented students. Likewise, U.S.-oriented, compared to return-oriented, students expressed a stronger desire to overcome cultural barriers in a U.S. job
interview, adjust to the American work system and customs, and learn about the U.S. job market (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). These findings signify that the type and degree of career and cultural learning needs differ between return-oriented versus U.S.-oriented students.

Upon returning to the home country, many international students are confronted with readjustment challenges as their cultural norms may be changed while studying abroad, and so do those of their home countries (Arthur & Popadiuk, 2010; Heppner & Fu, 2010; Leung, 2007; Mori, 2000). Those students who have assimilated into the host cultures and refused to keep their home cultures are most likely to experience the great deal of difficulties in adjusting to new careers in their home countries (Leong & Leung, 2004). In light of reentry adjustment to the home culture, maintaining and learning one's own culture is an important aspect of the career development, especially for international students who plan to move back to their home countries. In Liu’s (2009) study, the residency plans of Asian international college students did not predict their career decision self-efficacy. Liu, however, did not investigate the possibility that the residency plans may moderate the relationship between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy.

One study provides implications regarding differing levels of career decision self-efficacy as a function of interaction between post-graduation residency plans and acculturation. Lin and Betz (2009) examined the relationships between social self-efficacy and the English versus native language settings among 203 Chinese and Taiwanese international students. The findings indicated that the social self-efficacy of these international students was significantly higher when they were asked to imagine themselves interacting with others in native language settings than in English-speaking settings. In addition, acculturation stress was significantly and negatively correlated with social self-efficacy in English speaking settings ($r = .56$), but no relationships were found between acculturation stress and social-efficacy in imagined Chinese-speaking
situations. We can apply social self-efficacy to career decision self-efficacy, and native versus host country language settings to home versus host country-oriented post-graduation residency plans. Then, it can be inferred that the relationship between acculturation and Korean international students' career decision self-efficacy may vary according to the country in which they will land their job after graduation.

In essence, it was found that international students who plan to return home after graduation possess greater need for learning about their home cultures than those who plan to stay in host countries, and these students need re-entry preparation. Conversely, students with U.S.-focused career plans have greater need for learning U.S. job-seeking skills and cultures. These findings support the current study’s expectation that learning about either host culture or home culture may differently contribute to international students’ career decision self-efficacy depending on their post-graduation placement plans.

**Summary**

Multiple personal characteristics and cultural factors contribute to the development of career decision self-efficacy. Examining these influences is important in order to better understand and facilitate the career decision-making process of Korean international students. The review of theoretical and empirical literature supports the significant roles of cultural adjustment in career decision-self efficacy among culturally diverse populations. This line of research, however, has barely been expanded to international students despite the fact that these students have unique cultural and career needs that are different from other minority populations. Among various personal factors, hope can serve as a personal strength that contributes to the formation of career decision self-efficacy. Considering post-graduation residency plans of Korean international students can allow researchers to specify the context where these students will have
their future careers after graduation. The review of the literature reveals the following key findings that pertain to this present study:

1. Career decision self-efficacy is closely related to a variety of adaptive career behaviors, and thus, has been used as an important indicator of positive career development.

2. Cultural adjustment is a crucial factor that influences international students’ career development. Many international students also experience readjustment difficulties when they reenter their home countries.

3. Significant associations between acculturation to the host culture and career decision self-efficacy have been found among diverse racial/ethnic minority populations, but few studies have been conducted with international students.

4. A limited number of studies have examined the associations between identification with the home culture and career decision self-efficacy, and the findings have been somewhat mixed. No studies have been conducted on the role of engagement with the home culture in developing career decision self-efficacy among international students.

5. Hope plays a significant role in achieving adaptive work and career-related outcomes as well as coping with challenges and obstacles.

6. International students’ desires to learn the host versus home cultures are different depending on their post-graduation residency-plans.
Chapter 3

Method

Chapter three describes the research method for exploring the associations among acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, post-graduation residency plans, and career decision self-efficacy of Korean international students in the United States. This chapter includes research questions, study design, participants, instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis strategies.

Research Questions

Research questions were developed to examine the unique and combined contributions of each predictor variable (i.e., acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, and post-graduation residency plans) to career decision self-efficacy. These questions also address the moderating roles of hope and post-graduation residency plans on the relationships of acculturation to career decision self-efficacy. The two research questions below correspond to the two hierarchical regression analyses that were performed in this study.

Research Question 1: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, the acculturation to the U.S. × hope interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × hope interaction predict career decision self-efficacy?

Research Question 2: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, post-graduation residency plans, the acculturation to the U.S. × post-graduation residency plans interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans interaction predict career decision self-efficacy?
Study Design

This study used a correlational and cross-sectional design. A correlational approach is used for examining the relationships between variables without experimental control (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). Correlational research provides an understanding of a phenomenon as it naturally occurs (Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). This study examined the associations between the predictor variables (acculturation to the host culture, acculturation to the home culture, hope, post-graduation residency plans) and a criterion variable (career decision self-efficacy) in a natural setting. In addition, the present study examined the two-way interaction effects between acculturation variables and hope as well as between acculturation variables and post-graduation residency plans. The interaction effects demonstrate under which conditions (i.e., low versus high hope, home country-oriented versus host country-oriented residency plans) each acculturation variable is more strongly associated with career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students in the United States. Because variables were not manipulated, we cannot infer causal relationships (Heppner et al., 2008).

Participants

A convenience sampling technique was used to recruit participants. Participants were undergraduate Korean students that were enrolled in a U.S. university during the administration period of the instrument. Table 1 shows the demographic description of the sample population. The final sample included 213 participants. This final sample was used to examine Research Question 1. The gender distribution of the participants was quite even with a slightly higher percent of women participating (54%). The participants’ ages ranged from 18 to 30 years with a mean age of 22.01 ($SD = 2.34$). Participants reported that they have resided in the United States
for an average of 54.76 months ($SD = 29.86$), ranging from 0 to 148 months. The majority of the participants were juniors (41.8%), followed by seniors and sophomores. Participants were recruited from 18 different states across the United States: Pennsylvania (24.9%), Minnesota (19.7%), New York (15%), Ohio (6.6%), Washington (6.1%), Illinois (4.7%), Indiana (4.2%), Iowa (4.2%), Massachusetts (4.2%), Utah (4.2%), Michigan (1.9%), Georgia (1.4%), Arizona (0.5%), California (0.5%), Louisiana (0.5%), Missouri (0.5%), Texas (0.5%), and Wisconsin (0.5%). The majority of participants (95.8%) were on F-1 student visas. The remaining participants were on different types of temporary visas (e.g., J1, A2, E2, H4, and L2).

In terms of post-graduation residency plans, 58.2% of the participants indicated varied degrees of desire to secure employment in the United States after finishing their studies, and 34.3% of participants reported Korea-oriented residency plans. Additionally, 7.5% of participants indicated that they desired to secure employment in countries other than Korea and the United States. In order to answer Research Question 2, 16 participants that reported other country-oriented plans were removed from the analysis because Research Question 2 involves only Korea versus U.S. oriented-post-graduation residency plans. As a result, 197 participants that indicated either staying in the U.S. or going back to Korea as their plans were included for the second regression analysis. The demographic characteristics of these 197 participants are also presented in Table 1.
Table 1

**Demographic Description of the Sample Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Analysis 1 (N = 213)</th>
<th>Analysis 2 (N = 197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior +</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa type</td>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduation</td>
<td>U.S.-oriented plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Plans</td>
<td>Strong desire to secure</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate desire to secure</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided, but leaning</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduation</td>
<td>Korea-oriented plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Plans</td>
<td>Strong desire to secure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment in Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate desire to secure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment in Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided, but leaning</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduation</td>
<td>Other country-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency Plans</td>
<td>plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to secure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>employment in countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other than Korea and the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Instruments**

The questionnaire package consisted of (a) demographic and background information, (b) Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS), (c) The Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS), and (d) Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale-Short Form (CDSE-SF). All instructions and measures were provided in Korean, the participants’ native language.

**Demographics**

Participants were asked to provide demographic information including age, gender, class standing, length of U.S. residence, major, university, visa type, and post-graduation residency plan. In order to measure their post-graduation residency plans, participants were asked on one item to indicate in which country they desire to secure employment after finishing their studies in the United States (1 = strongly desire to secure post-graduation employment in the U.S.; 2 = moderately desire to secure employment in the U.S.; 3 = undecided, but leaning towards securing employment in the U.S; 4 = undecided, but leaning towards securing employment in Korea; 5 = moderately desire to secure employment in Korea; 6 = strongly desire to secure employment in Korea; 7 = desire to secure employment in countries other than Korea and the U.S.). In the data analysis, these responses were categorized into two levels: U.S.-oriented residency plans and Korea-oriented residency plans. Participants who chose response option 7 (countries other than Korea and the U.S.) were excluded from the regression analysis of the post-graduation residency plans data.

**Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS)**

Participants’ levels of acculturation to the United States and Korea were assessed using
the 30-item Korean version of the AAMAS. The original AAMAS (Chung, Kim, & Abreu, 2004) was translated into Korean by Doh (2011) based on Brislin’s (1970) three-step back-translation guidelines. The AAMAS was designed to measure “Asian Americans engagement in the behavioral norms of one’s Asian culture-of-origin, other Asian American cultures, and the European American culture” (Kim & Omizo, 2006, p. 250). It consists of three subscales: Culture of Origin (AAMAS-CO), Other Asian American Cultures (AAMAS-AA), and European American Culture (AAMAS-EA). AAMAS-AA is an optional subscale, and it was not used in this study. Respondents are asked to respond to each item based on a 6-point scale (1 = not at all; 6 = very) concerning the degree to which they engage in a certain cultural norm in relation to the U.S. and Korean cultural groups. The responses for each cultural group were averaged to calculate a mean score of each subscale for each respondent. Higher scores represent a greater engagement in the selected cultural dimension. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses identified four domains within each culture (Chung et al., 2004): cultural identity, language, cultural knowledge, and food consumption. Sample items include, “How much do you interact and associate with people from: a) the United States (AAMAS-EA), and b) Korea (AAMAS-CO),” “How often do you listen to music or look at movies and magazines from: a) the United States (AAMAS-EA), and b) Korea (AAMAS-CO),” “How knowledgeable are you about the culture and traditions of: a) the United States (AAMAS-EA), and b) Korea (AAMAS-CO),” and “How often do you actually eat the food of: a) the United States (AAMAS-EA), and b) Korea (AAMAS-CO).” According to Chung et al. (2004), out of 15 items of each subscale, 10 items measure cultural behavior, along with 3 items measuring cultural identity and 2 items measuring cultural knowledge. Thus, the majority of items tap into behavioral acculturation.

In terms of the reliability and validity of the original version, Chung et al. (2004) reported coefficient alphas ranging from .87 to .91 for the AAMAS-CO and from .76 to .81 for the AAMAS-EA using three different samples of Asian American college students and adults. In the
same study, two-week test-retest reliability coefficients were .89 for the AAMAS-CO and .78 for the AAMAS-EA. Yakunina and Weigold (2011) reported a coefficient alpha of .85 for the AAMAS-EA with a sample of 295 Asian international college students. Convergent validity was reported through the relationship between the AAMAS and Asian Values Scale (AVS; Kim, Atkinson, & Yang, 1999). Given that higher scores of AVS indicate greater adherence to the culture of origin, a positive correlation between the AAMAS-CO and the AVS and an inverse correlation between the AAMAS-EA and the AVA support the validity of the AAMAS (Chung et al., 2004). In a study of first-year international graduate students from India, Thakar (2010) reported a significant correlation between AAMAS-CO and a related variable, intracultural coping (i.e., finding coping resources from the same racial/cultural group) \( r = .38, p < .05 \).

In a study of Korean international students in the United States (Doh, 2011), the Korean version of the AAMAS-CO was significantly correlated with the Korean version of the AVS \( r = .31, p < .01 \), as predicted. The AAMAS-EA was significantly and inversely related with the Korean version of the AVS \( r = -.40, p < .01 \), as expected. Internal reliability for AAMAS-CO and AAMAS-EA scales were found to be .83 and .86, respectively (Doh, 2011). Additionally, the non-significant correlation between the AAMAS-EA and AAMAS-CO \( r = -.13 \) supports the bilinear process of acculturation. For the current study, the coefficient alphas of the overall AAMAS-CO and AAMAS-EA summated scores were .81 and .85, respectively.

**Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS)**

Participants' levels of hope were assessed using the Korean version of the Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS; Snyder et. al., 1991). The DHS is a 12-item self-report measure designed to assess a respondent’s level of global hope pertaining to agency thinking and pathways thinking. The DHS consists of agency, pathways, and filler items, with four items for each subscale.
Respondents were asked to rate each item on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = definitely false; 2 = somewhat false; 3 = somewhat true; 4 = definitely true). The responses were averaged to produce a mean score for each respondent. Higher scores indicate greater degrees of hope. Sample items include, “I can think of many ways to get out of a jam (Pathways)” and “I energetically pursue my goals (Agency).”

Snyder et al. (1991) reported coefficient alphas ranging from .74 to .84 for the total score, from .71 to .76 for the Agency Subscale, and from .63 to .80 for the Pathways Subscale using six different samples of introductory psychology undergraduate students and two samples of people under psychological treatment in the United States. The test-retest reliability coefficients were .85 over a 3-week interval and .73 over an 8-week interval (Snyder et al. 1991). Principal component analysis supported a two-factor structure of the DHS. Agency and pathways components of hope accounted for 52% to 63% of the variance across the aforementioned eight different samples (Snyder et al., 1991). In Babyak, Snyder, and Yoshinobu’s (1993) study, the results of the confirmatory factor analysis revealed that a two-factor model best represented the structure of the DHS across four samples of college students. Additionally, a higher-order latent construct overarching the agency and pathways factors was supported by substantial second-order loadings of agency (.731 to .949) and pathways (.627 to .949) on a global higher-order hope (Babyak et al., 1993).

Snyder et al. (1991) reported convergent and discriminant validity evidence by presenting the findings of studies (Gibb, 1990; Holleran & Snyder, 1990) regarding the correlations of the DHS with other conceptually similar or dissimilar constructs. For instance, overall scores of the DHS positively correlated with the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965; r = .58, p < .005), the Generalized Expectancy for Success Scale (Fibel & Hale, 1978; rs = .55 and .54, ps < .005), and optimism as measured by the Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985; rs = .60 and .50, ps < .005). The DHS negatively correlated with the Hopelessness Scale (Beck, Weissman, Lester, &
Trexler, 1974; \( r = - .51, p < .005 \), the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, Ward, Mendelsohn, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961; \( r = - .42, p < .005 \), and the lower levels of perceived problem solving abilities as measured by the Problem Solving Inventory (Heppner & Petersen, 1982; \( r = - .62, p < .005 \)), as predicted. With regard to discriminant validity, no significant correlations were found between the DHS and the self-consciousness scale (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975; \( rs = .06 \) and -.03), as expected. After Snyder and colleagues’ (1991) validation study of the DHS, numerous other studies have supported the reliability and validity of the DHS (e.g., Peterson & Byron, 2008; Sung, Turner, & Kaewchinda, 2012).

The DHS was translated from English to Korean on the basis of Brislin’s (1970, 1980) three-step process and validated by Choi (2008). First, the DHS was translated from English into Korean by one Korean doctoral student in counseling psychology, who is fluent in both Korean and English. Second, one bilingual person who was not familiar with the original version back-translated the Korean version into English. Third, four native English speakers compared the original items and the back-translated items of the DHS and rated the equivalence between the items of the two versions. One item that was identified as problematic was revised through the translation-back translation process.

This revised Korean version of the DHS was administered to 225 Korean college students (Choi, 2008). The coefficient alpha of the Korean version of the DHS was .77, and the test-retest reliability was .80 over the 5-week interval. Validity evidence was obtained by the significant and positive correlations between the Korean version of the DHS and related constructs such as optimism \( (r = .49, p < .01) \), general self-efficacy \( (r = .70, p < .01) \), and positive affect \( (r = .51, p < .01) \). The DHS was also negatively correlated with ineffective problem-solving appraisal \( (r = - .57, p < .01) \), negative affect \( (r = -.17, p < .01) \), and hopelessness \( (r = -.54, p < .01) \). In addition, scores of the DHS accounted for additional variance in psychological well-being over and above self-efficacy and optimism (Choi, 2008). Another study of Korean college students reported
coefficient alphas of .828, 743, and .753 for the overall scores of the Korean version of the DHS, the agency subscale, and the pathways subscale, respectively (Jin & Shin, 2010). In terms of the factor structure of the Korean version DHS, Choi (2008) reported one-factor structure based on an exploratory factor analysis, while Jin and Shin (2010) reported that the two-factor model was a better fit than the one-factor model. This current study used the mean score of the overall DHS to assess the levels of global hope overarching the agency and pathways components. For the current study, the coefficient alpha of the overall DHS summated score was .79.

**Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale-Short Form (CDSE-SF)**

Participants' perceived capabilities to successfully accomplish a range of career decision-making tasks were assessed using the 25-item Korean version of the CDSE-SF. The original version of the CDSE-SF (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996) was translated into Korean and validated by Lee and Lee (2000). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = no confidence at all and 5 = complete confidence) and averaged to produce a mean score. Sample items include "decide what you value most in an occupation," "find out about the average yearly earning of people in an occupation," "choose a career that will fit your interests," "prepare a good resume," and "persistently work at your career goal even when you get frustrated."

For the original version of the CDSE-SF, Betz et al. (2005) reported coefficient alphas of .93 to .95 for total scores across three different sets of undergraduate student samples. In this same study, CDSE-SF showed significant correlations with related constructs in expected directions. CDSE-SF negatively correlated with career indecision as measured by the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, 1987) among two groups of undergraduate students ($rs = -.52$ and -.54, $ps < .001$) and positively correlated with the Vocational Identity Scale (Holland et al., 1993, $r = .42, p < .001$). CDSE-SF also positively correlated with the positive affectivity scale ($r = .45, p$...
< .001) and inversely correlated with the negative affectivity scale \( r = -0.29, p < .001 \) as measured by the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988). For the Korean version of the CDSE-SF, Lee and Lee (2000) reported a coefficient alpha of .92 for total scores and a positive correlation between CDSE-SF and career attitude maturity \( r = 0.63 \). With a sample of 691 Korean female undergraduate students, Lee (2007) reported a coefficient alpha of .914 for total scores and significant correlations between CDSE-SF and perceived career barriers \( r = -0.498 \), career decision level \( r = 0.528 \), and trait anxiety \( r = -0.394 \) in expected directions.

In terms of the factor structure, Taylor and Betz (1983) proposed five domains of career decision making self-efficacy (i.e., self-appraisal, gathering information about occupations, goal setting, planning for the future, and problem solving), but the factor analyses have produced inconsistent factor structures of CDSE and CDSE-SF. Some studies supported the five factor structure (Betz et al., 1996; Miller et al., 2009) while others yielded four factors (Chaney, Hammond, Betz, & Multon, 2007) or one factor (Robbins, 1985; Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990). Similarly, the five-factor model of the Korean version of the CDSE-SF has not been supported (Lee & Lee, 2002; Lee et al., 2007, Nam, Yang, Lee, Lee, & Seol, 2011). For instance, Nam and colleagues (2011) found a unidimensional factor structure of the Korean version of the CDSE-SF with a sample of 998 Korean college students (with the possible exception of three items) and recommended researchers use the total score instead of subscale scores. The present study used the mean score of the overall CDSE-SF. For the current study, the coefficient alpha of the overall CDSE-SF summated score was .93.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained for this study from the Office for Research Protections at the researcher’s university prior to collecting data. A web-based survey
was used to collect the data. A web-based survey is an effective way to collect data from multiple institutions because it is inexpensive to administer to participants in various regions, and data is readily accessible (Best & Harrison, 2009). The online survey was distributed in multiple ways. First, the survey invitation was distributed among Korean international students via three email lists: two from Korean churches and one from a Korean student association. Second, the survey invitation was posted on the websites of ten Korean international student associations, including social media groups. Third, students at various U.S. universities were asked to forward the survey invitation to other Korean international students that they know.

The survey invitation included a description of the study’s objectives, survey procedures, a confidentiality clause, an incentive for completing the survey, as well as a link to the survey. After participants clicked on the survey link, they were provided with an informed consent form notifying them of the purpose of the study, procedures for completing the survey, potential benefits, confidentiality, and rights as participants. Upon approval of this consent form, they could proceed to the survey. To maintain confidentiality, only the primary researcher for this study was allowed to access the data from the participants. Participants’ email and IP addresses were examined for duplicates and then separated from survey responses. Using tracking cookies, the survey system prevented each respondent from taking the survey more than once from the same computer and browser. To increase the response rate, the study offered an incentive. The participants that completed the survey were entered into a random drawing for three $50 gift certificates, seven $20 gift certificates, and ten $5 gift certificates from Amazon.com or Starbucks.

In order to detect invalid responses, the survey also included the following three validity check items: Do not answer this question, please skip; Please click (1 = definitely false) for this item; Please click (1 = no confidence at all) for this item. These items were placed in the
AAMAS-CO, the DHS, and the CDSE, respectively. Participants that answered incorrectly more than one of the three validity check items were eliminated. Wei et al. (2007) reported that using validity check items improved the accuracy of the data.

**Data Analysis**

After screening the data and handling the missing data, univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analyses were carried out using SPSS version 21.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, Ill). Univariate analysis helps to explore and describe the characteristics of individual variables. Bivariate analysis involves the examination of the relationships between two variables through correlations and scatter plots. In the multivariate analysis, two hierarchical regression analyses were run to answer the two corresponding research questions (Table 2). Hierarchical regression analysis allows researchers to examine the unique and combined contributions of each predictor to the criterion variable, career decision self-efficacy. It subsequently allows researchers to test the interaction effects in predicting career decision self-efficacy beyond the proportion of the career decision self-efficacy variance explained by the first-order terms (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003). Regression assumptions were tested by univariate and bivariate analyses, as well as analysis of residuals.

Research question 2 excludes participants that reported plans to move to countries other than Korea and the Unites States, whereas Research Question 1 involves all Korean international student participants. Therefore, two separate regression analyses were conducted to address these two research questions. As can be seen in Table 2, the differences between Regression Analysis 1 and Analysis 2 are a moderating variable (hope or post-graduation residency plans) entered in Model 2 and the subsequent two-way interaction terms entered in Model 3 and Model 4.
### Table 2

*Hierarchical Regression Analysis 1 and Analysis 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Analysis 1</th>
<th>Analysis 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Hope</em></td>
<td>- Post-graduation residency plans (PGRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Hope</em></td>
<td>- Post-graduation residency plans (PGRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Acculturation to the U.S. × Hope</em></td>
<td>- <em>Acculturation to the U.S. × PGRP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 4</strong></td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>- Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>- Acculturation to Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Hope</em></td>
<td>- Post-graduation residency plans (PGRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Acculturation to the U.S. × Hope</em></td>
<td>- <em>Acculturation to the U.S. × PGRP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Acculturation to Korea × Hope</em></td>
<td>- <em>Acculturation to Korea × PGRP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Career decision self-efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses, aiming to answer the following research questions:

Research Question 1: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, the acculturation to the U.S. × hope interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × hope interaction predict career decision self-efficacy?

Research Question 2: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, post-graduation residency plans, the acculturation to the U.S. × post-graduation residency plans interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans interaction predict career decision self-efficacy?

The results of the preliminary analyses are described, followed by the results of univariate and bivariiate analyses. Lastly, the results of hierarchical regression analyses are presented in order to answer the research questions.

Preliminary Analysis

Data Cleaning

The survey data were downloaded from the survey website (www.qualtrics.com). From the full dataset (N = 278), respondents that met the following criteria were included in this study: a) Korean undergraduate students that were enrolled in a U.S. university when they responded to the survey, b) non-immigrant visa holders including F1, F1 OPT, and J1, and c) 18 years of age or older.
A total of 37 respondents were removed from the dataset because they indicated that they had either green cards \( (n = 13) \) or U.S. citizenship \( (n = 25) \). Nine additional participants were also removed because of the following reasons: Four had already graduated from university, one self-identified as a Canadian student, two were aged under 18 years, and two had attended community colleges during the survey period. After examining IP addresses, email addresses, and demographic information, I found that one participant took the survey twice: once in June and once in October, 2013. For this participant, the second data entry was eliminated. Among the remaining 231 respondents, four were excluded because they answered more than one of the three validity check items incorrectly. Five participants were also removed because they entered only demographic information. Lastly, nine participants were eliminated because they answered less than 70% of the career decision self-efficacy items. As a result, a total of 213 participants were analyzed for missing data.

