Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

6-2-1990

Communication Stress and Coping Strategies Among Japanese University Students in the United States

Atsuko Kurogi
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [International and Intercultural Communication Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Kurogi, Atsuko, "Communication Stress and Coping Strategies Among Japanese University Students in the United States" (1990). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 4072.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5956>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Atsuko Kurogi for the Master of Arts in Speech Communication presented July 2, 1990.

Title: Communication Stress and Coping Strategies Among Japanese University Students in the United States.

APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Devorah A. Lieberman, Chair

Leslie Good

Stephen Kbsokoff

Arthur Terry

The significant increase of Japanese students studying in the United States suggests an increase in interactions with Americans. However, it does not mean that Japanese are aware of intercultural communication. They may experience stress in their interactions and their acculturative process because of cultural differences. They also may try to cope with the stress in their own way. Their stress and coping

strategies may affect their academic performance, which is the most important aspect in their student life.

The purpose of this study is to examine whether there is any relationship among communication stressors, coping strategies, perceived academic self-efficacy, self-statement of grade point average (GPA), and biodemographic variables. The questionnaire was handed to 100 Japanese university students studying in Portland, Oregon and Vancouver, Washington.

Significant results emerged. Of the subjects, 81% had no previous training in intercultural communication. Japanese students reported that their communication stressors concern mainly academic tasks and in-class interactions. They also reported frequent use of emotion-focused coping strategies. Positive correlations emerged between emotion-focused and problem-focused coping strategies. This suggests that both emotion-focused and problem-focused coping strategies affect Japanese students.

The lack of language proficiency and academic experience in the United States may be factors adding to academic stress. Also, in-class interaction stressors may come from the culture differences. There are great differences between Japanese and American classroom behaviors and communication styles. This can be explained using high-context and low-context culture differences. In terms of Japanese students' stressors, it is speculated that previous training in intercultural communication is perhaps as meaningful as acquiring language proficiency and academic experience.

It is suggested that Japanese students often use emotion-focused coping strategies because they may perceive problematic events or situations personally and emotionally. It is not easy for Japanese to separate the conflict from the person. They seek social emotional support to cope with their stress. At the same time, they use problem-focused coping strategies. The interrelation between emotion-focused and problem-focused coping strategies seems to be related to Japanese cultural values. Japanese emotional support usually encourages self-discipline, which is highly valued in the Japanese culture. Self-discipline requiring hardship, endurance, and effort promotes problem-focused coping strategies. On the other hand, Japanese may use emotion-focused coping strategies after they have tried problem-focused coping strategies. "Akirameru" (to resign oneself) for the irreversible situations against one's wish can be proof of maturity and wisdom in the Japanese society.

Some factors need to be taken into consideration if this research is to be replicated. The language used in questionnaires should be presented as simply as possible. The length of questionnaires should not be so long as to frustrate respondents, and the scale would need to be set up to allow respondents to answer more readily.

Further research should be designed based on clarifying the subjects' social networks because this may affect their stressors, coping strategies, perceived academic self-efficacy, and GPA. Research addressing stress and coping

strategies also needs to be designed longitudinally since the positive aspect of stress may affect their degree of stress and specific coping strategies, and it may suggest positive factors in their acculturative process.

COMMUNICATION STRESS AND COPING STRATEGIES
AMONG JAPANESE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
IN THE UNITED STATES

by
ATSUKO KUROGI

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
SPEECH COMMUNICATION

Portland State University

1990

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Atsuko Kurogi presented July 2, 1990.

Devorah A. Lieberman, Chair

Leslie Good

Stephen Kosokoff

Arthur Terry

APPROVED:

Theodore G. Grove, Chair, Department of Speech Communication

C. William Savery, Interim Vice Provost for Graduate Studies
and Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has been supported by the encouragement of many people. First, I would like to thank Dr. Lieberman with my respect. She never spared her time and energy in guiding me through my thesis work. Without her support and caring I could not have completed this thesis. I learned an attitude toward study, education, and life through her. Words are not enough to express my gratitude and respect for Dr. Leiberman.

I am thankful to Linc, my tutor, who read my papers throughout my course work and the thesis. He was patient and sincere in doing so. For me, the challenge in writing a thesis was not only to write it in a second language but also to work with a computer. Dr. Good gave me useful advice and Chris in the Computer Lab gave me a lot of information. Muneo helped make the tables. Thanks to them I completed my first empirical research. Also, I would like to thank the hundred Japanese students who answered the questionnaire and those who helped collect the subjects.

My special thanks go to my friends. Mamie always supported me personally. Talking and sharing with her was my most useful coping strategy for stressful study and life in the United States. Jane encouraged me with her experience of working hard on a thesis in a foreign country. Noriko and Qiu Lu shared the difficulty and pleasure of studying

Intercultural Communication with me. Robin, Sue, and Neil accepted and understood me with their warm hearts. A friend who always said, "Study hard!," Chris, thank you.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my parents, Nobuo Kurogi and Mariko Kurogi. Because of their love I could accomplish my study in the United States. I am also grateful to my sisters, Tomoko and Masako.

It seemed to me that writing this acknowledgment was very difficult because encouragement and support that everyone gave me were not completely expressed in words. So, all I can do is to send the simplest but most beautiful thought, "Thank you" to them. I keep this thought, with their hearts, in my mind.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Justification	3
Definitions	4
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Cultural Distance	6
High-/Low-Context Culture Nonverbal Communication vs. Verbal Communication Indirect Communication vs. Direct Communication	
Stress	13
Acculturative Stress	16
Stress Reaction in Academic Performance .	18
Stressors	19
Coping Strategies	20
Perceived Academic Self-Efficacy	25
Biodemographic Variables	27
Purpose of this Study	27
Research Questions	28

CHAPTER		PAGE
III	RESEARCH METHODS	29
	Subjects	29
	Procedure	29
	Instrument	30
IV	RESULTS	33
	Biodemographic Variables	33
	Stressors	40
	Coping Strategies	42
	Statistical Analysis	44
	Biodemographic Variables	
	Stressors	
	Coping Strategies	
	Results for the Research Questions . . .	47
V	DISCUSSION	51
	Biodemographic Variables	51
	Stress and Stressors	53
	Coping Strategies	58
VI	LIMITATIONS	67
	Further Research	69
	REFERENCES	75
	APPENDIX	
A	CONSENT FORM AND QUESTIONNAIRE	84
B	STRESSORS CATEGORIES	94
C	COPING STRATEGIES CATEGORIES	98
D	HIGHLY STRESSFUL SITUATIONS	104
E	LOW STRESSFUL SITUATIONS	106
F	COPING STRATEGIES	109

APPENDIX

PAGE

G	INTERCORRELATION OF BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND PERCEIVED STRESSORS	111
H	INTERCORRELATION OF BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND COPING STRATEGIES	113
I	INTERCORRELATION AMONG BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES	115
J	INTERCORRELATION OF PERCEIVED STRESSORS AND COPING STRATEGIES	117
K	INTERCORRELATIONS OF PERCEIVED STRESSORS AND COPING STRATEGIES	119
L	INTERCORRELATION AMONG COPING STRATEGIES . .	121

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Class/Academic Level of subjects	35
II	Reported Grade Point Average	35
III	Subjects' Length of Stay in the United States .	36
IV	Subjects' Previous Training in Intercultural Communication	36
V	Subjects' Plans for Staying in the United States	37
VI	Subjects' Previous Trips to the United States .	37
VII	Number of Good American Friends Reported by Subjects	38
VIII	Subjects' Perceived Academic Self-Efficacy for the Term	39
IX	Subjects' Perceived Academic Self-Efficacy for the Year	39
X	Subjects' Perceived Academic Self-Efficacy for a Degree	40
XI	Intercorrelations of Biodemographic Variables and Perceived Stressors	112
XII	Intercorrelation of Biodemographic Variables and Coping Strategies	114
XIII	Intercorrelation among Biodemographic Variables	116

TABLE		PAGE
XIV	Intercorrelation among Perceived Stressors . .	118
XV	Intercorrelations of Perceived Stressors and Coping Strategies	120
XVI	Intercorrelation among Coping Strategies . . .	122

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1. Histogram Correlating Highly Stressful Situations on the Stress Level Scale	105
2. Histogram 1 Correlating Low Stressful Situations on the Stress Level Scale	107
3. Histogram 2 Correlating Low Stressful Situations on the Stress Level Scale	108
4. Correlation of the Frequency of the Use of Coping Strategies on the Stress Level Scale	110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The number of Japanese coming to the United States to study is increasing. The number of Japanese in Portland (e.g., students, professors and families) increased from 215 (95 males, 120 females) in 1986, to 475 (195 males, 275 females) in 1988, according to the "Survey of Japanese in the United States," done in 1986 and 1988 by the Japanese consulate in Portland. That represents a 100% increase in the number of Japanese moving to Portland in a two-year period. The number of Japanese students attending Portland State University also has increased--from 63 in Spring 1981, to 106 in Spring 1989. This is a 68.25% increase in Japanese students within three years, as reported by the Office of International Students Service at Portland State University in the Spring of 1981 and 1988. According to the Committee on Foreign Students and International Policy, an arm of the American Council on Education, the number of international students in American higher education will increase to over one million in the early 1990s (Scully, 1981).

This significant increase of Japanese students living in the United States also suggests an increase in intercultural interaction. The language barrier is often cited as the biggest difficulty for international students in their

interaction with Americans and in academic performance (Cieslak, 1955; Bois, 1956; Selltitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook, 1963). However, in terms of intercultural communication, cultural differences, other than language, are possibly as influential on the success of these interactions.

Language is a vehicle in verbal communication, but culture is the foundation of communication (Porter and Samovar, 1988). When persons from different cultures communicate, basic cultural differences emerge. This may affect the interaction process and increase communication difficulty.) Intercultural sojourners experience stress during the process of adjustment to a different culture (Lazarus, 1969). While intercultural sojourners lack knowledge about culture and appropriate social skills (Furnham and Bochner, 1982), the act of interacting itself may be a stressor.

Though several researchers have commented that stress affects the sojourners psychologically and physically (Barna, 1976, 1983), there is little research about what specifically causes stress, how to cope with it, and whether there is any relationship between stress level, coping, and academic performance. According to Bandura (1977), the expectations of self-efficacy determine the initiation of coping behavior, the effort toward achievement, and overcoming cultural obstacles. Perceived academic self-efficacy may influence stress levels and coping factors (Dinges and Lieberman, 1989).

International students employ "coping strategies . . . to either obviate or decrease the impact of stressors" (Dinges and Lieberman, 1989, p. 1). Possibly, Japanese students may employ culture-specific coping strategies aimed at reducing communication stress and achieving academic goals.

The purpose of this research is to examine whether there is any relationship among communication stressors, perceived academic self-efficacy, coping strategies, and academic performance (grade point average) among Japanese university students in the United States.

JUSTIFICATION

The study of Japanese students' communication stressors and coping strategies might be a step toward understanding communication difficulties for Japanese students and suggesting ways of dealing with stressors in their adjustment process to the United States. Examining the relationships between communication stressors and coping strategies might offer information for developing structured programs addressing international students, i.e., international students' orientation programs or pre-sojourn training programs for students coming to study in the United States. Also, the examination of the possible relationships among communication stressors, coping strategies, perceived academic self-efficacy, and academic performance can provide some information for advising international students. The results of this research will offer further information regarding

communication stress and adaptation of Japanese university students in the United States. Biodemographic variables may provide specific information for intercultural counseling.

Possible correlations between biodemographic variables, communication stressors, and coping strategies might offer suggestions to an intercultural orientation program for the Japanese students in particular or international students in general. Thus, this research might give more information to those who interact professionally and personally with international students.

DEFINITIONS

1. Stressor: Selye (1983) defines stressor as a condition which causes stress. The stress-producing factor is a "stressor." According to Lazarus (1971), stress is defined as the reaction to environmental stimulus depending on individual interpretation of the significance of a harmful, threatening, or challenging event. Stressors are threatening stimuli in everyday interaction (Spradley and Phillips, 1972). Based upon these definitions, stressors are the factors in one's environment which produce stress.

2. Communication stressor: according to the interactional and psychological definition of stress (Lazarus, 1971), communication itself may be a stressor. Communication stressors are defined as specific interactions producing stress.

3. Coping strategies: coping strategies are defined as ways of dealing with stress. Coping strategies are either to obviate or decrease the impact of stressors (Dinges and Lieberman, 1989).

4. Perceived academic self-efficacy: according to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy determines coping behavior: how much effort and time one expends to cope with some situations. An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes (Bandura, 1977). Perceived academic self-efficacy is defined as the perceived expectations of self-efficacy to accomplish one's academic performance/achievement.

5. GPA: GPA stands for cumulative grade point average. Cumulative grade point averages include credits and points earned at a university after admission. The GPA is computed based on the following scale: A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1, F = 0 (Portland State University Bulletin, 1988-1989).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

CULTURAL DISTANCE

Porter and Samovar (1988) state, "Culture and communication are inseparable. . . . Culture, consequently is the foundation of communication. And, when cultures vary, communication practices also vary" (p. 20). In this sense, intercultural communication may have added difficulties because of cultural diversity. Triandis and Vassiliou (1972) stated that the degree of cultural differences correlates with the degree of difficulty in interactions. Furnham and Bochner (1982) also said that the degree of difficulty in sojourners' everyday interaction is directly related to their disparity (or cultural distance). Cultural distance accounts for the amount of distress experienced by people from one culture living or staying in another (Furnham and Bochner, 1986). The degree of alienation, estrangement, and concomitant psychological distress is a function of the distance between one's own culture and a host culture.

According to Graham (1983), the more cultural differences international students experience, the greater their acculturative stress. There is maximum cultural distance between "Asians" (Japanese) and "Westerners" (Americans),

and it suggests there is maximum communication disparity and difficulty between these two cultures (Porter and Samovar, 1988). Thus, Japanese studying in the United States may experience high stress because of the great cultural differences. Graham suggested that Japanese students, in comparison to other students, at Brigham Young University, Hawaii campus, express the widest range of complaints, a factor which may reflect a lower tolerance for cultural diversity. This implies that Japanese students may have greater stress and more difficulty adjusting when interacting with Americans than they would in other cultures.

High-/Low-Context Culture

According to Hall (1976),

A high-context (HC) communication or message is one in which more of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while very little is in the coded, explicit part of the message. A low-context communication is just opposite; i.e., the mass of information is vested in the explicit code (p. 79).

Japanese culture is basically high-context. In Japan one communicates with another by using little information and putting stress on nonverbal behavior, whereas in America one is basically low-context. Americans need a lot more information to communicate; verbal messages are stressed rather than nonverbal ones. According to Gudykunst and Nishida (1986), "the level of context influences all other aspects of communication" (p. 527). The different context level, either high-context or low-context, is reflected in communication styles. There are two specific differences between

Japanese (high-context) and American (low-context) communication styles: one is nonverbal vs. verbal; the other is indirect vs. direct.