**Missing Data**

The dataset was examined using the Missing Values Analysis (MVA) menu option of SPSS to describe the pattern of missing values. A total of 19 respondents (8.92%) reported either one or two missing values. Seven missing data points were observed in demographic variables (one in age, one in gender, five in length of residence) and sixteen missing data points were observed across acculturation to Korea \( (n = 3) \), acculturation to the U.S. \( (n = 4) \), hope \( (n = 4) \), and career decision self-efficacy \( (n = 5) \). Except the item for the length of residence in the U.S., no individual item has more than two missing data points. The missing values accounted for 0.15% of the whole dataset.

The missing-data mechanism was examined in order to determine how to handle missing data. The missing-data mechanism is categorized into three: First, a variable is *missing*
completely at random (MCAR), when the probability that an observation on X is missing is not related to either X or any other variables in the data set (Cohen et al., 2003). If data are MCAR, discarding cases with missing values does not bias the parameter estimates. Second, a variable is missing at random (MAR), when the missingness depends only on observed variables (Graham, 2012). If data are MAR, the causes of missingness can be controlled for by including the observed variables that correlate with missingness in the analysis model (Graham, 2012). Third, a variable is not missing at random (NMAR), when the missingness depends on unobserved variables (Graham, 2012). Little’s MCAR test was conducted to examine whether or not missingness in the dataset is MCAR. The results of Little's MCAR test indicated that the data is not MCAR: $\chi^2 (df = 948) = 1033.859, p < .05$. When data is not MCAR, complete case analysis, also known as listwise deletion (i.e., removing cases with missing values), biases parameter estimates because complete cases are not representative of the whole sample (Graham, 2012).

Many researchers have pointed out that the multiple imputation method originally developed by Rubin (1987) has advantages over other traditional methods such as listwise deletion, pairwise deletion, and mean substitution (Cohen et al., 2003, Graham, 2012; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The goals of multiple imputation are to “preserve important characteristics of the data set as a whole, that is, to yield unbiased estimates of each parameter and to allow us to assess the variability around that estimate” (Graham, 2012, p. 104). Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) indicated that multiple imputation is the most highly regarded method for handling missing data and can be used for data that is not MCAR. Although multiple imputation is based on the MAR assumption, and it is difficult to test whether the data is MAR or NMAR (Schafer & Graham, 2002), multiple imputation is at least as good as and typically better than other methods at dealing with missing data, even data that does not meet the MAR assumption (Graham, 2012).

Building on these documented advantages of multiple imputation over other methods, multiple imputation was conducted based on Graham’s (2012) guidelines. The multiple
imputation (MI) process consists of three steps (Graham, 2012). First, MI generates multiply-imputed data sets, each of which replaces every missing value with a different imputed value. Second, multiply-imputed data sets are analyzed, and the analysis of each data set yields the parameter estimates and standard errors. Finally, one set of parameter estimates and corresponding standard errors are obtained by combining the parameter estimates and standard errors from each data set. In this present study, Schafer’s (1997) NORM 2.03 program was used to perform multiple imputation \((m = 40)\). Norm-imputed data was then transformed into SPSS using the MIAutomate utility. All predictor variables, a criterion variable, and several demographic variables (age, gender, year in school, and length of residency in the U.S.) were included in the imputation model.

The use of multiple imputation led to several hand-calculations in order to obtain aggregated statistics from 40 imputed data sets. For example, SPSS does not provide summary statistics of \(R^2\), adjusted \(R^2\), and standardized regression coefficients. Thus, aggregated values of \(R^2\), adjusted \(R^2\), and standardized regression coefficients were calculated based on Harel’s (2009) guidelines. That is, in order to calculate the normalized estimate and its variance, a square root value of \(R^2\), a square root value of adjusted \(R^2\), and standardized coefficients estimated from each imputed data set were converted to z scores using Fisher’s r-to-z transformation. The averages of the z scores were then converted back into \(R^2\), adjusted \(R^2\), and standardized coefficients.

Graham (2012) pointed out that “the single data set imputed from EM parameters is completely appropriate for addressing research questions for which hypothesis testing is not typically used (e.g., coefficient alpha analysis or exploratory factor analysis)” (p.126). In this study, coefficient alphas, residual plots, and scatter plots were obtained from a single data set imputed from EM parameters because of difficulties in obtaining a single output of these analyses from multiply-imputed data sets. The results from the complete case analysis are also presented in Appendices N and O.
Outliers

Z-scores of continuous study variables (acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, Hope, and career decision self-efficacy) were calculated to examine univariate outliers. The absolute value of a Z-score exceeding 3.29 indicates a potential univariate outlier according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). One univariate outlier was found for the mean score of acculturation to Korea (Z-score = -3.49). This univariate outlier was retained for further analyses. No univariate outliers were found for the acculturation to the U.S., hope, and career decision self-efficacy variables. These variables were also examined to detect multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis distances (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). No case was identified as multivariate outliers with $p < .001$. Additionally, Cook’s distance values were all less than one, indicating that there is no influential outlier (Cohen et al., 2003).

Univariate Analysis

Descriptive analyses were conducted to explore the central tendency and the distribution of each variable, and the results are presented in Table 3. Means, skewness values, and kurtosis values are the average values of the estimates from 40 imputed data sets. The standard deviation of each variable is the square root of the variance that was estimated by combining the average value of the variances from 40 data sets and the between imputation variance (i.e., the variance of the mean in each dataset from the overall mean value) following Rubin’s (1987) formula. Minimum and maximum values were identical across 40 data sets.

When the skewness statistic is divided by its standard error, a result (i.e., skewness ratio) that is greater than the absolute value of 2 indicates departures from normality among small to moderate sized samples (Weinberg & Abramowitz, 2002). Negative skewness was found in the
acculturation to Korea variable based on its skewness ratio value of 3.59. Except for the acculturation to Korea, the scores of all other measures were normally distributed. Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) indicated that a regression prediction equation is often improved when predictors are normally distributed. Therefore, acculturation to Korea scores were further examined to normalize their distribution. The elimination of the identified univariate outlier did not improve the skewness ratio value of acculturation to Korea. Retaining that outlier, the Box-Cox test was then performed to find an appropriate power transformation for normalizing the distribution of the acculturation to Korea scores. Box-Cox test indicated a cubic transformation (power of 3), and a cubic transformation of the acculturation to Korea variable resulted in a skewness ratio of 0.18, indicating the normal distribution of the scores. In addition, a univariate outlier no longer existed in the cubic transformed acculturation to Korea data. Therefore, this cubic transformed variable of acculturation to Korea was used for the regression analyses.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Decision Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation to Korea (T)</td>
<td>119.35</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>201.92</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 213. Acculturation to Korea (T): Cubic transformed acculturation to Korea.
Standard error of skewness = .17, Standard error of kurtosis = .33
Bivariate Analysis

As indicated in Table 4, Pearson correlations were performed to explore the associations between all possible pairs of variables. First, in the correlations between demographic variables and other variables, none of demographic variables (i.e., age, gender, year in school, length of residency in the U.S.) had a significant correlation with career decision self-efficacy, and the correlation coefficients were less than .15. Therefore, no demographic variables were used as control variables in the subsequent regression analyses. Length of residency in the U.S. was positively and moderately correlated with acculturation to the U.S. A significant and small correlation was found between gender and post-graduation residency plans.

In terms of relationships among the criterion variable and predictor variables, career decision self-efficacy significantly correlated to acculturation to Korea, cubic transformed acculturation to Korea, acculturation to the U.S., and hope. A variable of post-graduation residency plans was not significantly correlated with career decision self-efficacy.

Acculturation to Korea and transformed acculturation to Korea were highly correlated. The cubic transformed acculturation to Korea was used in the rest of the analyses instead of original scores. No significant correlation was found between acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea. Several small but significant correlations were found among predictor and moderator variables as follows: hope positively correlated to acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea. The variable of post-graduation residency plans was positively related to acculturation to Korea and inversely related to acculturation to the U.S. and hope. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), a correlation coefficient greater than .90 indicates the presence of multicollinearity. No evidence for multicollinearity was found based on the correlations among predictors and moderators.

Scatterplots were constructed for every possible pair of variables (see Appendix I). No
evidence of curvilinear relationships was found between each predictor variable and the criterion variable, meeting the assumption of linearity (see Cohen et al., 2003).
Table 4

Zero-Order Correlations among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.339**</td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.142*</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Year in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Length of Residency in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.987**</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.175*</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>.172*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Acculturation to Korea (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.160*</td>
<td>.140*</td>
<td>.160*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>-.212**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.168*</td>
<td>.699**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Post-Graduation Residency Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Career Decision Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 213 (N = 197 for correlations between post-graduation residency plans and other variables). *p < .05, **p < .01.
Acculturation to Korea (T) = Cubic transformed acculturation to Korea.
Gender: 0= Men, 1= Women. Post-graduation residency plans: 0 = U.S.-oriented plans, 1 = Korea-oriented plans.
Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis

In order to examine the two research questions, two corresponding hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. Before creating product terms, the continuous predictor and moderator variables (i.e., acculturation to Korea, acculturation to the U.S., and hope) were mean-centered to minimize nonessential multicollinearity (Cohen et al., 2003; Frazer, Tix, & Barron, 2004). The post-graduation residency plans variable was dummy-coded with 0 representing U.S.-oriented residency plans and 1 representing Korea-oriented residency plans. A cubic transformation was used on the measure of acculturation to Korea. To determine the moderating effects of hope and post-graduation residency plans, the four two-way interaction terms were created by multiplying variables of acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, and post-graduation residency plans (i.e., acculturation to the U.S. × hope, acculturation to Korea × hope, acculturation to the U.S. × post-graduation residency plans, acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans).

Analysis of Residuals

Residuals scatterplots from two regression analyses were examined to test model assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals (Cohen et al., 2003; Kutner, Nachtsheim, Neter, & Li, 2004; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Residuals refer to the difference between predicted values and obtained values. Multiple regression is based on the assumptions that (a) the residuals have a linear relationship with predicted criterion variables, (b) the variance of the residuals is the same across all the levels of the predicted criterion variables (homoscedasticity), and (c) the residuals are normally distributed around the predicted values.
Standardized residuals from the two regression analyses were plotted against the standardized predicted values (Appendix J). If all these three assumptions are met, “the residuals will be nearly rectangularly distributed with a concentration of scores along the center” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p.127). Residual scatterplots showed no evidence of violating the assumptions. Normal probability plots also confirmed that residuals are normally distributed (Appendix J).

Regression Analysis 1

Regression Analysis 1 was conducted to answer Research Question 1: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, the acculturation to the U.S. × hope interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × hope interaction predict career decision self-efficacy? Table 5 shows the unstandardized regression coefficients ($B$) as well as their standard errors and 95% confidence intervals, the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), p-values, the semipartial correlations, $R^2$, adjusted $R^2$, and the fraction of missing information (FMI) that resulted from the Hierarchical Regression Analysis 1. In general, statistical software programs such as SPSS estimate the standardized coefficient for a product term incorrectly by using the standardized score of the product term instead of the product of two standardized scores of first-order variables (Aiken & West, 1991; Whisman & McClelland, 2005). To avoid such inaccurate estimations, the standardized regression coefficients are presented only for Model 1 and Model 2, which do not contain product terms.

All of the regression models were found to be significant (Model 1, $p < .0005$; Model 2, $p < .0005$; Model 3, $p < .0005$; Model 4, $p < .0005$) across all 40 imputed data sets. In Model 1, acculturation to the U.S. and cubic transformed acculturation to Korea were entered. Both acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea were significantly and positively related to
career decision self-efficacy at the .01 level. The $R^2$ of Model 1 indicated that these two aspects of acculturation in combination accounted for 16.7% of the variability in career decision self-efficacy. Controlling for acculturation to Korea, acculturation to the U.S. explained 14.2% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy ($sr^2 = .142$). Controlling for acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea explained 2.6% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy ($sr^2 = .026$).

In Model 2, hope was entered. Hope accounted for additional 35.8% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy beyond that explained by the other two acculturation variables. Each standard deviation increase in hope produced a .634 standard deviation increase in career decision self-efficacy while holding acculturation variables constant ($\beta = .634, p < .01$). Acculturation to the U.S. uniquely accounted for 3.4% of the career decision self-efficacy variance when hope and acculturation to Korea were considered together. Each standard deviation increase in acculturation to the U.S. produced a .194 standard deviation increase in career decision self-efficacy, holding hope and acculturation to Korea constant ($\beta = .194, p < .01$). The relationship between acculturation to Korea and career decision self-efficacy was no longer significant when hope was entered in Model 2 ($\beta = .059, p > .05$). Acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, and hope explained 52.5% of career decision self-efficacy variance. When the sum of the squared semipartialss of acculturation to the U.S. ($sr^2 = .034$), acculturation to Korea ($sr^2 = .003$), and hope ($sr^2 = .358$) is subtracted from the $R^2$ for Model 2 ($R^2 = .525$), the result, 0.13, indicates that 13.0% of the career decision self-efficacy variance was common variance explained by various combinations of the three predictor variables. When this common variance was partitioned according to commonality formulas (Pedhazur, 1997), 10.7% of the variance was explained both by acculturation to the U.S. and by hope. In addition, 2.3% of the variance was explained in common by acculturation to Korea and hope. The formulas are presented in Appendix K.

In Model 3, the product term between acculturation to the U.S. and hope was entered. This product term was not significantly related to career decision self-efficacy at the level of .05
after controlling for the two acculturation variables and hope. In Model 4, the product term between acculturation to Korea and hope was entered, but it was not significant at the .05 level. Because no significant interaction effects were detected, further examination such as plotting the interaction and simple slope analysis was not performed.

$R^2$ based on sample data tends to overestimate the population $R^2$. $R^2$ always increases as predictors are added to the model even if added predictors are actually unrelated to the criterion variable (Weinberg & Abramowitz, 2002). To resolve this overestimation problem, the adjusted $R^2$ accounts for the number of predictors relative to the sample size and the possibility of overfitting the data. In this regression analysis, adjusted $R^2$'s were only slightly smaller than $R^2$'s, suggesting that the models were not overfit with too many predictors and that predictors in the models performed fairly well in predicting the criterion variable.

As shown in Appendix L, these results were generally comparable with the results from the complete case analysis at the .05 level of significance. The results from the complete case analysis revealed that acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, and hope in combination explained 53% of the career decision self-efficacy, and no interaction effects were found.
### Table 5
Summary of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis 1 with Acculturation Variables and Hope Predicting Career Decision Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% C. I. B.</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( sr^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2_{adj} )</th>
<th>FMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>[.231, .456]</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .004]</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>[.087, .266]</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[-.001, .002]</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>[.756, 1.036]</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>[.082, .265]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[-.001, .002]</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>[.757, 1.038]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × Hope</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>[-.168, .231]</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>[.081, .264]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.000, .002]</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>[.758, 1.039]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × Hope</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>[-.164, .236]</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea × Hope</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>[-.002, .005]</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( N = 213 \).
Regression Analysis 2

Table 6 shows the results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis 2 to answer Research Question 2: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, post-graduation residency plans, the acculturation to the U.S. × post-graduation residency plans interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans interaction predict career decision self-efficacy? In order to test the moderating effects of a post-graduation residency plan, 16 participants that reported their desires to secure employment in countries other than Korea and the U.S. were removed. As a result, 197 participants that indicated either staying in the U.S. or going back to Korea as their post-graduation residency plans were included in this analysis. A U.S.-oriented residency plan was coded 0 and a Korea-oriented residency plan was coded 1.

All of the regression models were found to be significant (Model 1, $p < .0005$; Model 2, $p < .0005$; Model 3, $p < .0005$; Model 4, $p < .0005$) across all 40 imputed data sets. In Model 1, acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea were entered simultaneously. Acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea in combination explained 19.3% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy. Controlling for acculturation to Korea, acculturation to the U.S. uniquely accounted for 16.9% of the variability in career decision self-efficacy. Each standard deviation increase in acculturation to the U.S. produced a .411 standard deviation increase in career decision self-efficacy while holding acculturation to Korea constant ($\beta = .411, p < .01$). Acculturation to Korea explained 2.7% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy over and above the percentage of variance explained by acculturation to the U.S. Each standard deviation increase in acculturation to Korea produced a .163 standard deviation increase in career decision self-efficacy with acculturation to the U.S. held constant ($\beta = .163, p < .05$).

In Model 2, a variable of post-graduation residency plans was entered. Post-graduation
residency plans did not explain a statistically significant proportion of variance in career decision self-efficacy over and above what was explained by acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea ($\beta = -0.040, p > .05$).

In Model 3, the product term between acculturation to the U.S. and post-graduation residency plans was entered. This product term was not significantly related to career decision self-efficacy after controlling for the two acculturation variables and post-graduation residency plans. Lastly, the product term between acculturation to Korea and post-graduation residency plans was entered in Model 5, but it did not uniquely explain the career decision self-efficacy variance controlling for the other four variables at the level of .05.

As presented in Appendix M, these results were comparable to the results from the complete case analysis at the .05 level of significance. The results from the complete case analysis revealed that acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea accounted for 20.4% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy, and that post-graduation residency plans did not moderate the relationships between acculturation variables and career decision self-efficacy.
Table 6
Summary of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis 2 with Acculturation Variables and Post-Graduation Residency Plans (PGRP) Predicting Career Decision Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% C. I. B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$</th>
<th>FMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>[.261, .492]</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .004]</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>[.250, .487]</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .004]</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGRP</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>[-.199, .106]</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>[.201, .484]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .004]</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGRP</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>[-.194, .118]</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × PGRP</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>[-.173, .354]</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>[.206, .488]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .006]</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGRP</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>[-.180, .131]</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × PGRP</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>[-.154, .376]</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea × PGRP</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>[-.007, .001]</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 197$. 
Chapter 5

Discussion

This chapter discusses the major findings of the present study. Strengths of the study are followed by limitations to this study. Finally, implications of the findings are provided for future research and practice.

Discussion of the Results

The purpose of this study was to examine the predictive abilities of acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, and hope for career decision self-efficacy among Korean international undergraduate students. The secondary purpose of this study was to investigate the moderating roles of hope and post-graduation residency plans in the relationship between acculturation variables and career decision self-efficacy. Two hierarchical regression analyses were performed. The first regression analysis (Analysis 1) was conducted to answer Research Question 1: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, hope, the acculturation to the U.S. × hope interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × hope interaction predict career decision self-efficacy? A total of 213 Korean international undergraduate students were included in the data set for this analysis. The second regression analysis (Analysis 2) was conducted to answer Research Question 2: To what extent do acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea, post-graduation residency plans, the acculturation to the U.S. × post-graduation residency plans interaction, and the acculturation to Korea × post-graduation residency plans interaction predict career decision self-efficacy? In order to focus on students with either
U.S.- or Korea-oriented residency plans, 19 students who reported a desire to move to countries other than the U.S. or Korea after graduation were excluded from this analysis, ending with a total of 197 participants. The results of the regression analyses indicate the following findings about the unique and combined contributions of predictor variables to the prediction of career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students. Findings from descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations are discussed as well.

**Acculturation**

When other predictors were not in the models, acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea in combination explained 16.7% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy in the full dataset (Analysis 1) and 19.3% of the career decision self-efficacy variance among the participants with either U.S.- or Korea-oriented residency plans (Analysis 2). These $R^2$ values indicate medium effect sizes according to Cohen's (1988) convention where $R^2$ or squared partial correlations of .02, .13, and .26 correspond to small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively. Lent and Sheu (2010) emphasized the need for examining cultural variables that are specific to a particular minority population to better elucidate their career development in a social cognitive career theory framework. Meeting this need, the current findings suggest that acculturation to U.S. culture and acculturation to Korean culture are significant cultural factors that are linked to career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students studying in the United States. More than 80% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy, however, remained unexplained by these two acculturation variables. It should be further noted that when hope was entered into the model, hope masked the effects of acculturation variables in the model, and the unique contributions of these two acculturation variables to the model substantially dropped.
The results of both first and second regression analyses showed that acculturation to the U.S. made a unique contribution to explaining the career decision self-efficacy variance among Korean international undergraduate students. The beta coefficient for acculturation to the U.S. was positive, suggesting that Korean international undergraduate students are likely to have higher levels of career decision self-efficacy when they adjust better to U.S. culture. This finding is consistent with previous studies documenting the positive associations between these two variables among American racial and ethnic minorities (Patel et al., 2008; Wu, 2009). In this present study, controlling for acculturation to Korea, acculturation to the U.S. accounted for 14.2% and 16.9% of the career decision self-efficacy variance in the first and second regression analysis, respectively. This indicates a medium effect size based on Cohen’s (1988) effect size table. In fact, Cohen’s effect size is about partial correlations and these percentages of the variance explained by acculturation to the U.S. were derived from semipartial correlations. Squared partial correlations of acculturation to the U.S. with career decision self-efficacy were higher than these squared semipartial correlations and yet within a medium effect size range. In Regression Analysis 1, after entering hope into the model, the unique contribution of acculturation to the U.S. to predicting career decision self-efficacy considerably dropped because 10.7% of the career decision self-efficacy variance was accounted for in common by acculturation to the U.S. and hope. Acculturation to the U.S. explained 3.4% of the career decision self-efficacy variance over and above what hope and acculturation to Korea accounted for.

The significant predictive role of acculturation to the U.S. for career decision self-efficacy found in this study can be explained in several ways. Studies have suggested that language barriers and unfamiliarity with U.S. cultures are substantial challenges that international
students encounter in their career planning and job seeking processes (Arthur & Flynn, 2011; Bikos & Furry, 1999; Crockett & Hays, 2011; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). Korean international students are particularly likely to experience cultural barriers over the course of their career development in the United States because of dissimilarities between Korean and American culture, such as the Korean language structure, Confucian values, and competitive education system (Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006). Korean international students with high acculturation to U.S. culture therefore are likely to perceive fewer cultural and language barriers and to feel more confident in their career decision-making processes. Furthermore, high levels of acculturation to the U.S. may increase career decision self-efficacy via positive experiential learning such as successful performance accomplishment, vicarious learning, and encouragement from others as suggested by Bandura (1977) and Lent et al. (1994). That is, Korean international students high in acculturation to U.S. culture may actively and successfully perform various types of activities for career decision-making because many of those activities require interaction with Americans, English skills, and familiarity with U.S. cultural norms. These students, for instance, may be active and successful in seeking advice from professors, socializing with American peers, networking with American employers, and seeking out U.S.-based internship opportunities to learn about various majors and occupations. While doing so, they are likely to receive support and encouragement from those people and to observe their American peers’ successful career decision making experiences. As a result, these experiences are likely to facilitate building confidence in completing career decision-making-related tasks in the context of U.S. culture.

**Acculturation to the Home Culture**

Controlling for acculturation to the U.S., acculturation to Korea (cubic transformed
variable) significantly accounted for 2.6% and 2.7% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy in the first and second regression analysis, respectively, indicating a small effect size (Cohen, 1988). The significant and positive beta coefficient for acculturation to Korea suggests that Korean international students who highly engage in Korean cultural behaviors may tend to feel capable to carry out courses of action for career decision-making. In support of this positive role of engagement with the home culture, Sangganjanavanich et al. (2011) found that international students gained information and support for their employment seeking processes by connecting with other international students from the same country of origin. Similarly, it can be speculated that a high engagement in Korean culture (e.g., Korean peers, employers in South Korea, Korean online resources, Korean culture-based student activities) may serve as a source for career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students by providing them with successful learning experiences about themselves and occupations, support for career planning, and opportunities to learn from Korean peers.

Compared to acculturation to the U.S., the predictive power of acculturation to Korea on career decision self-efficacy was far smaller. One possible explanation is that engagement in Korean culture, in comparison to U.S. culture, may be less relevant to career decision-making activities among Korean international students because they are currently living in the United States and have to navigate the career decision-making process mostly within the U.S. cultural context. This is especially true considering that the career decision self-efficacy measure contains several academic-related items (e.g., determine the steps you need to take to successfully complete your chosen major) and all Korean international students have to deal with academic issues in the United States.

After controlling for both acculturation to the U.S. and hope, acculturation to Korea no longer makes a significant unique contribution to the prediction of career decision self-efficacy because the portion of the career decision self-efficacy variance explained by acculturation to
Korea overlapped with that explained by hope. Specifically, acculturation to Korea and hope shared 2.3% of the variance in career decision self-efficacy. To the best of my knowledge, the present study is the first attempt to explore the link between identification with the home culture and career decision self-efficacy among international students. A small number of studies have produced mixed findings about the associations between engagement in the home culture and career development-related variables, but their participants were not international students (e.g., Ojeda et al., 2012; Wu, 2009). Overall, it appears that although engagement in Korean culture is positively related to career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students, after taking hope and acculturation to the U.S. into account, additional consideration of acculturation to Korea may be redundant in predicting their career decision self-efficacy.