Nonverbal Communication vs. Verbal Communication

Theorists advocate that verbal communication in high-context cultures does not carry as significant a message as nonverbal communication (Hall, 1976; Gudykunst and Nishida, 1986). On the other hand, more verbal interaction is needed in the low-context cultures for clearer understanding of the message. Ramsey (1985) described these differences as follows: the Japanese communication style is "hear one and understand ten" (p. 312), while the American's is "say ten thoughts with ten thoughts" (p. 311). This suggests that the Japanese tend to understand and communicate without verbalizing every thought, whereas Americans tend to verbalize more thoughts in their communication. Ishii and Klopff's (1976) report empirically supported this difference: the average American devotes about twice the time to verbal interaction (6 hours, 43 minutes) than do the Japanese (3 hours, 31 minutes) in a day.

In Katayama's (1982) research he cited 320 Japanese proverbs on the negative values of language, such as: "To say nothing is flower," "Those who know do not speak, those who speak do not know," "Silence is gold, eloquence is silver," "Out of the mouth comes all evil." Mistrust of words and their limitations can lead people to rely on

nonverbal communication, such as manners etiquette and form (Ramsey and Birk, 1983).

The classroom setting is a good example for measuring the emphasis on either nonverbal communication or verbal communication in the two cultures. It is surprising for Japanese students studying in American universities to see the professors in jeans and sitting on a desk or the students coming to class late, passing in front of their professors, stretching their legs, chewing gum, eating popcorn, and going out from class in the middle of the lecture (M. Joraku, personal communication, March 8, 1989). These nonverbal behaviors are not seen in Japanese classrooms, because Japanese perceive the behaviors as lacking respect, and the Japanese are expected to assume respectable nonverbal role behavior (teacher/student). In this case, it would be (1) arriving on time, (2) dressing formally, and (3) not eating in class. Some students may not listen to the lecture but their definitions of good manners are required. When they exhibit "good manners," they are perceived as good students. "Good manners" are defined as those behaviors which do not upset the atmosphere in the classroom. On the contrary, American students, within the American setting, chewing gum or eating popcorn, are not perceived as disrupting the class. As long as they are listening, asking questions, and giving their opinions, they are perceived as good students (N. Nakagawa, personal communication, April 1, 1989).

Japanese students are less inclined to initiate and maintain conversations than are American students. In general, Japanese speak less frequently and for a shorter time than American students (Ishii, Klopff, and Cambra, 1979, 1984). It is difficult for Japanese students to ask questions freely, state their opinions, argue, and criticize as much as Americans (Ulrich, 1986). Thus, the strong emphasis on verbal communication in the American classroom environment could be a stressor for Japanese.

Indirect Communication vs. Direct Communication

Hall (1976) stated that people raised in high-context cultures expect that others will understand what they are communicating. Thus, people in high-context cultures will speak indirectly, implicitly, and ambiguously (Gudykunst and Nishida, 1986).

One of the concepts that promotes indirect communication styles in Japan is "sasshi-enryo." "Sasshi" as a noun means conjecture, surmise, guess, judgment, and understanding what a person and a sign means (Nishida, 1977). The speaker depends on the listener to surmise the meaning of the message through context and nonverbal behavior. "Enryo" is the message-screening process in which ideas and feelings that may hurt the other person or damage the atmosphere are sent back for re-examination in an internal self-feedback process. When both speakers and listeners have consideration of the

other person and the context, they use "sasshi-enryo" (Ishii and Bruneau, 1988).

Ueda (1974) says that the Japanese must think of the feelings of others and avoid hurting those feelings in their interpersonal communication. She discusses the 16 ways to avoid saying "no" in Japan. Each of the 16 ways is indirect, such as silence, counter question, tangential responses, delaying answers, and so on (pp. 186-188). This seems to depend on the reciprocal relationship between "sasshi" and "enryo." "Sasshi," in this context, means a speaker expects that a listener will guess the message "no," even if the speaker says nothing direct. "Enryo" means a listener thinks that he should avoid asking another question to make sure whether the message means "yes" or "no." This is because indirectness comes from the speaker's consideration in not hurting the listener's feelings. Thus, for example, when a friend is asked if she would like to see a movie, and she says, "Maybe" or "I'll think about it," the message usually means "no," based on the lack of commitment, the context, and her nonverbal behavior. This is the first person's "sasshi" and the second person's "enryo."

The listener is expected to guess and develop the message ("sasshi"), and the speaker expresses himself/herself through his/her self-feedback process to avoid hurting the other's feelings and damaging the atmosphere. Indirect forms of communication in Japan are related to the value of interdependence and harmony in a group (Okabe, 1983). According

to Condon (1974) using Rogelio Diaz Guerrero's notion, the Japanese place value on "interpersonal reality" which is more important than "objective reality," that is, feelings are greater than mere facts. This cultural value may be related to saving face. Since they care about others' feelings more than facts, they may use particular communication strategies to save face. "Sasshi-enryo" is functional in saving face, which is necessary to maintain the interdependence and good harmony in a group. Indirect communication style seems to come from considering interdependence and group harmony.

On the contrary, American communication styles are more verbal and direct, and focus on information specific to the individuals (Gudykunst and Nishida, 1986). The difference between directness and indirectness is significantly marked in the level of directness and indirectness. According to Okabe (1983), an American might say, "The door is open," as an indirect way of asking the listener to shut the door. In Japan, instead of saying, "The door is open," one often says, "It is somewhat cold today." This is even more indirect, because no words refer to the door. The Japanese communication style comes from Japanese cultural values, which keep harmony in a group based on interdependence, while American communication styles are more direct and individually focused because their cultural values are individualistic and independent.

Condon and Yousef (1975) describe these cultural value differences between Japanese culture and American culture

with an example of the national flags. The individual stars symbolizing each state in the American flag are equally independent. On the Japanese flag, a single red circle on a field of white represents national unity as a whole including every individual person, which is supported by interdependence and harmony within the circle (Condon and Yousef, 1975). "All values are related in a culture" (Condon, 1974, p. 138). The different communication styles such as nonverbal vs. verbal and indirect vs. direct between Japanese culture and American culture come from their cultural value differences. The cultural value differences between the Japanese and American cultures seem to be almost polarized and reflect a maximum cultural distance (Porter and Samovar, 1988). Considering culture as the foundation of communication, a maximum cultural distance may become a maximum difficulty for effective communication. This cultural distance may be the cause of numerous stressors in intercultural interactions. In spite of a maximum cultural distance, there is little research about identifying specific stressors in Japanese and American interactions.

STRESS

Stress has been defined in many ways. For the purposes of this study, Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) approach to stress is adopted. Lazarus (1971) has an interactional and psychological view of stress, pointing out that both the environmental stimuli and the reacting individual are crucial

elements in stress. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) define stress as "a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and endangering his or her well-being" (p. 19).

Stress goes by many names: anxiety, anomie, conflict, uncertainty, frustration, and culture shock (Spradley and Phillips, 1972). Adler (1975) defines culture shock as "a form of anxiety which results from the misunderstanding of commonly perceived and understood signs and symbols of social interaction" (p. 13). When entering a new culture, one's own familiar signs and symbols may be useless or dysfunctional in interactions with people in a host country. Cultural values, beliefs, roles, norms, and communication styles do not always apply in a different cultural environment. This is where interactions may be the most stressful. This feeling may be called "communication stress." International students may experience stress when interacting with people in a host country. There are studies which report the difficulty of international students adjusting to a new academic environment (Wayman, 1984).

In Hofstede's (1986) research, he suggests cultural differences in teaching and learning based on four cultural dimensions: individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/femininity. The Japanese culture is very different from the American in each of the four dimensions. The marked differences may be the Japanese

students' stressors. According to Hofstede (1986), Japanese students generally speak up in class only when called upon personally by the teacher, while American students generally speak up in class in response to a general invitation by the teacher. Neither Japanese teachers nor students should ever be made to lose face, while face-consciousness is weak among Americans. Respect for teachers is also shown outside class in Japan, while teachers are treated as equals outside class in the United States.

Stress is experienced throughout the university system. Even when international students are alone in the library, they encounter a different library system. Wayman (1984) states that frustration and misunderstanding for both students and librarians is no longer a minor problem, but a major communication problem. In addition to these school interactions, students have to adjust to life off-campus encountering everything from finding a residence to social interaction. Although it seems to be easy to speculate on potential international students' stressors, there is lack of research confirming the particular communication stressors. There has been some research addressing stress in the communication settings (Cushman and King, 1986; King, 1987; Sorcinelli, 1989); however, except for Dinges and Lieberman (1989), there has been little intercultural research focusing on specific communication stressors in intercultural settings. Dinges and Lieberman examined relationships between stressors and coping strategies among international students studying

at a Northwest university. However, the research was culture-general and did not focus on one cultural group. They concluded that subgroup differences based on the cultural origin of the students are important and need to be examined (Dinges and Lieberman, 1989).

Klein (1977) stated that stress is a key element for adjustment in intercultural interaction and that culture plays an important role in determining what a particular stressor may be. For example, in Graham's (1983) research, Japanese students identify "rudeness in public" and "apathetic attitude" as annoying or irritating traits of others. Lebra (1976) also says that direct verbal communication causes Japanese stress. Thus, culture may determine what is stressful in adjusting to a new cultural environment. Furthermore, what causes stress may vary from culture to culture. Examining specific stressors is a step toward identifying potential culture-specific stressors.

ACCULTURATIVE STRESS

Marden and Meyer (1986) define acculturation as "the change in individuals whose primary learning has been in one culture and who take over traits from another culture" (p. 36). A generalization about acculturation is that individuals exposed to changing culture experience psychological disruption (Graham, 1983). Kim (1977) emphasized the importance of communication as the acculturation medium. This is because communication in a new cultural environment may not

be easy, and individuals may experience stress during the process of acculturation. The concept of acculturative stress is a particular set of stressors which occurs during acculturation, i.e., confusion, anxiety, depression, feelings of marginality, alienation, and identity confusion (Berry, Kim, Minde, and Mok, 1987). Japanese students studying in the United States are no exception; they experience acculturative stress in their process of acculturation. Adjusting to culture change in a new environment is stressful, however, it seems to promote cultural awareness and personal growth. Adler (1975) discussed culture shock as a positive stress reaction because one can experience new cultural and personal discoveries through their transitional experience. Dyal and Dyal (1981) pointed to "change in cognitive styles," "change in self-esteem," "change in ethnic identification," and "change in coping techniques" as some dimensions along with which change is likely to occur as a result of acculturation process (p. 306). According to Kim (1989), "Stress-Adaptation-Growth Dynamics" shows a positive relationship between stress and adaptation. This suggests that possibly the more stress people experience, the more easily they can adapt to a new culture. From these perspectives, stress may not only have the negative aspect that many people in general try to avoid, but also may have a positive aspect. It is a fact that one can hardly avoid stress in the acculturative process. The point is not how to avoid stress but how to cope with stress in the process and also to perceive stress not

only negatively but also positively. As stress experiences are related to cultural awareness and personal growth, it is crucial to do research about stress and coping from not only a negative perspective but also a positive one.

STRESS REACTION IN ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Stress refers to a broad class of problems because it encompasses physiological, social, and psychological demands which tax the system (Lazarus, 1971). According to Barna (1983), "stress can cause all types of illnesses, psychological disturbances, and social maladjustments, including obesity and poor academic performance" (p. 20). Academic performance is one of the most important parts of the students' life. According to Sharma's (1973) survey, 195 foreign students in North Carolina expressed that academic difficulties rank as the highest anxiety producers. Academic success is generally perceived as the most serious concern among international students (Klineberg and Hull, 1979).

There are some symptoms which may reflect stress regarding students' academic performance, such as irritability, compulsive sleeping, eating, and drinking, or loss of ability to work effectively (Kohls, 1984). In an interview of Tongan and Samoan students at Brigham Young University, Hawaii campus, they identified their reactions to feelings of depression: (1) not studying; (2) excessive sleeping; (3) spending much time with sports; and (4) speaking with their own cultural groups (Graham, 1983). This highlights

the possibility that stress negatively affects academic performance. On the other hand, in the same research done by Graham in 1983, Chinese students faced with similar depression tended to concentrate on their academic goals, sublimating their problems. Thus, cultures vary in coping strategies in stressful situations.

STRESSORS

According to John Cassel (1970), there are specific factors which cause stress in social situations: when the outcome of important events is uncertain; when flight or fight are inappropriate coping mechanisms; when the outcome will be dependent upon constant vigilance; when aspirations are blocked; and when meaningful human intercourse is restricted. In short, uncertainty, inappropriateness, fear, and restriction can be stressors. Rabkin and Struening (1976) also stated that, "speed of change, prolonged exposure, lack of preparedness, and lack of prior experience have each been found to heighten the impact of stressful events" (p. 1018). They perceive stressors from a psychological perspective; the cognitive process determines whether the event will be stressful. Thus, stressors may include lack of perceived control, a sense of helplessness, a threat to one's ego or self-esteem, inability to predict outcomes, and social isolation (Barna, 1983).

Many researchers say that ambiguity, uncertainty, and unpredictability are the first and foremost causes of stress

for sojourners (Barna, 1983). However, it is not determined what specific communication stressors are experienced by international students or any one cultural group. There has been a lack of research identifying specific communication situations causing stress for Japanese students (e.g., asking a question in class, registering for classes, having personal contact with the faculty). The research focusing on communication stressors in one cultural group is an attempt to identify culture-specific stressors in the intercultural communication setting.

COPING STRATEGIES

Mental health researchers and counseling services on campus have long been most concerned with examining stress and coping among college students (Befus, 1988; Higginbotham, 1979). Staff members assigned to counsel or give advice to international students are aware of the importance of obtaining multicultural perspectives and cultural sensitivity in their communication (Higginbotham, 1979). The research, however, has not concentrated on any one cultural group (Furnham, 1987). It is uncertain which specific coping strategies Japanese students most often employ. Furnham pointed out that research addressing coping strategies and stress in specific cultural groups among international students is needed.

In research addressing "problems and sources of difficulties" among students from 11 different countries, only

Japanese students ranked "lack of personal counseling" high (Klineberg and Hull, 1979). This suggests that Japanese students rarely use personal counseling as a coping strategy. Even if they know that a counseling service is available on campus, they probably do not use it as much as Americans, because Japanese still have a strong prejudice against mental health services in the private sector as well as in the educational system (Hiraki, 1984). Thus, it is assumed for the Japanese that personal counseling merely means to talk about their stress/problems to someone personally. In this sense, "lack of personal counseling" seems to have two factors: one is difficulty in disclosing themselves, and the other is lack of close associates to talk to about their inner feelings/problems.

According to Barnlund (1975), a Japanese person's public self (accessibility to others) is smaller, and his private self (the proportion not disclosed) is larger than Americans. In other words, Japanese interpersonal distance, which is measured verbally, is greater. Japanese tend to talk only in general terms to their closest associates--for example, their parents and intimate friends (Barnlund, 1975). This Japanese self-disclosure pattern suggests that they have more communication with close associates in their group such as living/working/studying in the same place (Okabe, 1983; Nakane, 1974). In other words, they self-disclose little with others who are unknown or out-group. They have little small talk. This communication pattern could be one of the

reasons why counseling is unfamiliar to them and is not as pervasive as in the United States. In general, when Japanese have stress or difficulty, they go to their closest associates such as their parents or intimate friends, instead of going to a counselor.

This raises another aspect of the Japanese students' coping: do Japanese students living in the United States have intimate American friends to whom they disclose their problems/stress? Separation between Americans and international students suggests that making American friends is often difficult for international students (Mestenhauser, 1983). It may be particularly difficult for Japanese students, because of their lack of communication initiation and indirect, high-context behavior (Klineberg and Hull, 1979).