This study supports the bilinear process of acculturation among Korean international students. The unilinear model of acculturation posits that cultural adjustment to the host culture occurs as people move away from their native cultures. In contrast to this idea, this study found a close-to-zero correlation between acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea, indicating these two aspects of acculturation are independent from each other. In addition, length of residency in the United States was significantly correlated with acculturation to the U.S. ($r = .409$, $p < .01$), but not with acculturation to Korea. This result is consistent with Doh's (2011) finding that Korean international students who had come to the host countries at an early age tended to exhibit higher levels of acculturation to the host culture, whereas their levels of identification with Korean culture did not differ from those of Korean international students who had come to the host-countries at later ages. It appears that Korean international students experience better adjustment to U.S. culture as they stay longer in the United States, but their bonds with the home culture do not decrease or increase depending on their length of residency in the United States. This finding offers additional support for two different processes of acculturation to the host culture and acculturation to the home culture.
In this study, the average score of acculturation to Korea \((M = 4.86, SD = .55)\) was higher than the average score of acculturation to the U.S. \((M = 4.00, SD = .62)\). Given that participants' average length of time in the United States was 4.56 years, it makes sense that U.S. culture may still be new to many Korean international student participants relative to their home culture where they spent their childhood and adolescence. This higher adherence to the home culture compared to adherence to the host culture is contrary to previous findings documenting higher average scores of acculturation to the host culture \((Ms = 4.75 \text{ to } 4.95, SDs = .59 \text{ to } .64)\) than acculturation to the home culture \((Ms = 4.34 \text{ to } 4.45, SDs = .77 \text{ to } .86)\) in samples of Asian-American college students (Chung et al., 2004; Kim & Omizo, 2006). This different pattern of acculturation scores between Korean international students and Asian American students supports the contention that international students’ cultural transition experiences are different from experiences of other cultural minority populations and that research is necessary to account for international students’ unique cultural characteristics. Additionally, small correlations were found between hope and both acculturation variables, but it is not clear whether hopeful students experience higher engagement in host and home cultures or high engagement in both cultures lead to high hope.

**Hope**

When hope was added to the model (Analysis 1), 35.8% of the career decision self-efficacy variance was explained uniquely by hope over and above acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea, indicating a large effect size (Cohen, 1988). Hope, acculturation to the U.S., and acculturation to Korea in combination explained more than half (52.5%) of the variance in career decision self-efficacy. Because hope was such a dominant predictor and correlated to the two acculturation variables, it considerably reduced the beta-weights of the acculturation variables. The positive beta coefficient for hope suggests that a Korean international
undergraduate student with a higher global sense of hope is likely to have greater self-efficacy in the domain of career-decision making. Previous findings suggest that hope positively contributes to multiple life domains including the career-related domain (Niles et al., 2010; Peterson & Byron, 2008; Sung et al., 2012; Tombaugh et al., 2011; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). In accordance with these findings, the results from this current study provide evidence that hope, as a personal strength, may help shape career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students.

High-hope Korean international students may not only engage in a wide range of activities that can be helpful for their career decision-making but also perceive their performance experiences in a more positive way. That is to say, international students with higher hope may more energetically search for multiple ways to engage in activities that will assist in making career-related decisions. They may also be more motivated to persist in these efforts even after encountering barriers. While performing various activities, high-hope students are likely to focus on acknowledging their successes than to be discouraged from failures (Snyder et al., 1991). These experiences will help them build confidence in their abilities to navigate the career decision-making process. This interpretation is consistent with Lent et al.’s (1994) perspectives that both accumulating successful performance accomplishments and perceiving performance experiences through positive cognitive filters are important to development of high self-efficacy. Social cognitive career theory points out that various personal inputs affect the formation of self-efficacy, but few studies have explored the construct of hope as a personal characteristic that can influence career decision self-efficacy. The present findings provide support for the utility of hope as an explanatory construct for understanding Korean international undergraduate students’ career decision self-efficacy.

The correlation between hope and career decision self-efficacy (r = .699) indicates that 48.9% of the variance of each of these variables is explained by the other in this sample of Korean international undergraduate students. Given this strong correlation, it seems necessary to
address the conceptual similarity of these two constructs and potential method variance. This strong relationship between hope and career decision self-efficacy could be, in part, because both constructs are conceptualized as cognitive beliefs in one’s capability for future success (Snyder, Rand, et al., 2002). Drawing upon Snyder’s hope theory, which is supported by substantial empirical research, the present study operationalizes hope as a cognitive-motivational factor that consists of pathways thinking and agency thinking. Some researchers, however, conceive of hope as a multidimensional concept that encompasses affective, cognitive, behavioral, interpersonal, temporal, and contextual components (Dufault & Martocchio, 1985; Smith et al., in press). It may be beneficial for future studies to explore the nature of hope and examine the link between other dimensions of hope and career decision self-efficacy.

It is noteworthy that the observed correlation between hope and career decision self-efficacy among Korean undergraduate students is stronger than the correlation among Korean international graduate students studying in the United States (r = .519, p < .01) (In, 2013). Previous studies of Korean undergraduate students also found similarly strong correlations between hope and career decision self-efficacy (rs = .63 and .65, Kim, 2005; Shin & Hyeon, 2008). Because undergraduate students, compared to graduate students, generally have less academic and work experience to help build career decision self-efficacy, undergraduate students’ hopeful thinking about life overall might have a stronger influence on their confidence in the career decision-making domain.

On the other hand, part of the observed correlation might be attributed to factors associated with the method of measurement rather than the constructs. That is, the relationship between hope and career decision self-efficacy might be inflated by shared method variance. Researchers may also need to examine whether the items on the hope scale and career decision self-efficacy scale accurately reflect intended constructs. The career decision self-efficacy scale explicitly specifies its career decision-making domain by using domain-specific words such as
majors, occupations, careers, employers, resumes, or interviews whereas the hope scale items describe a general sense of motivation and perceived capability to pursue goals. Further research, however, may examine how participants differentiate these items in their responses. This method variance issue is discussed further in limitations and implications for future study sections.

Interactions Between Acculturation Variables and Hope

No interaction effects were found between hope and acculturation to the U.S. or between hope and acculturation to Korea. Previous studies have shown that hope is positively related to healthy coping strategies (Chang & DeSimonea, 2001; Roesch et al., 2010) and serves as a buffer between stressors and negative psychological outcomes (Horton & Wallander, 2001; Jin & Shin, 2010; Ong et al., 2006; Valle et al., 2006; Visser et al., 2012). Unlike these findings, the current study failed to demonstrate the moderating role of hope in the relationship between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy. One speculation is that hope might function best as a moderator in the stressor-psychological outcome process. Low engagement with U.S. culture or Korean culture might not necessarily be a stressor to Korean international students, and CDSE involves cognitive self-appraisal rather than psychological outcomes such as depression, life satisfaction, and dysphoria. Therefore, although hope strongly predicts career decision self-efficacy, its buffering role may not be applied to the link between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy.

In addition, it should be noted that the effect size and statistical power for the interaction effect decrease when the first-order variables included in the interaction term are significantly associated with the criterion variable and not perfectly reliable (Aiken & West, 1991; Whisman & McClelland, 2005). For example, when reliability of the first-order variables drops from 1.00 to .80, the criterion variable variance accounted for by the interaction term drops by 50%. This
decrease in the proportion of the variance explained by the interaction term is even larger as the first-order variables explain the greater portion of the variance in the criterion variable (Aiken & West, 1991). Because hope, itself, was strongly associated with career decision self-efficacy and the reliability of the hope and acculturation scales was not perfect in the present study, this strong first-order effect and measurement errors may have led to a decrease in the effect size of interaction terms between acculturation variables and hope. Using highly reliable measures with a large sample size or using structural equation modeling to account for measurement errors may be helpful to more accurately examine the interaction effects between hope and acculturation (Aiken & West, 1991; Cohen et al., 2003; Whisman & McClelland, 2005).

**Post-Graduation Residency Plans**

Post-graduation residency plans did not significantly predict career decision self-efficacy after controlling for acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea, as expected. Contrary to the expectation of this study, post-graduation residency plans did not show significant interaction effects with either acculturation to the U.S. or acculturation to Korea in predicting career decision self-efficacy. In other words, the associations between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy did not vary depending on students’ post-graduation residency plans.

I offer several speculations to account for the non-significant moderating effect of post-graduation residency plans in the present study. One possible explanation is that post-graduation residency plans are more complex than the two categories that this study measured: staying in the U.S. or returning to Korea. For example, students often desire to build work experience in the United State and permanently return to Korea (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000; Spencer-Rodgers & Cortijo, 1998). Many international undergraduate students also consider going to graduate school before landing a job. In the current sample, 38.4% of the participants who reported Korea-
oriented residency plans indicated that they have a plan to pursue a graduate degree in the United States. This statistic suggests that even if students’ long-term residency plans are going back to the home country, their shot-term goals could be to make a successful transition to the host culture and achieve educational goals in the host culture. Therefore, it makes sense that acculturation to the U.S. is a stronger predictor of career decision self-efficacy than acculturation to Korea regardless of students’ post-graduation residency plans.

In addition, among those who indicated U.S.-oriented residency plans, 37.1% of students actually responded that they were “undecided, but leaning towards securing employment in the U.S.” Likewise, among those who indicated Korea-oriented residency plans, 54.8% of students responded that they were “undecided, but leaning towards securing employment in Korea.” These responses suggest that a significant portion of the participants were undecided or open to various options in terms of post-graduation residency plans. Therefore, by dichotomizing students’ residency plans into either going home or staying in the U.S., this study might not have captured the complexity of post-graduation residency plans.

Small but significant correlations were found between post-graduation residency plans and acculturation variables. That is, there was a slight tendency that students with high levels of acculturation to the U.S. reported U.S.-oriented post-graduation residency plans whereas students with high levels of engagement with Korean culture reported Korea-oriented residency plans. It may be of interest to examine how students’ acculturation experiences with home and host cultures might be related to their desires to stay in the United States or return to their home country after finishing their studies.

**Summary of the Findings**

The findings of the present study suggest that acculturation and hope are significant
cultural and personal factors that contribute to career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students. First, hope accounted for the largest portion of the variance in career decision self-efficacy when the two acculturation variables were considered together. Second, acculturation to the U.S. made a unique contribution to predicting career decision self-efficacy after controlling for acculturation to Korea and hope. Third, acculturation to Korea explained a small but significant portion of the career decision self-efficacy variance controlling for acculturation to the U.S., but it did not account for unique variance in career decision self-efficacy after controlling for hope. Fourth, neither hope nor post-graduation residency plans moderated the relationship between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy.

**Strengths of the Study**

The importance of culturally sensitive research and practice has been increasingly underscored in the field of career development. In addition, with the emergence of positive psychology, individuals’ strengths have been receiving growing attention. This study found that cultural variables (i.e., acculturation) and a personal strength (i.e., hope) predict career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students. This study has unique strengths as follows.

First, this study focused on Korean international students while most other studies have examined international students from multiple countries all together (e.g., Liu, 2009; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011). Therefore, the findings from the present study are not confounded by the within-group differences that come from various countries of origin. The current findings illuminate Korean international students’ career experiences within their contexts of cross-cultural transition.

Second, this study provided an understanding of the way that acculturation experiences are associated with Korean international students’ career decision-making. In particular, this
study is unique in that it investigated the role of home culture among Korean international students. No studies have examined the home culture aspect of acculturation using a bilinear model to examine the career development of international students.

Third, unlike most previous studies that have focused on maladaptive coping strategies of international students (Smith & Khawaja, 2011), this study brought attention to a personal strength, hope. Although research has demonstrated that hope is related to various positive psychological, academic, and athletic outcomes, few studies have examined the contribution of hope to career decision self-efficacy. Hope can be particularly important in the career development of marginalized and/or minority populations, who may face various actual and perceived barriers in their career development processes (Diemer & Blustein, 2007; Juntunen & Wettersten, 2006). In this sense, understanding the role of hope in Korean international students’ career development allows educators and career practitioners to better help these students navigate various challenges in their career development processes.

Lastly, in order to minimize potential biases from missing data, this study mainly used multiple imputation method, which has been known to have advantages over other traditional missing data methods (Cohen et al., 2003; Graham, 2012; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). By using multiple imputation method, this study attempted to estimate unbiased parameters and standard errors. Overall, the findings from this study will help career practitioners, educators, and school administrators to better address the career needs of international students, who have thus far been underserved.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study. First, because this study used a convenience sampling method, the current study sample may not represent the overall Korean international
undergraduate student population. The participants were mainly recruited through a survey advertisement posted on Korean student associations’ websites including social network groups, and participation in this survey was voluntary. Therefore, it is unclear whether students who did not participate in the survey might have different characteristics compared to those who completed the survey. In particular, students who were not familiar with utilizing Korean student associations’ websites or social network groups may have been less likely to access the online survey posted on those websites. Students with low engagement in Korean culture might not even join these Korean international student online groups, and thus, might not have the opportunity to participate in the survey. In addition, the majority of the participants were recruited from universities in the North-East and Mid-West U.S. Thus, the findings of this study might not reflect the experiences of Korean international students attending universities in the West or South U.S. We must take caution when generalizing the findings of this study to a broader range of international students such as students from different countries, graduate students, and students studying in different regions. It is recommended that future research replicates this study with diverse international student samples using more rigorous sampling methods.

Second, this study mainly focused on behavioral acculturation. The majority of items (10 out of 15) of the acculturation measure (AAMAS) are associated with the behavioral dimension of acculturation (e.g., interacting with people, using language, practicing cultural tradition, eating food), along with several items regarding cultural identity and cultural knowledge (Chung et al., 2004). Acculturation is a multifaceted factor that includes various dimensions such as behaviors, values, identities, and knowledge. An individual’s level of acculturation can vary across these different dimensions (Miller & Kerlow-Myers, 2009). For example, it may not be accurate to assess one’s level of acculturation about value systems based on his/her level of acculturation in a behavioral domain. Caution is needed to generalize the current findings to acculturation that occurs in different domains such as values or affective aspects of acculturation.
Third, all variables were assessed through the participant self-reported measures. Therefore, participants might have had a tendency to respond to the survey items in socially desirable ways. In addition, the common method (i.e., self-report) variance might have inflated the true associations between variables measured in this study (Trusty, 2011). The strong correlation between hope and career decision self-efficacy found in this study particularly suggests that their relationship might have been overestimated due to method variance. Using self-report measures, however, does not automatically cause common method bias for all variables (Brannick, Chan, Conway, Lance, & Spector, 2010; Spector, 2006). A near-zero correlation between acculturation to the U.S. and acculturation to Korea, and weak correlations between acculturation to Korea and other self-reported variables may indicate that method variance did not upwardly bias the relationships among these variables in the current study. In addition to common method bias, it should be also noted that a single item used to measure post-graduation residency plans in this present study might have failed to take into account the complexity of the participants’ post-graduation residency plans.

Fourth, because this study is correlational in nature, we cannot conclude that the predictor variables are the causes of the criterion variable. Because all variables in this study were measured in a cross-sectional manner without any manipulation, we should be cautious before making any causal conclusions. Based on social cognitive career theory, acculturation theory, and hope theory, I interpreted that Korean international students who have high hope and positive acculturation experiences are likely to have high career-decision self-efficacy. However, we cannot conclude that high levels of hope and acculturation cause high levels of career decision self-efficacy. Despite these limitations, this study offers important implications for research and practice, which are discussed in the following two sections.
Implications for Future Research

This study provides several important implications for future research about international students’ cross-cultural experiences and career development. First, an international student’s engagement in the culture of origin should not be measured through his/her engagement in the host culture. Some past studies interpreted low levels of acculturation to the host culture as an indication of high bond with the home culture (e.g., Shih & Brown, 2000). The present findings, however, signify that low levels of acculturation to the host culture should not be seen as the sign of high levels of acculturation to the home culture. Measuring only an engagement with the host culture might lead to an incomplete understanding of international students’ cross-cultural experiences. Because this study is the first attempt to examine the association between engagement in the home culture and career development among international students, little is known about the role of home culture engagement in international students’ career development. Future researchers are encouraged to examine how international students’ adherence to both home and host cultures influences their career development, adopting a bilinear model of acculturation.

Future researches may want to develop an instrument that takes into account international students’ unique acculturation experiences. Building on reliability and validity evidence with a sample of Korean international students (Doh, 2011), this study used the AAMAS that was originally designed to measure Asian Americans’ acculturation. Despite considerable similarities, cultural differences also exist between international students and immigrants (Crockett & Hays, 2011). Thus, it may be worth developing an instrument that captures international students’ unique acculturative experiences.

Future research studies may also benefit from examining international students’ acculturation across various domains such as cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains.
and Kerlow-Myers (2009) especially noted the lack of research that examines the cultural value aspects of the acculturation process. Examining only behavioral acculturation may not provide full information about an individual’s acculturative experiences (Miller, 2007). In the future, researchers should give their attention to different domains of the acculturation process, such as values or affective domains.

The use of samples of international students from countries other than South Korea may broaden our perspectives on diverse international students’ cultural and career experiences and their hope. According to Berry (1997), the acculturation process is influenced by the cultural and societal context of the home country and the extent of dissimilarity between the home culture and the host culture. Thus, the ways that students from other countries go through the acculturation process and develop career decision self-efficacy might not be the same as those of Korean international students. Moreover, although a positive role of hope has been found across cultures, the meaning of hope should be examined within a cultural context (Lopez, Gariglietti, et al., 2000). It is therefore necessary to investigate the associations of acculturation and hope to career decision self-efficacy using samples of international student from different parts of the world.

The strong association between hope and career decision self-efficacy found in the current study suggests that hope deserves further research attention as a personal factor that affects career decision self-efficacy. In conducting this line of research, future studies should investigate how hope and CDSE are operationalized differently and measured in a valid way. Several researchers have conceptualized hope differently from Snyder’s cognitive-motivational construct of hope. Some conceived of hope as an emotional construct (Averill, Catlin, & Chon, 1990; Bruininks & Malle, 2005) and others defined hope as a multidimensional construct (Dufault & Martocchio, 1985). These different views on hope, however, have not been widely researched and operationalized. Researchers may want to explore the definitions of hope
in various cultural contexts and ways to measure hope in order to better comprehend the association between hope and career decision self-efficacy. Future research may conduct a Multitrait-Multimethod (MTMM) analysis (Campbell & Fiske, 1959) using multiple methods of measurement for hope and career decision self-efficacy, such as parents’ rating, teacher’s rating, and self-report. The MTMM approach can help evaluate the convergent and discriminant validity as well as method variance of the hope and career decision self-efficacy measures.

Qualitative research may afford a holistic understanding of international students’ cross-cultural experiences, hope, and career situations. Qualitative research is useful to gain an in-depth understanding of phenomena and the lived experiences of people within a context (Morrow, 2007). The need for qualitative research has also been noted in previous literature reviews of international students' career development (Crockett & Hays, 2011) and acculturation experiences (Smith & Khawaja, 2011). As discussed above, acculturation is a multifaceted phenomenon across multiple life domains. Hope also might incorporate multiple aspects in addition to cognitive aspects. Additionally, international students' post-graduation residency plans are varied beyond home country- or host country-oriented plans, and students’ reasons behind making post-graduation residency plans are diverse as well. By listening to international students’ narratives or observing their lives, researchers may be able to more closely approach these complicated phenomena.

A longitudinal study is also necessary to explore the long-term patterns of international students’ acculturation experiences and career development. Berry’s (1997) acculturation theory indicates that acculturation is the long-term process that interacts with various pre- and post-arrival factors in achieving adaptation in various life domains. In support of the long-term nature of the acculturation process, Wang, Heppner, Fu, Zhao, Li, and Chuang (2012) showed that Chinese-speaking international students manifested different patterns of psychological adaptation over the first three semesters in the United States (i.e., constant high psychological distress,
decreasing distress, and increasing distress patterns over time). Therefore, future research can benefit from keeping track of international students’ acculturation experiences and their career development experiences over time. A longitudinal study would also allow researchers to reduce the limitation of interpreting the results from cross-sectional research and to examine whether the students’ hope and acculturation are antecedents of career decision self-efficacy. Another possible research topic using longitudinal data is to track the way that international students’ post-graduation residency plans change with time. Although the majority of international students desire to secure employment in the United States, many of them eventually end up returning to their home countries (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000). Findings from longitudinal research can help design more appropriate career interventions and education programs for international students at various stages of acculturation and career planning.

Furthermore, future studies may benefit from exploring the mediation models that link acculturation and hope to career choice-related outcome variables through career decision self-efficacy. Career-related self-efficacy is a variable that mediates the relationships between personal and contextual factors and the course of career choice formation (e.g., career interests, goals, actions, and performances) in SCCT. For example, one study found that career decision self-efficacy mediated the link between core self-evaluation (i.e., the personality construct that consists of general self-efficacy, self-esteem, locus of control, and neuroticism) and vocational identity among Greek high school students (Koumoundourou et al., 2012). Other studies also found the mediating roles of career decision self-efficacy between personal inputs and variables such as career planning and exploration (Rogers et al., 2008) and career choice commitment (Wang et al., 2006). Examining the mediating role of career decision self-efficacy between personal and contextual inputs and career outcome variables can provide a fuller understanding of the career decision-making process of international students.

Other future research will include exploring the factors that bolster international students’
hope and cultural adjustment. This will help develop appropriate interventions to enhance international students’ sense of hope and cultural adjustment, which in turn, increases students’ self-efficacy for performing career decision-making activities.

**Implications for Practice**

The present findings suggest that addressing Korean international students’ hope and acculturation experiences can help career practitioners better understand and promote these students’ self-efficacy in career decision-making. These findings are in line with a holistic approach to career services. Research has shown that clients often bring personal and psychological adjustment issues to career counseling and that personal issues and career concerns are not separable (Hinkelman & Luzzo, 2007; Multon, Heppner, Gysbers, Zook, & Ellis-Kalton, 2001; Niles, Anderson, & Cover, 2000; Schultheiss, 2000). From this perspective, career counselors should attend to broader psychological and adjustment issues such as overall sense of hope and cross-cultural transition experiences among international students and to examine how these personal and cultural factors intersect with their career decision-making concerns. Further, career counselors should work closely with university counseling centers, international student offices, and other relevant university offices to promote cultural adjustment and hopefulness for international students. University administrators can implement programs to promote hope in international students, provide opportunities to engage in the host culture, and support student activities related to their home cultures. Although further studies are necessary to apply the current findings to international students from countries other than South Korea, career practitioners may find meaningful implications from this study for a broader range of international student populations. Specifically, the findings from this study offer the following practical implications regarding acculturation, hope, and post-graduation residency plans in the
context of the career development of international students.

**Acculturation to the Host Culture**

High levels of acculturation to the host culture appear to positively relate to confidence in performing career decision-making tasks among Korean international undergraduate students. This finding suggests that facilitating Korean international students’ positive acculturative experiences can foster their adaptive career decision-making. This is congruent with previous literature suggesting that career counselors must assess each international student’s level of acculturation and its influence on their career development (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Shih & Brown, 2000). Career counselors can invite international student clients to share their cultural adjustment experiences, such as their socialization with American peers, language barriers, and their understanding and practice of American values and traditions. This conversation can inform career counselors about students’ confidence in career decision-making activities. If an international student is struggling with adjustment to U.S. culture, the counselor should assess the possibility that the student’s cultural adjustment issues might diminish his/her career decision self-efficacy. Further, counselors can assist international students in exploring what hinders and fosters their cultural adjustment and how to cope with challenges in adjusting to a new culture.

Given that this study mainly measured behavioral engagement in the host culture, career development practitioners should be aware of the importance of behavioral engagement with the host culture and encourage students to get involved in a diverse range of activities related to U.S. cultures. Various interventions can provide international students with opportunities to learn and practice language, cultural norms, and social customs through interaction with people from the host culture. These interventions can be made not only by traditional career counseling but also
cultural education programs, support groups, mentoring programs, and online resources, as many studies have emphasized outreach and customized programs for international students (Mori, 2000; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Sangganjanavanich et al., 2011; Yoon & Portman, 2004).

Importantly, U.S. universities must create a culturally sensitive and international student-friendly environment. To this end, it is crucial to promote cultural awareness in not only international students but also American students, faculty, and staff, to educate them about the acculturation process, and to provide them with an opportunity to examine their own cultural assumptions and biases.