After all, "lack of personal counseling" seems to have two meanings: one is that they may not have appropriate people to whom to disclose their stress problems; the other is that their small public self may prevent them from disclosing themselves, limiting the persons to whom they disclose. There seems to be a cultural reason why "lack of personal counseling" is ranked as a problem.

Lazarus (1979) suggested two coping mechanisms for intercultural sojourners: (1) preparatory coping (learning the language and getting information about the country); and (2) emotion-focused coping (consisting of various defensive mechanisms, such as denial, intellectualizing, and avoiding

negative thoughts). Mechanic (1970) claimed that there are three ways to cope with stress: (1) instrumental (skills and capacities done by preparation such as information seeking), (2) anticipatory problem solving (preparation of alternative strategies), and (3) motivation and socioemotional defenses. Lazarus's emotion-focused coping and Mechanic's socioemotional defenses include attention deployment, defensive reappraisal, and the wish-fulfilling fantasies of relief (Barna, 1983, p. 34).

In addition to these defensive mechanisms, there is other research about training programs or orientations helping cope with stress. Randolph, Landis, and Tzeng (1977) give "Culture Assimilator Training," in which students prepare for their new cultural experiences with information and knowledge about their host country. Harris and Moran (1977) state that it is important for intercultural sojourners to learn the verbal and nonverbal languages of the host country.

One of the interesting trainings is Meichenbaum's (1975) "Inoculation Training" in which the goal is not to avoid stress but to manage stress. Stress-inoculation training has three methods: (1) educating people about the nature of stressful reactions, (2) making them rehearse various coping behaviors, and (3) giving them an opportunity to practice their new coping skills in a stressful situation. The purpose of this training seems to be related to the idea of a positive perspective of stress. That is, people learn through this training not how to avoid stress but how to

manage stress. However, the question is whether Japanese students have an opportunity to have such training before and/or after their intercultural experience.

Triandis, Brislin, and Hui (1988) suggested another perspective for designing a training program, which divided individualism and collectivism. They define collectivist and individualist cultures as follows: the former is where one can find individuals who are "allocentric," meaning their primary attentions are to the needs of a group; the latter is where one can find individuals who are "idiocentric," meaning they pay more attention to their own needs than to the needs of others (p. 271). They discuss samples of collectivist cultures such as Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and samples of individualist cultures such as the United States and Northwestern Europe. There are a lot of differences between them, such as the self, activities, attitudes, values, and behaviors. They point to the key factors for training either collectivists to interact with individualists or individualists to interact with collectivists. Triandis, Brislin, and Hui selected some points as models for training collectivists to interact with individualists: "Expect the other to be more emotionally detached from events that occur in her ingroup than is likely in your culture" (p. 279); "Do not feel threatened if the other acts competitively" (p. 279). Their approach to intercultural training seems to be a new attempt to design the program by focusing on culture-specific characteristics.

Japanese students also ranked "insufficient previous training" as a problem and a source of difficulty (Klineberg and Hull, 1979). Thus, Japanese students may not be able to get information or knowledge about social skills or coping strategies in a different culture through their training. This background may not only increase their stress but also characterize their coping strategies. In other words, there could be any cultural-specific coping strategies under their cultural-social background.

"Lack of personal counseling" and "insufficient previous training" as difficulties among Japanese students seem to come from their social and cultural factors: prejudice toward a mental health service, difficulty in self-disclosing, difficulty in having close associates, and unawareness of intercultural communication. The Japanese social/cultural factors including these aspects may characterize Japanese coping strategies. Thus, there could be many specific characteristics for and types of coping strategies among Japanese students.

PERCEIVED ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY

According to Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory, "expectations of personal efficacy determine whether coping behavior will be initiated, how much effort will be expended, and how long it will be sustained in the face of obstacles" (p. 191). An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can execute the behavior required to produce the

outcomes (Bandura, 1977). Thus, the strength of the conviction is likely to affect whether they will even try to cope with given situations. In this sense, perceived self-efficacy influences choice of behavior, such as initiation and persistence of coping behavior (Bandura, 1977). In terms of perceived academic self-efficacy, when the students have low self-efficacy about completing their academic goals, they may try to avoid some behavioral settings or may not even attempt to cope with some threatening situations. On the contrary, the students with high perceived academic self-efficacy may have stronger perseverance for coping with problematic situations. For example, if a student earns a "D" on his midterm examination, he may go to talk to his professor about it and may ask to have a make-up assignment if he has high self-efficacy; however, if he has low self-efficacy, he may not go to talk to his professor at all. This is because people tend to avoid threatening situations they believe exceed their coping skills, while they get involved in activities when they judge themselves capable of handling situations (Bandura, 1977).

Perceived academic self-efficacy suggests that how students perceive their academic performance affects both their choice of activities and settings, and coping efforts. This translates into how much effort they exert to cope with stress, and how long these efforts are maintained. Perceived self-efficacy can be a factor relating to stressors and coping strategies. The study of relationships among

perceived self-efficacy, stressors, and coping in any one cultural group may give researchers another perspective.

BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Furnham and Bochner (1982) classify three conditions causing culture shock: (1) cultural differences; (2) individual differences; and (3) sojourn experience. Individual differences (age, sex, length of stay, educational level, number of American friends, previous training experience) and sojourn experience (previous sojourn experience) need further consideration as there has been little empirical research regarding individual difference factors in intercultural settings (Taft, 1981; Furnham, 1987). Moreover, Furnham (1987) puts emphasis on the importance of investigating the relevant variables (cultural differences and individual differences) in current intercultural communication research.

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

Dinges and Lieberman's (1989) research examined communication stressors and coping in an intercultural setting, purporting that it is important to examine subgroup differences based on the cultural origin of students, and to expand biodemographic variables to incorporate a greater range of potential predictors, and possibly, in turn, better adaptation.

Based on the review of literature, the present research is intended to examine the relationship among communication stressors, perceived academic self-efficacy, academic performance (grade point average), coping strategies, and biodemographic variables among the Japanese university students in the United States.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on previous literature in intercultural communication the following questions arise:

Research Question 1: Are there relationships among biodemographic variables, communication stressors, coping strategies, perceived academic self-efficacy, and self-statement of GPA?

Research Question 2: Is there greater reported stress associated with communication stressors than other stressors?

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

SUBJECTS

The subjects in this study consisted of Japanese students attending universities and colleges in Portland, Oregon and Vancouver, Washington. One hundred Japanese students were selected from three universities (Portland State University, University of Portland, and the Oregon Health Sciences University), five colleges (Lewis and Clark College, Concoridia College, Portland Community College, Western Business College, and Clark College), and one institute (The Language and Culture Institute of Oregon).

PROCEDURE

Subjects were gathered through the snowball technique, in the classroom setting, through the students' personal network, or asked directly. ESL students attending English as a Second Language classes at Portland State University were asked by their instructors to complete the questionnaire. Also, Japanese teaching assistants at Portland State University completed the questionnaire. Each student responded to the 10-page, 128-question English survey (see Appendix A). Completion took approximately 20 to 30 minutes.

INSTRUMENT

The survey instrument had four sections: biodemographic information; perceived academic self-efficacy; communication stressors; and coping strategies. The demographic information consisted of gender (male/female), academic level (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate, ESL, and Postbaccalaureate), age, GPA, length of stay in the United States, previous intercultural communication training, number of previous sojourns in the United States, planned length of stay in the United States, and number of good American friends (see Appendix A).

Bandura's (1977) perceived self-efficacy scale was used. Students were asked to rate their own confidence in their academic achievement. They answered three questions by using a 10-point Likert-type scale, which ranged from most to least confident. The questions were: How confident are you in completing (1) the academic term, (2) the academic year, and (3) your degree?

The questionnaire of "International students' stress and coping" (Dinges and Lieberman, 1989) was used to measure communication stressors. The subjects read situations they might encounter in their daily lives and were asked to rate the level of stress experienced during each situation on a 10-point Likerty-type scale. They ranked their level of stress from 0 (never having stress) to 9 (highest degree of stress), leaving blank the items which they had not experienced.

The situations were classified by two major categories: (1) communication stressors including in-class interaction (e.g., giving a class presentation), social interactions (e.g., socializing over a meal), and university procedure/environment (e.g., registering for classes); and (2) non-communication stressors including academic performance (e.g., receiving a D or F on a test), and intrapersonal communication (e.g., anxiety about adopting new behaviors) (see Appendix B). This classification was used to ascertain whether there was greater reported stress for communication stressors than for other stressors.

The frequency of coping strategies was adapted from Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) "Ways of Coping" scale. The concept of this scale is that

. . . a process-oriented measurement of coping must (1) refer to specific thoughts, feelings, and acts rather than to what a person reports he/she might or would do; (2) be examined in a specific context; and (3) be studied in slices of time so that changes can be observed in what is thought, felt, and done as the requirements and appraisals or the encounters change (p. 317).

The scale had eight subscales: (1) problem-focused coping (e.g., came up with a couple of different solutions to the problem), (2) wishful thinking (e.g., wished that the situation would go away or be over with), (3) detachment (e.g., did not let it get to me; refused to think too much about it), (4) seeking emotional social support (e.g., I got professional help), (5) focusing on the positive (e.g., rediscovered what is important in life), (6) self-blame (e.g.,

realized I brought the problem on myself), (7) tension-reduction/relaxation (e.g., slept more than usual), and (8) keep to self (e.g., maintained my pride) (see Appendix C).

According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), there might be two interpretable factors in coping strategies:

. . . one is a problem-focused factor, such as coming up with several solutions, gathering information, and making a plan of action; the other is an emotion-focused factor, such as seeking emotional social support, keeping distance, avoiding, emphasizing the positive side of the situation, and self-blame (pp. 318-319).

The eight coping strategies used in this research were also categorized by these two factors: problem-focused coping had a problem-focused factor; and wishful thinking, detachment, seeking social support, focusing on the positive, self-blame, tension-reduction/relaxation, and keeping to self had an emotion-focused factor.

There were 67 coping strategies in the questionnaire. The students rated the frequency of strategies by four points, from 0 (not used) to 3 (used a great deal).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

The subjects consist of 34 male and 66 female Japanese students ranging in age from 18 to 42 years. Their academic levels are Freshman--17 subjects; Sophomore--12 subjects; Junior--7 subjects; Senior--20 subjects; Graduate--14 subjects; ESL--24 subjects; and Postbaccalaureate--5 subjects (see Table I, p. 35). Of the students, 26% report cumulative GPAs between 2.00 and 3.00, and 56% report GPAs between 3.01 and 4.00 (see Table II, p. 35). All subjects have been living in the United States between 5 months and 12 years (see Table III, p. 36). Of the subjects, 81% have no previous training in intercultural communication (see Table IV, p. 36); 65% plan to stay in the United States from 1 year to 5 years (see Table V, p. 37); 72% have had either no previous trips to the United States or have been to the United States only once (see Table VI, p. 37). The subjects report the number of good American friends ranging from 1 to 99, and 60% of the subjects have from 1 to 5 American friends (see Table VII, p. 38).

Perceived academic self-efficacy is high among Japanese students. Of the students, 87% rank their confidence

in completing the academic term more than moderately confident (greater than 5 on a 10-point Likert-type scale) (see Table VIII, p. 39); 87% are more than moderately confident about completion of the academic year (see Table IX, p. 39); and 84% are more than moderately confident about completing their academic degree (see Table X, p. 40).

TABLE I
CLASS/ACADEMIC LEVEL OF SUBJECTS

Class	Frequency	Percent
Freshman	17	17.0
Sophomore	12	12.0
Junior	7	7.0
Senior	20	20.0
Graduate	13	13.0
ESL	25	25.0
Postbaccalaureate	5	5.0
	1*	1.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

*Missing; n = 99

TABLE II
REPORTED GRADE POINT AVERAGE

GPA	Frequency	Percent
2.00 - 2.5	6	6.0
2.51 - 3.00	20	20.0
3.01 - 3.5	30	30.0
3.51 - 4.00	26	26.0
	18*	18.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

*Missing; n = 82

TABLE III
SUBJECTS' LENGTH OF STAY IN THE UNITED STATES

Length of Stay	Frequency	Percent
Less than 6 mos.	8	8.0
6 mos. - 1 year	29	29.0
1 - 2 years	34	34.0
3 - 5 years	23	23.0
5 years or more	6	6.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

n = 100

TABLE IV
SUBJECTS' PREVIOUS TRAINING IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Training	Frequency	Percent
No	81	81.0
Yes	19	19.0
TOTAL	100	100.00

n = 100

TABLE V
SUBJECTS' PLANS FOR STAYING IN THE UNITED STATES

Length of Time	Frequency	Percent
Less than 6 mos.	8	8.0
6 mos. - 1 year	17	17.0
1 - 2 years	40	40.0
3 - 5 years	25	25.0
Indefinite	10	10.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

n = 100

TABLE VI
SUBJECTS' PREVIOUS TRIPS TO THE UNITED STATES

Trips	Frequency	Percent
0 - 1	72	72.0
2 - 3	22	22.0
4 - 5	2	2.0
6 - 7	3	3.0
8 or more	1	1.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

n = 100

TABLE VII
NUMBER OF GOOD AMERICAN FRIENDS REPORTED BY SUBJECTS

No. of Friends	Frequency	Percent
0	1	1.0
1	5	5.0
2	7	7.0
3	21	21.0
4	11	11.0
5	16	16.0
6	7	7.0
7	7	7.0
8	2	2.0
9	2	2.0
10	10	10.0
11	1	1.0
12	1	1.0
13	2	2.0
20	1	1.0
25	1	1.0
50	2	2.0
99	1	1.0
TOTAL	100	100.0

n = 98

TABLE VIII
SUBJECTS' PERCEIVED ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY
FOR THE TERM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Not confident	1	2	2.0
	2	2	2.0
	3	6	6.0
	4	2	2.0
Moderately confident	5	23	23.0
	6	13	13.0
	7	11	11.0
	8	13	13.0
	9	8	8.0
Highly confident	10	19	19.0
		1*	1.0
TOTAL		100	100.0

*Missing; n = 99

TABLE IX
SUBJECTS' PERCEIVED ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY
FOR THE YEAR

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Not confident	1	2	2.0
	2	1	1.0
	3	2	2.0
	4	7	7.0
Moderately confident	5	23	23.0
	6	12	12.0
	7	15	15.0
	8	15	15.0
	9	12	12.0
Highly confident	10	10	10.0
		1*	1.0
TOTAL		100	100.0

*Missing; n = 99

TABLE X
SUBJECTS' PERCEIVED ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY
FOR A DEGREE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent
Not confident	1	1	1.0
	2	2	2.0
	3	6	6.0
	4	3	3.0
Moderately confident	5	27	27.0
	6	14	14.0
	7	13	13.0
	8	14	14.0
	9	4	4.0
Highly confident	10	12	12.0
		4*	4.0
TOTAL		100	100.0

*Missing; n = 96

STRESSORS

There are 49 situations presented in the questionnaire, and the respondents rank each stressor by the scale ranging from 0 (no current stress) to 9 (highest degree of stress) (see Appendix A). The stressors are categorized into five composites: in-class interactions, social interactions, environment/university procedure, academic tasks, and intrapersonal communication (see Appendix B). These composites are also categorized as either communication stressors or noncommunication stressors. Communication stressors are in-class interactions, social interactions, environment/university procedure. Noncommunication stressors are academic tasks and intrapersonal communication. Intrapersonal

communication is classified as a "noncommunication stressor" because it is not interaction oriented.