**Acculturation to the Home Culture**

Career practitioners should not see Korean international students’ involvement with a home culture as a hindrance in adjusting to the host cultures. This present study showed no relationship between adjustment to the host culture and adherence to the home culture, rejecting the idea that moving away from one’s home culture is required to adjust to a new culture. In fact, this study revealed that both learning about a new culture and involvement with a home culture are positively associated with the development of career decision self-efficacy. Aligned with this result, Yoon and Portman (2004) contended that “the counselor's goal when working with international students is to help them gain bicultural competence rather than to assimilate them to American culture at the expense of rejecting their cultures of origin” (p. 39). Although the correlation between acculturation to the home culture and career decision self-efficacy was weak, this small effect size could have practical implications (McCartney & Rosenthal, 2000). By attending to international students' engagement in their home culture, career practitioners can obtain a fuller understanding of dynamic interplays between cultural transition experiences and career decision-making processes. Career counselors may want to initiate discussion with
students as to how engagement with their home culture could be helpful for building confidence in career decision-making activities. For example, they may discuss how students can gain support, acquire occupational information and skills, clarify their career goals, and explore their interests, values, and abilities through their interactions with the home culture. Universities can support student cultural group activities such as Korean student association networking events, recruitment fairs, and traditional holiday events, which might lead to career decision self-efficacy building experiences.

**Hope**

In light of the strong relationship between hope and career decision self-efficacy, career practitioners should be aware that when Korean international students lack an overall sense of hope, they are also likely to lack confidence in their career decision making-processes. Assessing and monitoring students’ levels of hope could add to the counselors’ understanding of students’ career decision self-efficacy. For those students with low hope, career practitioners need to address how their lack of hope might affect their perceived capabilities for career-decision making and to foster hope for students’ adaptive career development. Not only can interventions designed to bolster hope elevate their overall sense of hope, but these interventions can also help strengthen career decision self-efficacy among Korean international students. This increased self-efficacy for career decision-making can ultimately result in positive outcomes in their career development.

Studies have provided evidence that hope can be fostered by interventions that target clarifying goals and bolstering agency and pathways thinking towards reaching goals (Cheavens, Feldman, Gum, Michael, & Snyder, 2006; Davidson, Feldman, & Margalit, 2012; Marques, Lopez, & Pais-Ribeiro, 2011). Efforts to raise hope in international students can be made through
various modalities such as educational programs, workshops, international student orientations, support groups, one-on-one interactions, and counseling services. For example, by providing a psycho-educational program that teaches hopeful thinking during new international student orientation week, universities can be proactive in empowering international students to successfully cope with various challenges including career-related ones.

Setting meaningful goals in various life domains is important to promote hope. Goals that are merely imposed by others are likely to weaken their sense of hope (Snyder, 1994). In a career counseling setting, counselors can help international students become clear about their goals in multiple life domains such as interpersonal, family, academic, and career domains. It could be beneficial to have a dialogue about what led them to the United States, what they hope to gain through studying abroad in the United States, and how these short-term goals are connected to their long-term life goals. Given that international students from collectivistic cultures often highly value meeting their family expectations (Sheu & Fukuyama, 2007), counselors can also help international students examine how their families might influence their goal setting. Educational programs and workshops can teach students goal setting skills (e.g., setting measurable goals, prioritizing goals, and developing concrete sub-goals) (Snyder, 1994; Snyder et al., 2003).

In order to facilitate international students’ sense of agency, educators and career practitioners can help international students acknowledge their strengths, achievements, and successful coping experiences. Another way to enhance agency thinking is to share stories of other international students who successfully overcame challenges and achieved their goals, via online, printed materials, or in-person programs (Lopez, Floyd, Ulven, & Snyder, 2000). Smith et al. (in press) found that receiving supports from others positively affect undergraduate students’ sense of hope whereas negative relationships with others lowered students’ hope. Thus, counselors and educators should help international students identify support systems and build
good relationships with professors, advisors, and peers. Further, universities can offer mentoring programs and support groups for international students and educate professors and staff about building positive relationships with international students. Reframing negative self-talk to positive can also bolster agency thinking (Lopez, Floyd, et al., 2000).

Lastly, educators and career practitioners should encourage international students to establish multiple strategies to pursue their goals. By doing so, students are able to use different strategies when they encounter roadblocks to their goals rather than sticking to one strategy and giving up when they are not successful in one way (Snyder et al., 2003). In addition, interventions can help international students anticipate obstacles to reaching their goals, develop strategies to overcome obstacles, and reframe those obstacles as surmountable challenges (Snyder, 1994).

**Post-Graduation Residency Plans**

The majority of the participants (58.2%) in this study reported that they wanted to secure employment in the United States after finishing their studies whereas 34.3% of the participants indicated that they would like to return to South Korea after graduation. This result is consistent with previous findings that international students' post-graduation residency plans were mainly U.S.-focused (Liu, 2009; Spencer-Rogers, 2000; Spencer-Rogers & Cortijo, 1998). In addition, 7.5% of the participants reported that they wished to find a job in a country other than the United States and Korea after finishing their studies. These findings support Arthur’s (2007) contention that career practitioners should reevaluate the traditional assumption that international students demand career services to prepare them for returning to their home countries. Rather than assuming that most international students want to return home, career counselors need to help international students identify their post-graduation residency plans, and provide career assistance accordingly. Because work authorization issues may restrict the job opportunities of international
students in the United States (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000), career counselors may need to address international students' frustrations and disappointments. Counselors should also help these students develop back-up plans while helping them navigate these work-permit issues.

In this study, the strengths of associations between acculturation and career decision self-efficacy did not differ depending on Korean international students’ post-graduation residency plans. It appears that, regardless of their post-graduation residency plans, adjustment to the host culture plays a more important role in developing career decision making self-efficacy than dose engagement with the home culture among Korean international students. Therefore, career development practitioners should not assume that adjustment to the U.S. culture is less important for the career decision making processes of students who want to go back to their home country after graduation. Although specialized career services are necessary to meet the differential needs of international students based on their post-graduation residency plans (Arthur, 2007), helping them adjust to the host culture is likely to increase career decision self-efficacy even for those who want to go back to the home country after finishing their studies. Likewise, engagement in the home culture could possibly benefit even Korean international students who desire to secure employment in the United States.
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Appendix A

Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research (English)
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: The Relationships between Acculturation and Career Development among Korean International Students

Principal Investigator: Hyoyeon In, MA
Doctoral Student
Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education
316 Cedar Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA
hoi5006@psu.edu

Advisor: Spencer G. Niles, Ed.D.
Distinguished Professor and Department Head
Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education
327 Cedar Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2412; sgn3@psu.edu

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is to explore how Korean international students' acculturative experiences influence their career development process.

Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to answer 96 questions about your acculturation, career development and background information.

Benefits: The results of this study will advance an understanding of Korean international students’ cross-cultural transition experiences and career development processes. This study will also provide implications for career services for Korean international students.

Payment for Participation: At the end of the survey, you will be provided with the opportunity to participate in a drawing for one of the following 20 Amazon.com or Starbucks gifts: three $50 gift certificates, seven $20 gift certificates, and ten $5 gift certificates. To participate in the drawing, please provide your email address on the last question of this survey. Your email address will be used for the raffle and the delivery of the gifts. Your email address will be stored separately from your survey responses.

Duration: It will take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete the survey.

Statement of Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is confidential. The data will be stored at a secure server and stored on the primary researcher’s computer in a password protected
file. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third parties. The results of this study may be published or presented for scholarly purposes only, with no personally identifiable information.

**Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Hyoyeon In (814-954-2032; hoi5006@psu.edu) with questions, complaints or concerns about this research study.

**Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to participate in this research is voluntary. You can refuse to take part in or you can withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years of age or older and enrolled in a U.S. university to take part in this research. You can participate in this survey only one time. Completion and return of the survey implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in this research. Please keep this form for your records or future reference.

You can fill out the following survey by clicking the arrow below.
Appendix B

Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research (Korean)
The Pennsylvania State University

연구제목: 한국인 유학생의 문화적응과 진로발달의 관계
연구 책임자: Hyoyeon In, MA
Doctoral Student
Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education
316 Cedar Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA
hoi5006@psu.edu

지도교수: Spencer G. Niles, Ed.D.
Distinguished Professor and Department Head
Educational Psychology, Counseling, and Special Education
327 Cedar Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-2412; sgn3@psu.edu

연구목적: 본 연구는 한국인 유학생들의 문화적응 경험에 진로발달에 어떤 영향을 미치는지를 알아보기 위한 것입니다.

연구절차: 본 설문지는 문화적응, 진로발달 및 배경정보와 관련된 총 96 문항으로 구성되어 있습니다.

혜택: 본 연구의 결과는 한국인 유학생들의 문화적응과 진로발달 과정에 관한 이해를 높이고, 한국인 유학생을 위한 진로발달 프로그램 개발에 기여할 것입니다.

설문참여에 대한 보답: 설문에 참여하시면, 추첨을 통해 선정된 20 대상의 Amazon.com 또는 Starbucks 상품권 중 하나가 제공됩니다: $50 상품권 3명, $20 상품권 7명, $5 상품권 10명. 상품 추첨에 참여하기 원하실 경우, 설문 마지막 질문에 이메일 주소를 입력하여 주십시오. 이메일 주소는 상품 추첨 및 발송의 목적으로 쓰이게 되며, 여러분들의 설문 답변 데이터와는 분리되어 보관될 것입니다.

예정소요시간: 본 설문지 작성 소요시간은 약 10~15분으로 예상됩니다.

비밀유지: 여러분들이 응답하신 내용은 비밀이 보장됩니다. 비밀보장을 위해 여러분들의 개인정보와 이메일 주소는 본 연구에서 분석된 설문 답변 데이터와는
분리되어 보관될 것입니다. 모든 설문 답변은 보안 장치가 된 서버에 저장되며, 책임 연구자의 컴퓨터에 비밀번호로 보호된 파일 형태로 보관됩니다. 귀하의 정보는 현재 기술 수준에 입각하여 보호될 것입니다. 인터넷을 통한 제3자에 의한 정보유출의 가능성은 존재함을 알려드립니다. 본 연구의 결과는 오직 학술적 목적을 위해서만 출판 또는 발표될 것이며, 여러분들의 어떠한 개인정보도 공개되지 않을 것입니다.

질문: 본 연구와 관련된 질문이나 의견이 있을 경우 다음의 연락처로 연락주십시오: 인효연(814-954-2032; hoi5006@psu.edu)

자발적 참여: 연구참여 결정은 전적으로 귀하의 자발적인 의사에 기반합니다. 여러분은 설문 작성은 거절하시거나 중단하실 수 있으며, 이에 따른 어떠한 불이익도 없습니다. 또한 응답하고 싶지 않으신 문항에 대해서는 응답하지 않으실 권한이 있습니다.

만 18 세 이상의 한국인이며 현재 미국 대학에 등록되어 있는 유학생은 누구나 이 연구에 참여하실 수 있습니다. 본 설문에는 한 번만 참여가 가능합니다.

본 설문지를 작성하시는 것은, 위의 모든 사항을 읽고 연구 참여에 동의하신다는 의사표시로 간주됩니다. 귀하의 기록 보관을 위해서는 본 동의서를 보관하여 주시기 바랍니다.

아래의 화살표 버튼을 눌러 설문에 참여하실 수 있습니다.
Appendix C

Demographic Information (English)

These questions are about you and your background.

1. What is your age (in full years)? ______

2. What is your gender? 1) male 2) female

3. What will your academic status be as of August 2013?
   1) Freshman 2) Sophomore 3) Junior 4) Senior 5) Senior + ______
   6) Master’s student 7) Doctoral student 8) Other ______

4. What is your major:

5. The institution where you are currently enrolled:

6. Length of stay in the United States: ______ year(s) ______ month(s)

7. I primarily identify myself as
   1) a Korean international student
   2) a Korean American student
   3) Other ______

8. Visa type:
   1) F-1 Students 2) F-1 Optional Practical Training (OPT) 3) J-1
4) U. S. Green card  
5) U.S. Citizenship  
6) Other _______

9. Are you planning to pursue an advanced degree after completing your current degree?

1) I am planning to pursue an advanced degree in the U.S.
2) I am planning to pursue an advanced degree in Korea
3) I am planning to pursue an advanced degree in countries other than the U.S. and Korea
4) I don’t have a plan to pursue an advanced degree.
5) Other _______

10. In which country would you like to secure employment after finishing your studies?

1) Strongly desire to secure employment in the U.S.
2) Moderately desire to secure employment in the U.S.
3) Undecided, but leaning towards securing employment in the U.S.
4) Undecided, but leaning towards securing employment in Korea.
5) Moderately desire to secure employment in Korea.
6) Strongly desire to secure employment in Korea.
7) Desire to secure employment in countries other than Korea and the U.S. _______

11. For what reasons do you prefer to secure employment after finishing your studies in the country that you chose in the question above?