Eight of the situations are classified as highly stressful for the majority of the respondents. "Highly stressful situations" are considered responses of greater than 5 on a 10-point Likert-type scale (see Appendix B). These stressful situations are: stressor #17--studying for a test (88%); stressor #36--taking an examination (81%); stressor #6--giving a class presentation (73%); stressor #9--receiving a D or F on a test (70%); stressor #11--pressure to get an A or B in a course (68%); stressor #3--asking a question in a class (67%); stressor #24--lack of assertiveness or ability to speak up for your own beliefs (63%); stressor #35--interacting with large groups of people for the first time (56%) (see Appendix D for a histogram comparing the situations on the Stress Level Scale). Stressors #17, 36, 9, and 11 are considered in-class interactions. Stressor #25 is considered social interaction. According to the categorization of communication stressors/noncommunication stressors, stressors #17, 36, 9, and 11 are considered noncommunication stressors. Stressors #6, 3, 24, and 25 are considered communication stressors.

Twelve situations are classified as low stress for most of the respondents. "Low stress" responses are considered responses of less than 4 on a 10-point Likert-type scale (see Appendix A). The low stressful situations are:

stressor #49--ordering food on campus (86%); stressor #48--buying textbooks (78%); stressor #33--asking other students to explain class material (76%); stressor #42--socializing over a meal (70%); stressor #34--discussing cultural problems with other students (69%); stressor #30--registering for classes (68%); stressor #37--being around people from many different cultures (66%); stressor #28--making an appointment to meet a professor in their office (65%); stressor #8--loneliness for other speakers of my native language (62%); stressor #32--using public transportation to go to school (59%); stressor #21--asking people about university policies, rules, and services (57%); stressor #35--discussing personal life problems with other students (48%); (see Appendix E for a histogram comparing the situations on the Stress Level Scale). Stressors #49, 48, 32, 30, and 21 are considered environment/university procedure. Stressors #42, 34, and 35 are considered social interactions. Stressors #33 and 28 are considered in-class interactions, and stressors #37 and 8 are considered intrapersonal communication.

COPING STRATEGIES

There are 67 coping strategies in the questionnaire (see Appendix C), and the respondents rank each coping strategy by the following scale: 0 (not used), 1 (used somewhat, 2 (used quite a bit), and 3 (used a great deal). The coping strategies are categorized into eight composites: problem-focused coping, wishful thinking, detachment, seeking

emotional social support, focusing on the positive, self-blame, tension-reduction/relaxation, and keeping to self (see Appendix C).

Of the coping strategies, nine are identified by most subjects as "used quite a bit" or "used a great deal." These coping strategies are: strategy #8--talked to someone to find out more about the situation (77%); strategy #15--looked for the positive aspects; tried to look on the bright side of things (74%); strategy #2--I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better (73%)--strategy #42--I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice (67%); strategy #45--talked to someone about how I was feeling (65%)' strategy #26--I made a plan of action and followed it (63%); strategy #28--I let my feelings out somehow (62%); strategy #27--I accepted the next best thing to what I wanted (61%); and strategy #31--I talked to someone who could do something concrete about the problem (61%) (see Appendix F for a histogram showing the correlation of the frequency of use of coping strategies). According to the categorization of the coping strategies, coping strategies #8, 42, 45, 28, and 31 are categorized as seeking emotional social support. Coping strategies #15 and 27 are categorized as problem-focused coping. It seems that Japanese students often use "seeking emotional social support" coping strategies.

However, there are two "seeking emotional social support" coping strategies that many Japanese students ranked

0 (not used): coping strategies #22--I got professional help (60%), and #60--I prayed (40%). Thus, Japanese students in general, seek emotional social support from someone whom they know personally rather than from professional or religious sources.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSX) is used to summarize the data. Pearson Product Moment Correlations indicate possible relationships among the variables in this research. The significance level was set at alpha ($r = .5$; $n = 100$; $p < .01$).

Biodemographic Variables

There are no correlations among biodemographic variables. However, some correlations between biodemographic variables and stressors/coping strategies emerge. Academic level (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate, ESL, and Postbaccalaureate) is negatively correlated with one stressor and four coping strategies.

There is a negative correlation between academic level and stressor (academic tasks)/ coping strategies (total coping, wishful thinking, tension reduction/relaxation, and keeping to self). A negative correlation emerges for academic level and academic task stressor (see Appendix G). Four negative correlations emerge for academic level and coping strategies: (1) negative correlation between academic

level and total coping; (2) negative correlation between academic level and wishful thinking; (3) negative correlation between academic level and tension reduction/relaxation; and (4) negative correlation between academic level and keeping to self (see Appendix H).

There are no significant correlations between age, sex, GPA, previous training, the plan for staying in the United States, the number of good American friends, and perceived academic self-efficacy and any other variables (see Appendix I).

Stressors

Stressors are considered the factors in one's environment which may produce stress. A positive correlation emerges for environment/university procedure and social interactions. Also, there are three positive correlations between stressors (social interactions and environment/university procedure) and coping strategies (focusing on the positive, self-blame, and keeping to self). In addition to these, there are both positive and negative correlations between stressors and previously mentioned biodemographic variables.

There is a positive correlation between environment/university procedure and social interactions (both considered communication stressors) (see Appendix J). This is the only significant correlation among stressors.

Three positive correlations between stressors and coping strategies are: (1) between social interactions and

focusing on the positive; (2) between social interactions and self-blame; and (3) between environment/university procedure and keeping to self (see Appendix K).

Coping Strategies

Sixty-seven coping strategies were divided into eight composites and further categorized into two main coping factors: problem-focused factors and emotion-focused factors. Getting information and taking an action to solve a problem are considered problem-focused factors. Emotion-focused factors are considered as wishful thinking, detachment, seeking emotional social support, focusing on the positive, self-blame, tension-reduction/relaxation, and keeping to self.

There is a positive correlation between problem-focused coping and wishful thinking, seeking emotional social support, and tension-reduction/relaxation. Wishful thinking is positively correlated with detachment, focusing on the positive, keeping to self, and seeking emotional social support. Tension-reduction/relaxation is positively correlated with detachment, seeking emotional social support, focusing on the positive, self-blame, and keeping to self. Keeping to self also has a positive correlation with focusing on the positive (see Appendix L).

RESULTS FOR THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Question 1: Are there relationships among biodemographic variables, communication stressors, coping strategies, perceived academic self-efficacy, and self-statement of GPA?

There are relationships among biodemographic variables, communication stressors, and coping strategies. There are no significant correlations between perceived academic self-efficacy and GPA (see Appendix G). Also, there are no significant correlations among biodemographic variables. However, academic level (one of the biodemographic variables) negatively correlates with one stressor (academic tasks) and four coping strategies (total coping strategies, wishful thinking, tension-reduction/relaxation, and keeping to self) (see Appendix H).

A positive correlation emerges between environment/university procedure and social interactions (see Appendix J). Academic tasks, in-class interactions, and intrapersonal communication are not significantly correlated with any other stressors (see Appendix J). However, there are three positive correlations between stressors and coping strategies. They are: (1) social interactions and focusing on the positive; (2) social interactions and self-blame; and (3) environment/university procedure and keeping to self (see Appendix K).

Several significant correlations emerge among coping strategies. Coping strategy correlations are divided into three categories: (1) positive correlations between problem-focused coping and wishful thinking, keeping to self, tension-reduction/relaxation; (2) positive correlations between wishful thinking and detachment, focusing on the positive, keeping to self, seeking emotional social support; and (3) positive correlations between tension-reduction/relaxation and detachment, seeking emotional social support, focusing on the positive, self-blame, keeping to self, and problem-focused coping (see Appendix L). In addition to these correlations, focusing on the positive is correlated positively with keeping to self.

Research Question 2: Is there greater reported stress associated with communication stressors than other stressors?

There is not greater reported stress associated with communication stressors than other stressors. Eight highly stressful situations (stressors) emerge among Japanese students (see Appendix D). Four out of the eight highly stressful situations are communication stressors (in-class interactions and social interactions), and the rest of the situations are noncommunication stressors (academic tasks). The significant stressful in-class interactions reported are: stressor #3--asking a question in class; stressor #6--giving a class presentation; stressor #24--lack of assertiveness or ability to speak up for one's own beliefs. The stressful

social interaction is stressor #25--interacting with large groups of people for the first time. The stressful academic tasks are: stressor #9--receiving a D or F on a test; stressor #11--pressure to get an A or B in a course; stressor #17--studying for a test; stressor #36--taking an examination (see Appendix D). According to the results, a similar number of both communication stressors and noncommunication stressors are significantly reported.

Positive and negative correlations emerge for each of the results. The discussion section addresses possible reasons for these results.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The discussion of this research addresses three themes: (1) biodemographic variables; (2) stress and stressors; and (3) coping strategies. These areas are discussed in relation to the results of this study and the Japanese culture.

BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

There were 12 biodemographic variables in this research. However, only two biodemographic variables were significantly correlated with either stressors or coping strategies (see Appendix L). Overall, the biodemographic variable, "academic level" (i.e., Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Graduate, ESL, and Postbaccalaureate) was negatively correlated with academic task stressors (see Appendix G). The lack of language proficiency and academic experience may be related to their academic task stressors. The lack of previous training in intercultural communication may also be a factor relating to Japanese students' academic task stressors.

The negative correlation between academic level and academic task stressors suggests that possibly the lower the academic level of the Japanese students, the higher the stress related to academic tasks. Thus, the higher the academic level of the students, possibly the lower the stress

level. Based on this result, it is possible that undergraduate students have reported higher academic task stress than have graduate students.

Language proficiency and academic experience are influential in students' academic stress. First of all, language proficiency is generally the primary stress for international students (Cieslak, 1955; Bois, 1956; Selltitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook, 1963). Particularly, language proficiency is one of the most important requirements in academic tasks. Seward (1984) also posited that graduate students have fewer problems than undergraduate students because of language proficiency and academic experience. Higher academic task stressors reported in this research are stressor #9--receiving a D or F on a test; stressor #11--pressure to get an A or B in a course; stressor #17--studying for a test; and stressor #36--taking an examination (see Appendix B). Students may learn how to cope with these academic pressures and improve their study skills as they experience more academic tasks and in-class interactions, which can then be called "academic experience." In this sense, undergraduate students may have less academic experience than graduate students, and thus, undergraduate students may have more problems or difficulties in their academic tasks. Based upon these results, it is possible that an 18-year-old ESL student who has just graduated from a Japanese high school may have more academic stress than a 30-year-old graduate student who has a 600 TOEFL score (Test of English as Foreign Language) and

experience in an ESL program. Thus, language proficiency and academic experience may influence academic task stressors.

The lack of previous training in intercultural communication may also influence academic task stressors. If Japanese students had previous training in intercultural communication, it may provide the information and the skill to be more successful in the American academic tasks or in-class interactions. However, data regarding biodemographic variables indicate that 81% of the Japanese students did not have previous training in intercultural communication. Many Japanese students are not conscious of the complexity of intercultural communication until they face actual intercultural interactions because they have not had an opportunity to engage in these interactions prior to their arrival in the United States.

In Japan, the field of intercultural communication itself is relatively new. There are a few colleges or universities, such as International Christian University and Nanzan University, which have intercultural communication classes. Also, there are few organizations which are aware of the importance of training programs in intercultural communication. As a result, there are few individuals who design and facilitate training programs. Training programs in Japan usually stress language preparation rather than culture training as students themselves pay more attention to language because of their high language anxiety (from a Survey by cooperation of Kyodo News Service and Diamond Inc.,

1989). Furthermore, the demand of a predeparture orientation about intercultural communication for students is greater than the supply of sufficient programs (Higginbotham, 1979). In Klineberg and Hull's (1979) research, Japanese students reported insufficient previous training as a problem and a source of difficulty in studying in the United States. If Japanese students had sufficient training programs providing information on how to deal with American academic tasks and how to behave in their in-class interactions, they might feel less stress related to academic tasks or environment. However, it is difficult for Japanese students to get not only sufficient previous training but to get any cultural training at all.

This research speculates that previous training in intercultural communication is as meaningful as having language proficiency and academic experience. Thus, the three factors of language proficiency, academic experience, and sufficient previous training in intercultural communication may have significant effects on Japanese students' stress.

STRESS AND STRESSORS

Academic tasks and in-class interactions were reported by the subjects as the situations with the highest stress (see Appendix D). These stressors may come from the Japanese cultural characteristics. One is that Japanese are very conscious of their academic tasks and grades. The other is that

Japanese students see great cultural differences in their in-class interactions.

High grade-consciousness may lead to Japanese students' stress related to academic tasks. Many Japanese believe that going to a prestigious school and maintaining high grades is the road to achieving a successful life (Reischauer, 1988). Thus, academic performance or achievement is used as a measurement to evaluate a person's success in Japanese society. When someone suffers in academic achievement, it is often interpreted as failure in life. Consequently, it is very important for Japanese students to be successful in their schooling. Stressor #9--receiving a D or F, stressor #11--pressure to get an A or B in a course, stressor #17--studying for a test, and stressor #36--taking an examination, were rated by the subjects as the greatest stressors (see Appendix D).

The subjects reported high stress due to the large cultural differences in their in-class interactions. The Japanese students may feel required to adjust to the cultural differences in order to accomplish their studies, and this may be a very stressful adjustment process. "Asking a question in class," "giving a class presentation," and "assertiveness" are required in the American classroom setting. However, because of the lack of these behaviors in the Japanese classroom, those studying in the United States may have difficulty getting used to these in-class interactions. As the literature reports, the classroom setting

can be used as a typical example of the difference between nonverbal and verbal communication. Japan, a high-context culture, emphasizes nonverbal communication, while America, a low-context culture, emphasizes verbal communication.

Ishii (1982) describes the different cultural backgrounds of the rhetorical patterns between Japanese and Americans:

Japanese have low value for speech, weak necessity of speech, and positive attitudes toward silence; Americans have high value for speech, strong necessity of speech, and negative attitudes toward silence. These differences between Japanese and Americans reflect the disparities between high-context and low-context cultures. Thus, the Japanese are culturally trained to listen to the lecture and quietly take notes, while Americans are encouraged to ask questions and speak their own opinions. "Deru kugi wa uatreru" (the nail that sticks up is hit) is often quoted as a typical example of this. Japanese believe that they are supposed to avoid any behavior which leads to individualism in the group, so as to maintain group harmony. Even if Japanese students know that they are expected to feel free to ask questions or to speak their own opinions in the American classroom, they have not learned the appropriate behaviors to do so; for example, when to take a turn speaking, how to argue or how to be assertive are difficult skills to master. However, they may begin to believe that to be successful in American universities, they need to exhibit the American style of in-class interaction. In this sense Japanese students have

a double pressure--pressure for good academic achievement and pressure to acquire American classroom interactive behavior.

From another perspective, Japanese students may experience less stress in environment/university procedure and social interactions (see Appendix E). There are three possible reasons why they feel less stress in these situations. Each of the reasons touches upon similar variables common to both environment/university procedure and social interactions. These three similarities address interaction outside the classroom, short-term interaction, and minimal verbal interaction. First, addressing the concept of interacting outside of the classroom: Japanese students do not have as much pressure to interact as they do regarding academic tasks and in-class interactions. They also can avoid or refuse some situations, such as stressor #14--peer pressure to take part in time-consuming extra-curricular (social) activities; stressor #27--peer pressure to use alcohol or drugs; and stressor #34--discussing cultural problems with other students.

Second, the concept of short-term interactions with strangers is not serious enough for Japanese to feel stress. Nakane (1974) argues that Japanese ignore an individual whose background is unknown because they can not predict his/her behavior or they can not know whether he/she will follow the norms/conventions appropriate in the context. This is because people in a high-context culture need to know social information (e.g., where they are from, where they

work, or from which school they are graduated) to communicate (Gudykunst and Nishida, 1986). In other words, as people in a high-context culture require more knowledge of the context in their communication, they hardly have communication with strangers. From the perspective of Japanese group orientation, Japanese spend the majority of their lives belonging to groups; they are very concerned with how others react and how they interact with others in their groups (Nakane, 1974). However, "strangers are, to a certain extent, 'nonpersons'" (Gudykunst and Kim, 1984, p. 77). In this sense, stressor #37--being around people from many different cultures, or stressor #45--asking for career/professional advice from faculty and school staff, are not as important and stressful for them, because they do not see the need to initiate these interactions.

Third, the concept of nonverbally-oriented interactions reduces stress because individuals in the Japanese culture are not as verbally-oriented as in American culture. Individuals in a high-context culture emphasize nonverbal in their communication, while those in a low-context culture have the emphasis on verbal communication. Stressor #48--buying textbooks, stressor #49--ordering food on campus, and stressor #32--using public transportation to go to school, can be carried out with minimum verbal interaction. According to Barna (1988), one of the stumbling blocks in intercultural communication is obviously language. Thus, when Japanese have less verbal interactions, it is less

stressful for them, particularly for those who are not verbally oriented in a high-context culture.

Based on this writer's personal experience Japanese students' significant stressors may be related to their academic tasks and in-class interactions because of their strong academic consciousness and cultural differences. On the other hand, they have reported less stress in environment/university procedure and social interactions which may be associated with three main factors: nonrelated academic situations, short-term interaction with strangers, and less frequent verbal interactions. Thus, Japanese students who report great stress while in academic-related situations may feel less stress when outside the academic situation. Japanese tend to ignore or avoid interactions with strangers. People in a high-context culture do not think that they can have communication without knowing their social background. Also, a situation which is based in high-context interaction rather than low-context may be less stressful because it is more familiar to the Japanese. Apparently, the Japanese also reported that culture-specific stressors, academic tasks, and in-class interactions may be grounded in the Japanese cultural values and the characteristics of high-context culture.

COPING STRATEGIES

Japanese students tend to use their learned culture-specific coping strategies. Two points for discussion regarding Japanese students' coping strategies emerge from

the data: the most frequently used coping strategy reported by Japanese students is "seeking emotional social support," that is, emotion-focused coping strategy; at the same time, the positive correlation between emotion-focused coping strategies and problem-focused coping strategies suggests that Japanese students use both strategies, and these two strategies are interrelated for Japanese.

According to Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) "Ways of Coping," there are problem-focused and emotion-focused coping strategies. "Seeking emotional social support" has emotion-focused factors, such as coping strategy #8--talked to someone to find out more about the situation; strategy #42--I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice; strategy #45--I talked to someone about how I was feeling; and strategy #28--I let my feeling out somehow (see Appendix C). These emotion-focused coping strategies may be used more often by those who perceive problems more personally or emotionally.

Japanese who think about feelings, and perceive situations more personally or emotionally, cope with their stress in emotion-focused ways. This comes from their cultural values. "Values often help to define a situation in communication that we are trying to analyze, and help to clarify certain problems that are encountered in such situations" (Condon, 1974, p. 139). Condon applied Rogelio Diaz Guerrero's notion that Americans place value on objectivity and facts; while Japanese place great value on their feelings.

Thus, Americans interpret reality based on "fact," which is called "objective reality." Japanese interpret reality based on their feelings, which can be called "interpersonal reality." For example, a group in class consisting of five American students and one Japanese student had a group discussion. They had a very active discussion; however, the Japanese student did not say anything during that time. After this group activity, the American students recognized that the Japanese did not say anything, and interpreted this fact as meaning that he did not have anything to say. The Japanese student thought that they did not let him talk or they ignored him. He was also worried about how the American students felt about his attitude; they might have thought that he was not smart or he was not interested in that discussion. Furthermore, he may have started to worry that they did not want him in their group (A. Kawamoto, personal communication, April 20, 1989). Japanese take situations/problems personally as they always think of the others' feelings in their communication (Ueda, 1974).

According to Ting-Toomey (1985), people in a high-context culture have much difficulty separating the conflict issues from the person. It is not as easy for Japanese as for Americans to perceive reality based on only facts or objectivity. Japanese seldom separate the rational from the emotional. As Japanese take situations personally or emotionally, they tend to use emotion-focused coping strategies to deal with stress. Using the former example

again, the Japanese student who did not say anything in the group discussion found it difficult to separate the fact (he said nothing during the discussion) from the group members (how they felt about him). Japanese perceive situations/problems with the people involved in the situations/problems.

Japanese who take situations/problems more personally or emotionally use emotion-focused coping strategies. The student who had a difficult time in his group discussion may go to his friends and ask for emotional support. If his friends said that he did not have to worry about it or no one had a negative impression of him, he might be released from his stress. Even if his problem can not be solved by his friends' support, he can cope with his stress.

Japanese students also use problem-focused coping strategies, which are supported by emotion-focused coping strategies. When the student having the stress in his group goes to his Japanese friends, they probably encourage him by emphasizing their cultural value "self-discipline" requiring hardship ("kuro"), endurance ("gaman," "nintai," and "shimbo"), effort ("doryoku"), and the utmost self-exertion ("isshokemmei"). His friends would say, "You should make an effort to get your speaking turn," or, "You should show with the utmost self-exertion that you are interested in your group discussion, and you have something to say." This is one of the hardships that all Japanese students experience in American classrooms. It's important to be enduring in a certain situation; at the same time, to keep making efforts

(A. Kawamoto, personal communication, December 18, 1989).

This emotional support encourages problem-focused coping strategies. Japanese students probably try to focus on their problems with their friends' encouragement so as to cope with their stress and decide what action they should take or how they should solve this problem. The point is, that Japanese problem-focused coping strategies come from someone's or one's own emotional encouragement.

In fact, the results indicate that there is a positive correlation between emotion-focused coping strategies and problem-focused coping strategies. This suggests that both coping strategies are interrelated for Japanese students. How are these strategies interrelated for Japanese? Does any specific Japanese cultural value explain this inter-relation?

Self-discipline is necessary to build up the quality of self in Japanese society (Befus, 1986). Achieving self-discipline requires experience involving hardship ("kuro"), endurance ("gaman," "nintai," "shimbo," and "gambaru"), effort ("doryoku"), and the utmost self-exertion ("isshokemmei") (Befus, 1986, p. 24). Posters proclaiming "Nintai" (endurance), "Doryoku" (effort), and "Isshokemmei" (utmost self-exertion), are hung on the wall in Japanese classrooms or companies. Their importance is emphasized to almost everyone everywhere in Japanese society. Japanese believe that it is necessary to endure psychological and material hardships to become a mature person or to be successful

(Befus, 1986). In this sense, Japanese students try to cope with their stress, focusing on their problems and making great efforts to cope with them. These characteristics of Japanese students' coping strategies are supported by the results of this study. Two problem-focused coping strategies were reported by subjects as often used: strategy #2--I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better, and strategy #26--I made a plan of action and followed it (see Appendix F).

Japanese use the words "nintai" (endurance), "doryoku" (effort), and "isshokemmei" (the utmost self-exertion), when they encourage themselves or others who have problems. Encouraging people with the self-discipline value appeals to their emotion, and this emotional encouragement makes them focus on their problems and cope with them. In this sense, Japanese problem-focused coping strategies are based on this emotional encouragement. This suggests that emotion-focused coping strategies and problem-focused coping strategies are interrelated for the Japanese because they place value on feelings and working toward solutions.

Another aspect of the relationship between the two coping strategies is that Japanese students use emotion-focused coping strategies, such as wishful thinking, tension-reduction/relaxation, and detachment, after they use problem-focused coping strategies with their endurance, effort, and the utmost self-exertion. Examining the use of emotion-focused coping strategies after problem-focused coping

strategies, Japanese seem to resign themselves ("akirameru") to their failure, conflict, difficulty, or unfavorable situations/results/ This "akirame" (noun form of "akirameru" meaning resignation) comes from fatalism embedded in Buddhism (Lebra, 1976). According to Lebra:

Fatalism is linked with the futility of making an effort to control what has happened or is going to happen. Things are considered irreversible once they have taken place. It is silly, therefore, to regret that things have turned out as they have because no amount of regret can reverse the course of events (1976, pp. 165-166).

In terms of the irreversible situations against one's wish, "shikata ga nai" (can not be helped) is used as often as "akirame" (resignation). The Japanese students studying in the United States may have "akirame" for not fulfilling their expectations in the American culture, such as asking questions or asserting one's own opinion in class. They may simply say "I can't be so assertive, because I am not American but Japanese--shikata ga nai (can not be helped)." Japanese, in general, think it childish to stick with any irreversible events--"shikata ga nai." "Akirame no ii hito da" (he/she easily resigns himself/herself to his/her situations/results) does not always have a negative meaning. It is proof of maturity and wisdom to have the capacity for "akirame" (Lebra, 1976), since the idea "akirame" comes from fatalism. After Japanese students try to cope with stress by focusing on their problems, their feelings may reach "akirame"; then they feel like engaging in wishful thinking, relaxation, or detachment. There are some expressions telling these

feelings in Japanese: "Attate kudakero" (Do your best, and there is no regret or worry); "Jinchi o tsukushite tenmei o matsu" (Do all that you can do, and wait and see what happens to you); "Ato wa no to nare yama to nare" (this meant "No one cares what is going on" and is used after people have tried everything possible). Once Japanese students have these feelings, they forget their problems or go out to have a relaxing time. As a result, Japanese students seem to resign themselves after they try to cope with stress by focusing on their problems.

The Japanese characteristics of coping strategies suggest that it would be important to have close friends in order to reduce and cope with stress. The most often reported coping strategy was "seeking emotional social support" (see Appendix J) which requires someone who gives support, such as listening, giving advice, sharing feelings, encouraging, and comforting. Japanese students also need someone in using other emotion-focused coping strategies. They need someone to confirm and justify their own feelings as they perceive themselves through others. When they have wishful thinking, detachment, or relaxation as their coping method, they want to hear someone saying, "Don't worry any more as you tried hard," "It's not worth worrying as no one knows what is going on," "Be optimistic," or just simply, "Relax." The persons who give emotional support or confirmation are generally close friends. This is because the Japanese tend to self-disclose only to their relatives and

closest friends (Barnlund, 1975). This might explain why Japanese students reported that they did not use professional counselors to help reduce stress. Japanese need close friends to whom they can disclose feelings to cope with their stress, instead of having a counselor. Having close friends to whom they can disclose means a great deal to Japanese students. Whether they have someone to talk with about their stress is probably the key factor in being successful in studying in the United States.

CHAPTER VI

LIMITATIONS

Were this research to be replicated, several factors would need to be taken into consideration. The research questionnaire was handed from the researcher to students, and from the students to other students. This snowball technique made it possible to get the respondents' feedback about the questionnaire, which allowed for verbal feedback addressing limitations of this research. However, this technique gave rise to several minor problems.

First, some students had difficulty understanding the language of the questions. One ESL student wrote in the questionnaire that the English was too difficult to answer. When the researcher distributed the questionnaire at the Japanese teachers' assistants meeting and ESL class, there were some respondents who had questions about the English--primarily meanings of certain sentences.

The questionnaire was written in English because Japanese students in American universities and colleges have completed at least a high school diploma and six years of English language learning in Japan. They should be familiar with reading standard English. The questionnaire does not have any technical terms. However, some students' vocabulary might be limited and this may have prevented them from complete comprehension.

Second, the length of the questionnaire (10 pages consisting of 128 questions) seemed to frustrate some respondents. Observing the respondents in the Japanese teachers' assistants meeting, ESL class, and the face-to-face setting it was noted that there were some respondents who were counting unfinished pages as they completed the questionnaire or repeatedly looked at their watches, sighing, and making comments such as, "A lot of questions!" or "10 pages!" One student refused to complete the questionnaire and there were several students who left questions or pages of questions blank, or repeated the same number in the last two or three pages. This many questions may have affected the respondents' motivation for answering all questions and may have reduced their concentration level. These factors may have affected the validity of their answers.

Third, many respondents complained about signing the consent form with the questionnaire. Many expressed apprehension about disclosure of their GPA, and about 17% of the subjects did not disclose their GPA. Also, one respondent refused to fill out the questionnaire because of the consent form, and another told the researcher that she wrote a false name to maintain a confidential GPA. The consent form might have made them feel a little defensive about the questionnaire itself (see Appendix A).

Finally, the scale in the self-efficacy section (1-10) and the stressors section (0-9) may offer too many choices. Some subjects asked, "Tell me exactly what the differences

are between marking a 7 or 8 on the scale?" The others complained that they were not sure what the difference was between numbers on the scale, even after they had completed the answers. The 10-point Likert-type scale seemed to confuse some respondents and to prevent them from answering accurately.

Some important points for constructing a questionnaire and conducting a survey are suggested through the limitations of this research. Questionnaires are probably best written in the language which respondents have the least difficulty understanding. The length of questionnaires should not be so long as to frustrate respondents. The scale used in questionnaires should be set up so that subjects can respond easily.

FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on this research, there are two factors which suggest further research in terms of Japanese students' stress and coping strategies. One concerns a possible relationship between Japanese students' social network in the United States, and their stress and coping strategies. The other is about the possible relationship between their perceived academic self-efficacy and GPA, from the perspective of acculturative process including stress and coping strategies.

The present research does not identify Japanese students' social network in the United States. Some words

relating to the respondents' social network (e.g., "other students," "friends," "someone") in the questionnaire of this research are not clarified as to whether they are either Japanese, or Americans, or other international students. For instance, the respondents ranked their stress level as low for the following stressors: stressor #34--discussing cultural problems with other students; stressor #35--discussing personal life problems with other students (see Appendix J). However, it is not identified whether "other students" are Japanese, or Americans, or other international students. This problem is also found in coping strategies, such as: strategy #8--talked to someone to find out more about the situation; strategy #42--I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice; strategy #45--talked to someone about how I was feeling. The interpretation for "someone" or "friend" depends on each respondent. Clarification as to the respondents' social network is needed for further research addressing Japanese students' stress and coping strategies.