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D
Demographic Information (Korean)

다음은 여러분들의 기본적인 인적 사항에 관한 질문입니다.

1. 연령 
   만 _______세

2. 성별 
   1) 남  2) 여

3. 학년 (2013년 8월 기준)
   1) 학부 1 학년
   2) 학부 2 학년
   3) 학부 3 학년
   4) 학부 4 학년
   5) 학부 4 학년 + ______
   6) 석사과정
   7) 박사과정
   8) 기타 ______

4. 전공은 무엇입니까?

5. 현재 재학 중인 학교 명을 기입하여 주십시오.

6. 나는 나 자신을 ___________라고 주로 생각한다.
   1) 한국인 유학생
   2) 한국계 미국인 학생
   3) 기타 ______

7. 얼마나 오랫동안 미국에 거주하셨습니까? : ___________년 ________개월

8. 비자 유형
   1) F-1  2) F-1 Optional Practical Training (OPT)  3) J-1
   4) 미국 영주권  5) 미국 시민권  6) 기타_______

9. 졸업 후 상위 학위 과정에 진학할 계획하고 계십니까? (예: 학부생일 경우 대학원 과정)
   1) 미국에서 진학할 계획이 있다.
   2) 한국에서 진학할 계획이 있다.
3) 미국과 한국이 아닌 다른 나라에서 진학할 계획이 있다.
4) 졸업 후 더 이상 상위학위과정에 진학할 계획이 없다.
5) 기타______

10. 학업을 모두 끝마친 후 어느 나라에서 직업을 갖길 바라십니까? 아래 보기 중 하나를 선택하여 주십시오.

1) 미국에서 직업을 갖기를 매우 원합니다.
2) 미국에서 직업을 갖기를 원하는 편이다.
3) 아직 잘 모르겠지만, 미국에서 직업을 갖는 쪽으로 조금 더 마음이 기운다.
4) 아직 잘 모르겠지만, 한국에서 직업을 갖는 쪽으로 조금 더 마음이 기운다.
5) 한국에서 직업을 갖기를 원하는 편이다.
6) 한국에서 직업을 갖기를 매우 원합니다.
7) 한국이나 미국이 아닌 다른 나라에 가서 직업을 갖기를 원한다.

11. 어떠한 이유로 학업을 마친 후 위에 응답한 나라에서 직업을 갖길 선호하십니까?
Appendix E

The Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS) (English)

This section is concerned with your thoughts and behaviors in relation to Korean and American cultures. Please respond to all items by using the scale below.

Not at all 1------2------3------4------5------6 Very

- Acculturation to Korean culture

1. How much do you feel you have in common with Koreans?
2. How much do you interact and associate with people from Korea?
3. How much do you identify with Koreans?
4. How much would you like to interact and associate with people from Korea?
5. How proud are you to be a part of Korea?
6. How negative do you feel about people from Korea?
7. How well do you speak the language of Korea?
8. How well do you understand the language of Korea?
9. How well do you read and write in the language of Korea?
10. How often do you listen to music or look at movies and magazines from Korea?
11. How knowledgeable are you about the culture and traditions of Korea?
12. How knowledgeable are you about the history of Korea?
13. How much do you actually practice the traditions and keep the holidays of Korea?
14. How often do you actually eat the food of Korea?
15. How much do you like the food of Korea?
- Acculturation to U.S. culture

16. How much do you feel you have in common with Americans?

17. How much do you interact and associate with people from the US?

18. How much do you identify with Americans?

19. How much would you like to interact and associate with people from the US?

20. How proud are you to be a part of the US?

21. How negative do you feel about people from the US?

22. How well do you speak English?

23. How well do you understand English?

24. How well do you read and write English?

25. How often do you listen to music or look at movies and magazines from the US?

26. How knowledgeable are you about the culture and traditions of the US?

27. How knowledgeable are you about the history of the US?

28. How much do you actually practice the traditions and keep the holidays of the US?

29. How often do you actually eat the food of the US?

30. How much do you like the food of the US?
Appendix F

The Asian American Multidimensional Acculturation Scale (AAMAS) (Korean)

다음은 한국문화 및 미국문화에 대한 귀하의 생각과 행동에 관한 질문입니다. 아래의
번호를 사용하여 자신의 잘 나타내는 숫자에 표시하여 주십시오.

전혀 (Not at all) 1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6 매우(Very)

- Acculturation to Korean culture

1. 당신은 얼마나 한국인들과 공통점이 있다고 생각합니까?
2. 당신은 한국사람들과 얼마나 교제합니까?
3. 당신은 얼마나 한국 문화와 동질감을 느낄니까?
4. 당신은 한국사람들과 얼마나 교제하기를 원합니까?
5. 당신이 한국사회의 한 부분이라는 사실이 얼마나 자랑스럽습니까?
6. 당신은 한국사람들에 대해 얼마나 부정적으로 생각합니까?
7. 당신은 한국어를 얼마나 잘합니까?
8. 당신은 한국어를 얼마나 잘 이해합니까?
9. 당신은 한국어를 얼마나 잘 읽고 쓸 수 있습니까?
10. 당신은 얼마나 자주 한국 음악을 듣거나 한국영화, 잡지를 보니까?
11. 당신은 한국 문화나 전통에 대한 지식이 얼마나 있습니까?
12. 당신은 한국 역사에 대한 지식이 얼마나 있습니까?
13. 당신은 한국 전통이나 공휴일을 얼마나 지킵니까?
14. 당신은 얼마나 자주 한국음식을 먹습니까?
15. 당신은 얼마나 한국음식을 좋아합니까?

- Acculturation to U.S. culture

16. 당신은 얼마나 미국인들과 공통점이 있다고 생각합니까?
17. 당신은 미국인들과 얼마나 교제합니까?
18. 당신은 얼마나 미국 문화와 동질감을 느껴합니까?
19. 당신은 얼마나 미국인들과 교제하기를 원합니까?
20. 당신이 미국사회의 한 부분이라는 사실이 얼마나 자랑스럽습니까?
21. 당신은 미국인들에 대해 얼마나 부정적으로 생각합니까?
22. 당신은 영어를 얼마나 잘합니까?
23. 당신은 영어를 얼마나 잘 이해합니까?
24. 당신은 영어를 얼마나 잘 읽고 쓸 수 있습니까?
25. 당신은 얼마나 자주 미국 음악을 듣거나 미국 영화, 잡지를 보니까?
26. 당신은 미국 문화나 전통에 대한 지식이 얼마나 있습니까?
27. 당신은 미국 역사에 대한 지식이 얼마나 있습니까?
28. 당신은 미국 전통이나 공휴일을 얼마나 지킴니까?
29. 당신은 얼마나 자주 미국 음식을 먹습니까?
30. 당신은 얼마나 미국 음식을 좋아합니까?
Appendix G

The Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS) (English)

1-4: Definitely false; Mostly false; Mostly true; Definitely true

1. I can think of many ways to get out of a jam. (Pathways)
2. I energetically pursue my goals. (Agency)
3. I feel tired most the time. (Fillers)
4. There are lots of ways around any problem. (Pathways)
5. I am easily downed in an argument. (Filler)
6. I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are most important to me. (Pathways)
7. I worry about my health. (Filler)
8. Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem. (Pathways)
9. My past experiences have prepared me well for my future. (Agency)
10. I've been pretty successful in life. (Agency)
11. I usually find myself worrying about something. (Filler)
12. I meet the goals that I set for myself. (Agency)
**Appendix H**

The Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS) (Korean)

1-4: 분명히 아니다; 거의 아니다; 거의 그렇다; 분명히 그렇다

1. 나는 곤경에서 벗어날 많은 방법들을 생각할 수 있다.
2. 나는 원기 왕성하게 목표를 추구한다.
3. 나는 대부분 왜로를 느낀다.
4. 어떤 문제라도 길은 많이 있다.
5. 나는 논쟁에서 쉽게 수그러든다.
6. 나는 삶에서 나에게 중요한 것들을 얻을 많은 방법들을 생각할 수 있다.
7. 나는 내 건강을 걱정한다.
8. 다른 사람들은 절망할 때라도, 나는 내가 문제를 해결할 방법을 찾을 수 있다는 것을 안다.
9. 나는 과거 경험들로 인해 미래를 잘 준비하게 되었다.
10. 나는 인생에서 폭 성공적이다.
11. 나는 늘 무엇인가를 걱정하고 있다.
12. 나는 스스로 정한 목표를 따른다.
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Scatter Plot Matrices of Every Pair of Variables

Regression Analysis 1
Regression Analysis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acculturation to the U.S.</th>
<th>Acculturation to Korea</th>
<th>Acculturation to Korea (Cubic Transformed)</th>
<th>Post-Graduation Residency Plans</th>
<th>Career Decision Self-Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Acculturation to the U.S.

Acculturation to Korea

Acculturation to Korea (Cubic Transformed)

Post-Graduation Residency Plans

Career Decision Self-Efficacy
Appendix J

Residual Scatter Plots and Normal probability Plots

Regression Analysis 1

Scatter Plot of Standardized Residuals

Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual
Regression Analysis 2

Scatter Plot of Standardized Residuals

Normal Probability Plot of Regression Standardized Residual
Appendix K

Commonality Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acculturation to the U.S. (1)</th>
<th>Acculturation to Korea (2)</th>
<th>Hope (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(12)</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(13)</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(23)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(123)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  Criterion variable: career decision self-efficacy
U: The unique contribution of the predictor. This is equal to the squared semipartial correlation of the predictor with the criterion variable.
C: The commonality of the predictors (e.g., C(13) indicates the proportion of the variance accounted for in common by acculturation to the U.S. and hope).
Negative values of commonalities can be obtained when the two predictors are negatively correlated with each other and both predictors positively correlate to a criterion variable. This negative value should not be interpreted as the proportion of the variance (Cohen et al., 2003; Pedhazur, 1997).

Formulas (Pedhazur, 1997)

C (12) = - $R^2_3 + R^2_{13} + R^2_{23} - R^2_{123}$
C (13) = - $R^2_2 + R^2_{12} + R^2_{23} - R^2_{123}$
C (23) = - $R^2_1 + R^2_{12} + R^2_{13} - R^2_{123}$
C (123) = $R^2_1 + R^2_2 + R^2_3 - R^2_{12} - R^2_{23} - R^2_{13} + R^2_{123}$

$R^2_1 = .141$ (R squared when acculturation to the U.S. alone is in model)
$R^2_2 = .026$ (R squared when acculturation to Korea alone is in model)
$R^2_3 = .489$ (R squared when hope alone is in model)
$R^2_{23} = .491$ (R squared when acculturation to Korea and hope are in model)
$R^2_{13} = .522$ (R squared when acculturation to the U.S. and hope are in model)
$R^2_{12} = .167$ (R squared when the two acculturation variables are in model)
$R^2_{123} = .525$ (R squared when all of the three predictors are in model)
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Summary of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis 1 from the Complete Case Analysis (N = 199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>95% C. I. $B$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$sr^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2_{adj}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>[.246, .480]</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .005]</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>[.093, .282]</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.000, .003]</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>[.716, 1.002]</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>[.094, .293]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.000, .003]</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>[.710, 1.000]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × Hope</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>[-.256, .170]</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>[.093, .292]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.000, .003]</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>[.709, .999]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × Hope</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>[-.255, .171]</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea × Hope</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>[-.002, .005]</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Summary of the Hierarchical Regression Analysis 2 from the Complete Case Analysis (N = 188)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% C. I. B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>sr²</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² adj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>[.264, .505]</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .005]</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>[.255, .502]</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .005]</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGRP</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>[-.194, .115]</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>[.160, .452]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .005]</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGRP</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>[-.172, .140]</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × PGRP</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>[-.023, .521]</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S.</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>[.162, .454]</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>[.001, .006]</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PGRP</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>[-.166, .148]</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to the U.S. × PGRP</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>[-.017, .528]</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation to Korea × PGRP</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>[-.006, .003]</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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