Clarifying who makes up the international students' social network may help explain the acculturative process, which includes stress degree and types of coping strategies. According to Furnham and Bochner (1982), those who have a large social network with host culture members learn the skills of the second culture more easily than those who do not. Overseas students tend to belong to three social networks: (1) monocultural network; (2) bicultural network;

and (3) the foreign students' multicultural network (Bochner, Buker, and McLeod, 1976; Bochner, McLeod, and Lin, 1977; Bochner and Orr, 1979). However, sojourners have very few host culture friends and limited contacts (Furnham and Bochner, 1982). If this is the case for Japanese students, they perhaps answered the questions by interpreting "other students," "someone," or "friend" as Japanese. That is why stressors #34 and 35 might be ranked as low, and coping strategies #8, 42, and 45 might be ranked as frequently used.

Further research needs to clarify the Japanese students' social networks and the specific relationship to their stress and coping strategies. Those who have interactions with only Japanese may not have as much stress as those who interact with Americans. Those who seek social support from Japanese may not have as much opportunity to learn the American culture and social skills as those who seek support from Americans.

It might be more effective to design further research addressing stress and coping strategies from a longitudinal perspective. According to Kim (1989), "Stress-Adaptation-Growth Dynamics" suggests that stress and adaptation have a positive spiral. Stress affects adaptation positively. People can learn the second culture through their stress experience. Specific stressors may produce more cultural learning and in turn better adjustment. This positive spiral may affect perceived academic self-efficacy or GPA. The results in this research indicate that there is no

significant correlation between perceived academic self-efficacy and GPA, and between perceived academic self-efficacy or GPA and any other variables in this research. However, if the research had been designed longitudinally, the results may have been different. In fact, research on international students' adjustment reports that international students who have spent five months in the United States worry less about their academic work, perform better academically, and adapt to the American culture better than five months prior (Selltitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook, 1963, pp. 359-360). As Japanese students adjust to the American culture, they may have some changes in their perceived academic self-efficacy and GPA. The factor of time and "Stress-Adaptation-Growth Dynamics" can not be neglected in the research about stress and coping strategies.

To summarize, stress and coping strategy should be researched based on clarifying the subjects' social networks in the host culture. The research also should be designed longitudinally because "Stress-Adaptation-Growth Dynamics" may affect stress, coping strategy, perceived academic self-efficacy, and GPA.

The number of Japanese students studying in the United States has been increasing; however, they have still had little or no training in intercultural communication. Japanese students are beginning to recognize the importance of sufficient previous training after their arrival in the United States. "Sufficient" training probably means culture-

focused training because each culture has its own culture-specific difficulties or problems in their interactions with Americans. In fact, Japanese culture-specific stressors (academic tasks and in-class interactions) and coping strategies (emotion-focused coping strategies) emerged in this research. The Japanese culture-specific information about stress and coping strategies from this present research could aid in the design for Japanese students' intercultural training.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. S. (1972). Culture shock and the cross cultural learning experience. In D. S. Hoopes (ed.), Readings in intercultural communication, Vol. II. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education.
- _____. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15(4), 13-23.
- Azuma, H. (1984). Psychology in a non-Western country. International Journal of Psychology, 19, 45-55.
- Babiker, I. E., Cox, J. L., and Miller, P. M. C. (1980). The measurement of culture distance and its relationship to medical consultation, symptomatology and examination performance of overseas students at Edinburgh University. Social Psychiatry, 15, 109-116.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191-215.
- Barna, L. M. (1976). How culture shock affects communication. Communication, 5(1), 1-18.
- _____. (1983). The stress factor in intercultural relations. In R. W. Brislin and D. Landis (eds.), Handbook of intercultural training, Vol. II, pp. 19-49. New York: Pergamon Press.
- _____. (1988). Stumbling blocks in intercultural communication. In L. A. Porter and R. E. Samovar (eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, 5th ed., pp. 322-330. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barnlund, D. C. (1975). Public and private self in Japan and the United States. Tokyo: The Simul Press, Inc.
- Befus, C. P. (1988). A multilevel treatment approach for culture shock experienced by sojourners. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12(4), 381-400.
- Befus, H. (1986). The social and cultural background of child development in Japan and the United States. In H. Stevenson, H. Azuma, and K. Hakuta (eds.), Child development and education in Japan, pp. 13-27. New York: W. H. Freeman & Company.

- Berry, J. W., Kim, U., Minde, T., and Mok, D. (1987). Comparative studies of acculturative stress. International Migration Review, 21(3), 491-511.
- Bochner, S., Buker, E. A., and McLead, B. M. (1976). Communication patterns in an international student dormitory: A modification of the "small world" method. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 6, 275-290.
- Bochner, S. McLeod, B. M., and Lin, A. (1977). Friendship patterns of overseas students; A functional model. International Journal of Psychology, 12, 277-294.
- Bochner, S. and Orr, F. E. (1979). Race and academic status as determinants of friendship formation: A field study. International Journal of Psychology, 14, 37-46.
- Bois, C. D. (1956). Foreign students and higher education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Brein, M. and David, K. H. (1971). Intercultural communication and the adjustment of the sojourner. Psychological Bulletin, 76(3), 215-230.
- Cassel, J. (1970). Physical illness as a response to stress. In S. Levine and N. A. Scotch (eds.), Social Stress. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cieslak, E. C. (1955). The foreign student in American colleges. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Condon, J. C. (1974). The values approach to cultural patterns of communication. In J. C. Condon and M. Saito (eds.), Intercultural encounters with Japan, pp. 132-152. Tokyo: The Simul Press, Inc.
- Condon J. C. and Yousef, F. (1975). An introduction to intercultural communication. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill.
- Cooper, C. L. (1981). The stress check. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Cushman, D. P. and King, S. S. (1986). Communication of social support as a strategy for mediating life stress. In B. Dervin and M. J. Boigt (eds.), Progress in communication sciences, Vol. 7, pp. 225-242. Norwood, NJ: Ahlex Publishing Corporation.

- David, K. H. (1971). Culture shock and the development of self-awareness. Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 41(1), 44-48.
- Dinges, N. G. and Lieberman, A. (1989, August). Stressors and coping strategies among international students: Implications for classroom practice. Paper presented at the World Communication Association Convention, Singapore.
- Dyal, J. A. and Dyal, R. Y. (1981). Acculturation, stress and coping. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 5(4), 301-327.
- Furnham, A. (1987). The adjustment of sojourners. In Y. Y. Kim and W. B. Gudykunst (eds.), Cross-cultural adaptation--current approaches, pp. 42-61. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Furnham, A. and Bochner, S. (1982). Social difficulty in a foreign culture: An empirical analysis of culture shock. In S. Bochner (ed.), Cultures in contact, pp. 161-198. New York: Pergamon Press.
- _____. (1986). Culture shock--psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments. New York: Methuen.
- Graham, M. S. (1983). Acculturative stress among Polynesian, Asian, and American students on the Brigham Young University-Hawaii campus. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 7(1), 79-103.
- Gudykunst, W. B. and Kim, Y. Y. (1984). Communication with strangers. New York: Random House.
- Gudykunst, W. B. and Nishida, T. (1986). Attributional confidence in low- and high-context cultures. Human Communication Research, 12(4), 525-549.
- Gudykunst, W. B. and Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Culture and interpersonal communication. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.
- Hammer, M. R., Gudykunst, W. G., and Wiseman, R. L. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12(4), 382-393.

- Hannigan, T. P. (1988). Culture shock with a happy ending. Journal of Counseling and Development, 67, 91.
- Harris, P. R. and Moran, R. T. (1977). Managing cultural differences. Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Higginbotham, H. (1979). Cultural issues in providing psychological services for foreign students in the United States. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3(1), 49-85.
- Hiraki, N. (1984). Kaunseling no hanashi (Talking about counseling). Tokyo: Asahi Culture Gyosho.
- Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10(3), 301-331.
- Ishii, S. (1982). Thought patterns as modes of rhetoric: The United States and Japan. Communication, 11, 81-86.
- Ishii, S. and Bruneau, T. (1988). Silence and silences in cross-cultural perspective: Japan and the United States. In R. E. Porter and L. A. Samovar (eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, 5th ed., pp. 310-318. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Ishii, S. and D. W. Klopf (1976). A comparison of communication activities of Japanese and American adjuts. Eigo Tembo (ELEC Bulletin), 53, 22-26.
- Ishii, S., Klopf, D. W., and Cambra, R. E. (1979). Oral communication apprehension among students in Japan, Korea and the United States. Jijieigogaku Kenkyu (Current English Studies), 18, 12-26.
- _____ (1984). The typical Japanese student as an oral communicator: A preliminary profile. Otsuma Review, 17, 39-63.
- Kagitchibasi, C. (1978). Cross-national encounters: Turkish students in the United States. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2(2), 141-160.
- Katayama, H. (1982). Kotowaza ni hanei sareta nipponjin no gengokan (Japanese views of language as reflected in proverbs). Kyoiku Kiyo 8-go (English General Education Annual). Chiba: Matsudo Dental School, Nihon University, 1(11).

- Kiefer, C. W. (1974). The psychological interdependence of family, school and bureaucracy in Japan. In T. S. Lebra and W. P. Lebra (eds.), Japanese culture and behavior. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kim, Y. Y. (1977). Communication patterns of foreign immigrants in the process of acculturation. Human communication Research, 4(1), 66-77.
- _____. (1989). Intercultural adaptation. Edited by M. K. Asante and W. B. Gudykunst. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- King, S. S. (1987). The relationship between stress and communication in the organizational context. Central States Speech, 57(1), 27-35.
- Klein, M. H. (1977). Adaptation to new cultural environments. in D. S. Hoopes, P. B. Pedersen, and G. W. Enwick (eds.), Overview of intercultural education, training, and research, Vol. I, pp. 49-55. Washington, D.C.: Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.
- Klineberg, O. and Hull, W. F. (1979). At a foreign university. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Klopf, D. W. and Cambra, R. E. (1983). Communication apprehension in foreign students. Paper presented at the Communication Association of the Pacific 13th International Convention, Seoul, Korea.
- Kohls, L. R. (1984). Survival kit for overseas living. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1969). Patterns of adjustment and human effectiveness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- _____. (1971). The concept of stress disease. In L. Levi (ed.), Society, stress and disease, Vol. 1, pp. 53-60. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1979). Positive denial: The case for not facing reality. Psychology Today, (November), pp. 44-69.
- Lazarus, R. S. and Folkman, S. (1984). Stress appraisal and coping. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lebra, T. S. (1974). Japanese culture and behavior. Edited by T. S. Lebra and W. P. Lebra. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- Lebra, T. S. (1976). Japanese patterns of behavior. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Marden, C. F. and Meyer, G. (1968). Minorities in American society. 3rd ed. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Mechanic, D. (1970). Some problems in developing a social psychology of adaptation to stress. In J. E. McGrath (ed.), Social and psychological factors in stress. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Meichenbaum, D. (1975). A self-instructional approach to stress management: A proposal for stress inoculation training. In C. D. Spielberger and I. G. Sarason (eds.), Stress and anxiety, Vol. I, pp. 317-330. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing.
- _____ (1985). Stress inoculation training. Edited by A. P. Goldstein, L. Krasner, and S. L. Garfield. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Mestenhauser, J. A. (1983). Learning from sojourners. In R. W. Brislin and D. Landis (eds.), Handbook of intercultural training, Vol. II. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Nakane, C. (1974). The social system reflected in interpersonal communication. In J. Condon and M. Saito (eds.), Intercultural encounters with Japan. Tokyo: The Simul Press, Inc.
- Nishida, H. (1985). Japanese intercultural communication competence and cross-cultural adjustment. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 9(3), 247-270.
- Nishida, T. (1977). An analysis of a cultural concept affecting Japanese interpersonal communication. Communication, 6, 69-80.
- Oberg, K. (1954). Culture shock. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- _____ (1972). Culture shock and the problem of adjustment to new cultural environments. In D. S. Hoopes (ed.), Readings in intercultural communication, Vol. II. Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education.
- Okabe, R. (1983). Cultural assumptions of East and West. In W. B. Gudykunst (ed.), International and intercultural communication annual. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Porter, R. E. (1972). An overview of intercultural communication. In R. E. Porter and L. A. Samovar (eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Porter, R. E. and Samovar, L. A. (eds.) (1988). Intercultural communication: A reader. 5th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pruitt, F. J. (1978). The adaptation of African students to American society. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2(1), 90-118.
- Rabkin, J. G. and Struening, E. L. (1976). Life events, stress, and illness. Science, 194, 1013-1020.
- Ramsey, S. (1985). To hear one and understand ten: Non-verbal behavior in Japan. In R. E. Porter and L. A. Samovar (eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader, 4th ed., pp. 307-325. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Ramsey, S. and Birk, J. (1983). Preparation of North Americans for interaction with Japanese: Considerations of language and communication style. In R. W. Brislin and D. Landis (eds.), Handbook of intercultural training, Vol. II, pp. 227-259. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Randolph, G., Landis, D., and Tzeng, O. C. (1977). The effects of time and practice upon culture assimilator training. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1(4), 105-119.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1988). The Japanese today. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scully, M. G. (1981). One million foreign students at U.S. colleges seen likely by 1990. Chronicle of Higher Education, 1.
- Selltiz, D., Christ, J. R., Havel, J., and Cook, S. W. (1963). Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Selye, H. (1983). The stress concept: Past, present, and future. In C. L. Cooper (ed.), Stress research, pp. 1-20. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Seward, L. G. (1984, February). The impact of international students on American campuses. Paper presented at the Western Speech Association Convention, Seattle, WA.

- Sharma, S. (1973). A study to identify and analyze adjustment problems experienced by foreign non-European graduate students enrolled in selected universities in the state of North Carolina. California Journal of Educational Research, 24(3), 135-146.
- Singh, A. K. (1963). Indian students in Britain. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.
- Sorcinielli, M. D. (1989, April). Controlling your career: Managing time and faculty stress. Paper presented at Teaching Fellows Program, Boston, MA.
- Spradley, J. P. and Phillips, M. (1972). Culture and stress: A quantitative analysis. American Anthropologist, 74(3), 518-529.
- Stening, B. W. (1979). Problems in cross-cultural contact: A literature review. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3(3), 269-313.
- Sutterly, D. C. (1979). Stress and health: A survey of self-regulation modalities. Topics in Clinical Nursing, 1(1), 1-29.
- Taft, R. (1977). Coping with unfamiliar cultures. In N. Warren (ed.), Studies in cross-cultural psychology, Vol. I, pp. 121-153. New York: Academic Press.
- _____. (1981). The role and personality of the mediator. In S. Bochner (ed.), The mediating person: Bridges between cultures. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1985). Toward a theory of conflict and culture. International and Intercultural Communication Annual, pp. 71-85. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Toffler, A. (1970). Future shock. New York: Bantam Books.
- Triandis, H. C., Brislin, R., and Hui, C. H. (1988). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collectivism divide. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 12(3), 269-289.
- Triandis, H. C. and Vassiliou, V. (1972). Interpersonal influence and employee selection in two cultures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 56, 140-145.
- Ueda, K. (1974). Sixteen ways to avoid saying "no" in Japan. In J. C. Condon and M. Saito (eds.), Intercultural encounters with Japan. Tokyo: The Simul Press, Inc.

- Ulrich, K. (1986). Normative teacher and student behaviors in the United States with a contrast to Japan. M.A. thesis, Portland State University, Portland, OR.
- Wayman, S. G. (1984). The international student in the academic library. The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 9(6), 336-341.
- Wolpe, J. and Lazarus, A. (1966). A behavior therapy technique: A guide to the treatment of neurosis. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Zwingmann, C. A. and Gunn, A. D. G. (1983). Uprooting and health: Psychosocial problems of students from abroad. Geneva: World Health Organization, Division of Mental Health.

APPENDIX A

CONSENT FORM AND QUESTIONNAIRE

CONSENT FORM

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND COPING

TO ALL STUDENTS:

International students in different parts of the United States are taking part in this important survey. This survey will help us to understand the stresses you face in attending colleges and universities so that programs can be developed to better meet your needs in attaining academic and personal goals.

Your responses are CONFIDENTIAL. There are NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. This is NOT A TEST. Please feel free to answer exactly as you feel. We ask for your signature to release your academic grade point average to us from the registrar for use in the survey. Your name will not be used in the analysis, so no one will know your answers. We will let you know the results of the entire survey as soon as we have completed the study.

If you have any more questions about this study you may contact us at (503) 464-3531.

Your help is VERY IMPORTANT to us.

THANK YOU, we really appreciate your participation.

Your signature

Please print your name here

The name of your school

QUESTIONNAIRE

EXCEPT WHERE NOTED PLEASE WRITE THE NUMBER OF YOUR ANSWER TO THE RIGHT OF EACH ITEM.

1. How old are you? _____
2. What is your sex? _____
1=Male 2=Female
3. What country are you from?

4. What is your current academic standing? _____
1=Freshman 3=Junior 5=Graduate Student
2=Sophomore 4=Senior 6=ESL
5. What do you think your current G.P.A. is? _____. ____
6. How long have you been in the U.S.? _____

7. Did you have any intercultural training
for this trip/sojourn before you left
your home country? _____
1=No 2=Yes
8. How many trips to the U.S. of one month or
more have you taken? _____
9. How long do you plan to live in the U.S.? _____
1=less than 6 months
2=6 months to 1 year
3=from 1-3 years
4=from 3-5 years
5=indefinitely
10. How many good American friends do you
have? _____

USING THE SCALE BELOW, WRITE THE NUMBER WHICH INDICATES:

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
Not at all				Moderately				Highly	
Confident				Confident				Confident	

1. How confident are you in completing the academic term? _____

2. How confident are you in completing the academic year. _____

3. How confident are you in completing your degree? _____

The following items indicate events that might be stressful for you. If you have not had these events happen to you, leave the item blank. If the event happened but you feel no current stress about it, please enter 0. For all other events mark a numerical value ranging from (1), least intense stress, to (9), highest degree of stress, to express the amount of stress you are currently feeling about the event.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
LEAST INTENSE					HIGHEST DEGREE					
STRESS					OF STRESS					
1. Being an international student on your campus.										_____
2. Being singled out in class as a spokesperson for international students.										_____
3. Asking a question in class.										_____
4. Anxiety about adopting behaviors I never had before.										_____
5. Acting as if I am from the United states, to gain acceptance from classmates (non-International).										_____
6. Giving a class presentation.										_____
7. Pressure to create a positive impression (set a high example) for my country.										_____
8. Loneliness for other speakers of my native language.										_____
9. Receiving a D or F on a test.										_____
10. Pressure of living in two worlds (my culture and this culture) with different sets of expectations for me.										_____
11. Pressure to get an A or B in a course.										_____
12. Deciding between the benefits and disadvantages of leaving my home/family/culture for a university degree.										_____
13. Competing on an athletic team.										_____
14. Peer pressure to take part in time-consuming extra-curricular (social) activities.										_____
15. Cheating on a test.										_____

Remember, leave the item blank if it has not happened to you. Use 0 if it has happened to you, but feel no current stress. For all other items, use the scale from 1 to 9.

16. Failing to complete assignments. _____
17. Studying for a test. _____
18. Making child care arrangements for children. _____
19. Conflict with instructor(s). _____
20. Personal contact with the faculty. _____
21. Asking people about university policies, rules and services. _____
22. Speaking English. _____
23. Living with strangers for the first time. _____
24. Lack of assertiveness or ability to speak up for own beliefs. _____
25. Interacting with large groups of people for the first time. _____
26. Being called on in class. _____
27. Peer pressure to use alcohol or drugs. _____
28. Making an appointment to meet a professor in their office. _____
29. Knowing when it is appropriate to make a comment in class. _____
30. Registering for classes. _____
31. Asking someone I do not know to go to a social activity. _____
32. Using public transportation to go to school. _____
33. Asking other students to explain class material. _____
34. Discussing cultural problems with other students. _____
35. Discussing personal life problems with other students. _____
36. Taking an examination. _____

Remember, leave the item blank if it has not happened to you. Use 0 if it has happened to you, but feel no current stress. For all other items, use the scale 1 to 9.

- 37. Being around people from many different cultures. _____
- 38. Doing social activities with individuals from the opposite sex and another culture. _____
- 39. Being asked out on a date. _____
- 40. Asking someone out on a date. _____
- 41. Having intimate relations. _____
- 42. Socializing over a meal. _____
- 43. Responding to obvious negative remarks about my culture. _____
- 44. Finding a place to live. _____
- 45. Asking for career/professional advice from faculty and school staff. _____
- 46. Dealing with roommate problems. _____
- 47. Getting needed health care. _____
- 48. Buying textbooks. _____
- 49. Ordering food on campus. _____

COPING STRATEGIES

When you have been in stressful situations in the U.S., how much do you use the following ways of coping?

0=Not used

2=Used quite a bit

1=Used somewhat

3=Used a great deal

1. Just concentrated on what I had to do next--the next step. _____
2. I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better. _____
3. Turned to work or substitute activity to take my mind off things. _____
4. I felt that time would make a difference--the only think to do was wait. _____
5. Bargained or compromised to get something positive from the situation. _____
6. I did something which I didn't think would work, but at least I was doing something. _____
7. Tried to get the person responsible to change his or her mind. _____
8. Talked to someone to find out more about the situation. _____
9. Criticized or lectured myself. _____
10. Tried to keep my options open, leave things open somewhat. _____
11. Hoped a miracle would happen. _____
12. Went along with fate; sometimes I just have bad luck. _____
13. Went on as if nothing had happened. _____
14. I tried to keep my feelings to myself. _____
15. Looked for the positive aspects; tried to look on the bright side of things. _____
16. Slept more than usual. _____
17. I expressed anger to the person(s) who caused the problem. _____

0=Not used
1=Used somewhat

2=Used quite a bit
3=Used a great deal

18. Accepted sympathy and understanding from someone. _____
19. I told myself things that helped me to feel better. _____
20. I was inspired to do something creative. _____
21. Tried to forget the whole thing. _____
22. I got professional help. _____
23. Changed or grew as a person in a good way. _____
24. I waited to see what would happen before doing anything. _____
25. I apologized or did something to make up. _____
26. I made a plan of action and followed it. _____
27. I accepted the next best thing to what I wanted. _____
28. I let my feelings out somehow. _____
29. Realized I brought the problem on myself. _____
30. I came out of the experience better than when I went in. _____
31. Talked to someone who could do something concrete about the problem. _____
32. Got away from it for a while; tried to rest or take a vacation. _____
33. Tried to make myself feel better by eating, drinking, smoking, using drugs or medication, etc. _____
34. Took a big chance or did something very risky. _____
35. I tried not to act too hastily or follow my first hunch. _____
36. Found new faith. _____
37. Maintained my pride. _____
38. Rediscovered what is important in life. _____

0=Not used
1=Used somewhat

2=Used quite a bit
3=Used a great deal

39. Changed something so things would turn out all right. _____
40. Avoided being with people in general. _____
41. Did not let it get to me; refused to think too much about it. _____
42. I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice. _____
43. Kept others from knowing how bad things were. _____
44. Didn't take the situation so seriously; refused to get too serious about it. _____
45. Talked to someone about how I was feeling. _____
46. Stood my ground and fought for what I wanted. _____
47. Took it out on other people. _____
48. Drew on my past experiences; I was in a similar situation before. _____
49. I knew what had to be done, so doubled my efforts to make things work. _____
50. Refused to believe it happened. _____
51. I made a promise to myself that things would be different next time. _____
52. Came up with a couple of different solutions to the problem. _____
53. Accepted it, since nothing could be done. _____
54. I tried to keep my feelings from interfering with other things too much. _____
55. Wished that I could change what had happened or how I felt. _____
56. I changed something about myself. _____
57. I daydreamed or imagined a better time or place than the one I was in. _____

0=Not used
1=Used somewhat

2=Used quite a bit
3=Used a great deal

58. Wished that the situation would go away or
somehow be over with. _____
59. Had fantasies or wishes about how things might
turn out. _____
60. I prayed. _____
61. I prepared myself for the worst. _____
62. I went over in my mind what I would say or do. _____
63. I thought about how a person I admire would
handle this situation. _____
64. I tried to see things from the other person's
point of view. _____
65. I reminded myself how much worse things could be. _____
66. I jogged, worked out, or exercised. _____
67. I sought advice from a spiritual guide or
tribal leader. _____

APPENDIX B

STRESSORS CATEGORIES

STRESSORS CATEGORIES

I. Communication Stressors

(1) In-class Interactions

- 2) Being singled out in class as a spokesperson for international students.
- 3) Asking a question in class.
- 5) Acting as if I am from the United States, to gain acceptance from classmates (non-International).
- 6) Giving a class presentation.
- 19) Conflict with instructor(s).
- 20) Personal contact with the faculty.
- 22) Speaking English.
- 24) Lack of assertiveness or ability to speak up for own beliefs.
- 26) Being called on in class.
- 28) Making an appointment to meet a professor in their office.
- 29) Knowing when it is appropriate to make a comment in class.
- 33) Asking other students to explain class material.

(2) Social Interactions

- 13) Competing on an athletic team.
- 14) Peer pressure to take part in time-consuming extra-curricular (social) activities.

- 25) Interacting with large groups of people for the first time.
- 27) Peer pressure to use alcohol or drugs.
- 31) Asking someone I do not know to go to a social activity.
- 34) Discussing cultural problems with other students.
- 35) Discussing personal life problems with other students.
- 37) Being around people from many different cultures.
- 38) Doing social activities with individuals from the opposite sex and another culture.
- 39) Being asked out on a date.
- 40) Asking someone out on a date.
- 41) Having intimate relations.
- 42) Socializing over a meal.
- 43) Responding to obvious negative remarks about my culture.

(3) Environment/University Procedure

- 18) Making child care arrangements for children.
- 21) Asking people about university policies, rules, and services.
- 30) Registering for classes.
- 32) Using public transportation to go to school.
- 44) Finding a place to live.
- 45) Asking for career/professional advice from faculty and school staff.

- 47) Getting needed health care.
- 48) Buying textbooks.
- 49) Ordering food on campus.

II. Non-communication Stressors

(1) Academic Tasks

- 9) Receiving a D or F on a test.
- 11) Pressure to get an A or B in a course.
- 15) Cheating on a test.
- 16) Failing to complete assignments.
- 17) Studying for a test.
- 36) Taking an examination.

(2) Intrapersonal Communication

- 1) Being an international student on your campus.
- 4) Anxiety about adopting behaviors I never had before.
- 7) Pressure to create a positive impression; set a high example for my country.
- 8) Loneliness for other speakers of my native language.
- 10) Pressure of living in two worlds (my culture and this culture) with different sets of expectations for me.
- 12) Deciding between the benefits and disadvantages of leaving my home/family/culture for a university degree.

APPENDIX C

COPING STRATEGIES CATEGORIES

COPING STRATEGIES CATEGORIES

I. Problem-focused coping

- 1) Just concentrated on what I had to do next--the next step.
- 2) I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better.
- 7) Tried to get the person responsible to change his or her mind.
- 26) I made a plan of action and followed it.
- 35) I tried not to act too hastily or follow my first hunch.
- 39) Changed something so things would turn out all right.
- 46) Stood my ground and fought for what I wanted.
- 48) Drew on my past experiences; I was in a similar situation before.
- 49) I knew what had to be done, so doubled my efforts to make things work.
- 52) Came up with a couple of different solutions to the problem.
- 54) I tried to keep my feelings from interfering with other things too much.
- 62) I went over in my mind what I would say or do.
- 64) I tried to see things from the other person's point of view.

- 65) I reminded myself how much worse things could be.

II. Wishful Thinking

- 11) Hoped a miracle would happen.
34) Took a big chance or did something very risky.
50) Refused to believe it happened.
55) Wished that I could change what had happened or how I felt.
57) I daydreamed or imagined a better time or place than the one I was in.
58) Wished that the situation would go away or somehow be over with.
61) I prepared myself for the worst.

III. Detachment

- 3) Turned to work or substitute activity to take my mind off things.
4) I felt that time would make a difference--the only thing to do was wait.
12) Went along with fate; sometimes I just have bad luck.
13) Went on as if nothing had happened.
21) Tried to forget the whole thing.
24) I waited to see what would happen before doing anything.
36) Found new faith.
41) Did not let it get to me; refused to think too much about it.

- 44) Didn't take the situation so seriously; refused to get too serious about it.
- 53) Accepted it, since nothing could be done.

IV. Seeking Emotional Social Support

- 8) Talked to someone to find out more about the situation.
- 18) Accepted sympathy and understanding from someone.
- 22) I got professional help.
- 28) I let my feelings out somehow.
- 31) Talked to someone who could do something concrete about the problem.
- 42) I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice.
- 45) Talked to someone about how I was feeling.
- 60) I prayed.
- 67) I sought advice from a spiritual guide or tribal leader.

V. Focusing on the Positive

- 5) Bargained or compromised to get something positive from the situation.
- 6) I did something which I didn't think would work, but at least I was doing something.
- 10) Tried to keep my options open, leave things open somewhat.
- 15) Looked for the positive aspects; tried to look on the bright side of things.
- 20) I was inspired to do something creative.

- 23) Changed or grew as a person in a good way.
- 27) I accepted the next best thing to what I wanted.
- 38) Rediscovered what is important in life.
- 63) I thought about how a person I admired would handle this situation.

VI. Self-Blame

- 9) Criticized or lectured myself.
- 25) I apologized or did something to make up.
- 29) Realized I brought the problem on myself.
- 51) I made a promise to myself that things would be different next time.
- 56) I changed something about myself.

VII. Tension-Reduction/Relaxation

- 16) Slept more than usual.
- 17) I expressed anger to the person(s) who caused the problem.
- 32) Got away from it for a while; tried to rest or take a vacation.
- 33) Tried to make myself feel better by eating, drinking, smoking, using drugs or medication, etc.
- 47) Took it out on other people.
- 66) I jogged, worked out, or exercised.

VIII. Keep to Self

- 14) I tried to keep my feelings to myself.
- 19) Told myself things that helped me to feel better.

- 30) I came out of the experience better than when I went in.
- 37) Maintained my pride.
- 40) Avoided being with people in general.
- 43) Kept others from knowing how bad things were.

APPENDIX D

HIGHLY STRESSFUL SITUATIONS

Highly Stressful Situations

- S17. Studying for a test
 S36. Taking an examination
 S6. Giving a class presentation
 S9. Receiving a D or F on a test
 S11. Pressure to get an A or B in a course
 S3. Asking a question in class
 S24. Lack of assertiveness or ability to speak up for own beliefs
 S25. Interacting with large groups of people for the first time

Figure 1. Histogram correlating highly stressful situations on the stress level scale.

APPENDIX E

LOW STRESSFUL SITUATIONS

Low Stressful Situations

- S49. Ordering food on campus
 S48. Buying textbook
 S33. Asking other students to explain class material
 S42. Socializing over a meal
 S34. Discussing cultural problems with other students
 S30. Registering for classes
 S35. Discussing personal life problems with other student

Figure 2. Histogram 1 correlating low stressful situations on the stress level scale.

Low Stressful Situations

- S37. Being around people from many different cultures
 S28. Making an appointment to meet a professor in their office
 S8. Loneliness for other speakers of my native language
 S32. Using public transportation to go to school
 S21. Asking people about university policies, rules and services.

Figure 3. Histogram 2 correlating low stressful situations on the stress level scale.

APPENDIX F

COPING STRATEGIES

Coping Strategies

Coping Strategies

- C8. Talking to someone to find out more about the situation.
 C15. Looked for the positive aspects; tried to look on the bright side of things.
 C2. I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better.
 C42. I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice.
 C45. Talked to some one about how I was feeling.
 C26. I made a plan of action and followed it.
 C28. I let my feelings out somehow.
 C27. I accepted the next best thing to what I wanted.
 C31. Talked to someone who could do something concrete about the problem.

Figure 4. Correlation of the frequency of the use of coping strategies on the stress level scale.

APPENDIX G

INTERCORRELATION OF BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND PERCEIVED STRESSORS

TABLE XI
INTERCORRELATIONS OF BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
AND PERCEIVED STRESSORS

	ACADEMIC	INCLASS	SOCIAL	ENVIRON	PERSONAL
AGE	.1788 (9) P= .323	.0284 (9) P= .471	-.0128 (9) P= .487	.2413 (9) P= .266	.0982 (9) P= .401
SEX	.2402 (9) P= .267	.5056 (9) P= .082	.0541 (9) P= .445	-.0595 (9) P= .440	.6165 (9) P= .438
CLASS	-.7930 (9) * P= .005	-.4089 (9) P= .137	-.5312 (9) P= .071	-.6077 (9) P= .041	-.3254 (9) P= .474
GPA	-.5069 (9) P= .082	-.4704 (9) P= .101	-.6853 (9) P= .021	-.4673 (9) P= .102	-.3800 (9) P= .419
USA	.0932 (9) P= .406	-.4808 (9) P= .095	-.2825 (9) P= .231	-.0655 (9) P= .434	-.0294 (9) P= .470
TRAINING	.4538 (9) P= .110	-.3811 (9) P= .156	-.4121 (9) P= .135	-.3585 (9) P= .172	-.1557 (9) P= .345
TRIPS	.3775 (9) P= .158	-.0548 (9) P= .444	.0254 (9) P= .474	.4608 (9) P= .106	-.1354 (9) P= .364
USPLAN	-.0766 (9) P= .422	.6020 (9) P= .043	.7463 (9) P= .010	.2950 (9) P= .220	.4102 (9) P= .136
FRIENDS	-.6855 (9) P= .021	.1421 (9) P= .358	-.0279 (9) P= .472	-.3348 (9) P= .189	.6157 (9) P= .039
EFFICACY	.3212 (9) P= .200	-.2363 (9) P= .270	-.5259 (9) P= .073	-.4297 (9) P= .124	-.1886 (9) P= .313
PROBFCC	.5773 (9) P= .052	.5613 (9) P= .058	.5731 (9) P= .053	.5760 (9) P= .052	-.0635 (9) P= .436

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / 1-TAILED SIG)

" . " IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED

Note: Significant correlation * $P < .01$

APPENDIX H

INTERCORRELATION OF BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND COPING STRATEGIES

TABLE XII

INTERCORRELATION OF BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND COPING STRATEGIES

	PROBFOC	WISHEUL	DETACHMT	SEKSUPT	POSITIVE	SLFBLAME	RELAX	KEEPSLIF	TOTCOPE
AGE	-.2113 (.91) P=.293	-.3897 (.91) P=.150	-.4365 (.91) P=.120	-.2284 (.91) P=.277	-.1395 (.91) P=.361	-.3908 (.91) P=.149	-.4260 (.91) P=.126	.1723 (.91) P=.329	-.3200 (.91) P=.201
SEX	.3537 (.91) P=.175	.2428 (.91) P=.265	-.0526 (.91) P=.446	.3293 (.91) P=.153	-.0112 (.91) P=.489	.4890 (.91) P=.091	.2055 (.91) P=.298	.0760 (.91) P=.423	.2251 (.91) P=.280
CLASS	-.6098 (.91) P=.041	-.7966 (.91) P=.005	-.7009 (.91) P=.018	-.6398 (.91) P=.032	-.6689 (.91) P=.024	-.5890 (.91) P=.048	-.7706 (.91) P=.008	-.7928 (.91) P=.005	-.8042 (.91) P=.004
GPA	-.3911 (.91) P=.149	-.5682 (.91) P=.055	-.6411 (.91) P=.031	-.5690 (.91) P=.055	-.6204 (.91) P=.037	-.4890 (.91) P=.091	-.6459 (.91) P=.030	-.4608 (.91) P=.106	-.6423 (.91) P=.031
USA	-.5495 (.91) P=.063	-.2439 (.91) P=.264	.1101 (.91) P=.389	-.5325 (.91) P=.070	-.0973 (.91) P=.402	-.3318 (.91) P=.191	-.2457 (.91) P=.262	-.0657 (.91) P=.494	-.2839 (.91) P=.230
TRAINING	-.0921 (.91) P=.407	.2613 (.91) P=.248	.5589 (.91) P=.059	-.2603 (.91) P=.249	.0355 (.91) P=.464	-.2097 (.91) P=.294	.0928 (.91) P=.406	.0300 (.91) P=.469	.0968 (.91) P=.402
TRIPS	.3778 (.91) P=.172	.1756 (.91) P=.326	-.0150 (.91) P=.485	.2373 (.91) P=.269	.0618 (.91) P=.437	-.1906 (.91) P=.312	.0587 (.91) P=.440	.5225 (.91) P=.074	.1771 (.91) P=.324
USPLAN	.2500 (.91) P=.258	.1857 (.91) P=.316	.0775 (.91) P=.421	.3780 (.91) P=.158	.5294 (.91) P=.071	.4506 (.91) P=.112	.3348 (.91) P=.189	.1291 (.91) P=.370	.3238 (.91) P=.198
ERIENDS	-.3024 (.91) P=.214	-.4188 (.91) P=.131	-.5527 (.91) P=.061	-.3416 (.91) P=.184	-.2566 (.91) P=.253	.2670 (.91) P=.244	-.2805 (.91) P=.232	-.3868 (.91) P=.152	-.3759 (.91) P=.159
EFFICACY	-.3602 (.91) P=.170	-.1339 (.91) P=.366	.0770 (.91) P=.422	-.4260 (.91) P=.126	-.2659 (.91) P=.245	-.2415 (.91) P=.266	-.2580 (.91) P=.251	-.1883 (.91) P=.314	-.2505 (.91) P=.258

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / 1-TAILED SIG) * . = IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED

Note: Significant correlation * $P < .01$

APPENDIX I

INTERCORRELATION AMONG BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

TABLE XIII

INTERCORRELATION AMONG BIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

AGE	SEX	CLASS	GPA	USA	TRAINING	TRIPS	USPLAN	FRIENDS	EFFICACY
AGE	1.0000 (.91) P=.3993	.1391 (.91) P=.100	.2902 (.91) P=.224	.4119 (.91) P=.135	-.3441 (.91) P=.182	.6167 (.91) P=.038	-.1591 (.91) P=.361	-.1746 (.91) P=.321	-.0272 (.91) P=.412
SEX	1.0000 (.91) P=.144	-.4128 (.91) P=.135	-.1030 (.91) P=.399	-.4781 (.91) P=.097	-.1581 (.91) P=.342	-.1000 (.91) P=.399	-.1754 (.91) P=.326	.2459 (.91) P=.262	.2947 (.91) P=.221
CLASS	-.4128 (.91) P=.361	1.0000 (.91) P=.135	.4182 (.91) P=.022	-.0881 (.91) P=.411	-.3730 (.91) P=.161	-.1180 (.91) P=.381	-.0323 (.91) P=.467	.5184 (.91) P=.076	-.2923 (.91) P=.223
GPA	-.1030 (.91) P=.224	-.4128 (.91) P=.135	1.0000 (.91) P=.022	-.0747 (.91) P=.424	-.1581 (.91) P=.342	.3250 (.91) P=.197	-.6139 (.91) P=.039	.4575 (.91) P=.108	.0188 (.91) P=.481
USA	.4119 (.91) P=.135	.4182 (.91) P=.022	-.0881 (.91) P=.411	1.0000 (.91) P=.424	.3780 (.91) P=.158	-.0598 (.91) P=.439	-.3407 (.91) P=.185	-.3348 (.91) P=.189	.6083 (.91) P=.041
TRAINING	-.3441 (.91) P=.182	-.3730 (.91) P=.161	-.1180 (.91) P=.381	.3780 (.91) P=.158	1.0000 (.91) P=.439	-.1581 (.91) P=.342	-.4854 (.91) P=.093	-.3777 (.91) P=.158	.7654 (.91) P=.011
TRIPS	.6167 (.91) P=.038	.3250 (.91) P=.197	-.6139 (.91) P=.039	-.0598 (.91) P=.439	-.1581 (.91) P=.342	1.0000 (.91) P=.467	-.4166 (.91) P=.132	.72775 (.91) P=.233	-.2464 (.91) P=.261
USPLAN	-.1591 (.91) P=.361	-.0323 (.91) P=.467	-.6139 (.91) P=.039	-.3407 (.91) P=.185	-.4854 (.91) P=.093	-.4166 (.91) P=.132	1.0000 (.91) P=.467	.1302 (.91) P=.369	-.5803 (.91) P=.031
FRIENDS	.2459 (.91) P=.262	.5184 (.91) P=.076	.4575 (.91) P=.108	-.3348 (.91) P=.189	-.3777 (.91) P=.158	-.2775 (.91) P=.235	.1302 (.91) P=.369	1.0000 (.91) P=.467	-.2646 (.91) P=.246
EFFICACY	-.0272 (.91) P=.412	-.2923 (.91) P=.223	.0188 (.91) P=.481	.6083 (.91) P=.041	.7454 (.91) P=.011	-.2464 (.91) P=.261	-.5803 (.91) P=.031	1.0000 (.91) P=.467	

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / 1-TAILED SIG) * . = IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED

Note: Significant correlation * P<.01

APPENDIX J

INTERCORRELATION AMONG PERCEIVED STRESSORS

TABLE XIV
INTERCORRELATION AMONG PERCEIVED STRESSORS

	ACADEMIC	INCLASS	SOCIAL	ENVIRON	PERSONAL
ACADEMIC	.1.0000 (.91) P = .	.3755 (.91) P = .160	.2797 (.91) P = .233	.3716 (.91) P = .162	-.0538 (.91) P = .445
INCLASS		.1.0000 (.91) P = .160	.6972 (.91) P = .018	.3538 (.91) P = .175	.4435 (.91) P = .116
SOCIAL			.1.0000 (.91) P = .233	.7993 (.91) *P = .005	.4709 (.91) P = .103
ENVIRON				.1.0000 (.91) *P = .005	.0897 (.91) P = .409
PERSONAL					.1.0000 (.91) P = .

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / 1-TAILED SIG) " . " IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED

Note: Significant correlation * $P < .01$

APPENDIX K

INTERCORRELATIONS OF PERCEIVED STRESSORS AND COPING STRATEGIES

TABLE XV
INTERCORRELATIONS OF PERCEIVED STRESSORS
AND COPING STRATEGIES

	ACADEMIC	INCLASS	SOCIAL	ENVIRON	PERSONAL
PROBFCC	.5773 (.9) P = .052	.5613 (.9) P = .058	.5731 (.9) P = .053	.5760 (.9) P = .052	-.0635 (.9) P = .436
WISHFUL	.6281 (.9) P = .035	.3215 (.9) P = .199	.5703 (.9) P = .054	.5882 (.9) P = .048	-.0089 (.9) P = .491
DETACHMT	.5112 (.9) P = .080	-.1104 (.9) P = .389	.3625 (.9) P = .169	.4338 (.9) P = .122	-.0935 (.9) P = .405
SEESUPT	.4375 (.9) P = .119	.5611 (.9) P = .058	.7106 (.9) P = .016	.7502 (.9) P = .010	-.1621 (.9) P = .338
POSITIVE	.5594 (.9) P = .059	.5222 (.9) P = .075	.7842 (.9) *P = .006	.6095 (.9) P = .041	.3829 (.9) P = .155
SLFBLAME	.1065 (.9) P = .393	.6169 (.9) P = .038	.7844 (.9) *P = .006	.5769 (.9) P = .052	.4693 (.9) P = .101
RELAX	.4360 (.9) P = .120	.3401 (.9) P = .185	.7309 (.9) P = .013	.7158 (.9) P = .015	.1012 (.9) P = .398
KEEPSLF	.6840 (.9) P = .021	.3789 (.9) P = .157	.7078 (.9) P = .016	.8573 (.9) *P = .002	.2362 (.9) P = .275
[COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / 1-TAILED SIG.]					

* . " IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED

Note: Significant correlation * $P < .01$

APPENDIX L

INTERCORRELATION AMONG COPING STRATEGIES

TABLE XVI
INTERCORRELATION AMONG COPING STRATEGIES

	PROBFC	WISHFUL	DETACHMT	SEEKSUPT	POSITIVE	SLFBLAME	RELAX	KEEPSLF
PROBFC	1.0000 (.91) P = .	.8644 (.91) P = .001	.4475 (.91) P = .114	.8963 (.91) P = .001	.7256 (.91) P = .013	.5221 (.91) P = .075	.7672 (.91) P = .008	.7028 (.91) P = .017
WISHFUL		1.0000 (.91) P = .	.8162 (.91) P = .004	.7860 (.91) P = .004	.8393 (.91) P = .002	.5899 (.91) P = .047	.9403 (.91) P = .000	.7940 (.91) P = .005
DETACHMT			1.0000 (.91) P = .	.4560 (.91) P = .109	.6406 (.91) P = .032	.3428 (.91) P = .183	.8060 (.91) P = .004	.6159 (.91) P = .039
SEEKSUPT				1.0000 (.91) P = .	.6287 (.91) P = .035	.6349 (.91) P = .033	.8133 (.91) P = .004	.6726 (.91) P = .024
POSITIVE					1.0000 (.91) P = .	.6235 (.91) P = .036	.8276 (.91) P = .003	.7980 (.91) P = .005
SLFBLAME						1.0000 (.91) P = .	.7640 (.91) P = .008	.5558 (.91) P = .060
RELAX							1.0000 (.91) P = .	.7922 (.91) P = .005
KEEPSLF								1.0000 (.91) P = .

(COEFFICIENT / (CASES) / 1-TAILED SIG) = . = IS PRINTED IF A COEFFICIENT CANNOT BE COMPUTED

Note: Significant correlation * P < .01