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ABSTRACT

Asian international students compose more than 10% of enrollments at predominantly White-institutions of higher education (PW-IHE) in the United States (US) of America and are primarily enrolled at research IHE (Institute for International Education, 1999). Students from countries outside of the US are an important constituency for IHE in the USA America due to the added cultural richness they bring to the academy (Tan, 1994). However, many Asian international students at PW-IHE in US encounter difficulty when attempting to describe assimilation and may have difficulty adjusting to their environment (Uba, 1994). Specific to adapted physical activity (APA), several Asian countries (e.g. China, Japan, and Korea) have received academic and pedagogical influences related to teaching physical activities and sports for individuals with disabilities from scholars in and beyond USA America (Doll-Tepper, Dahms, Doll, & von Selzam, 1990; Kobayashi, et al., 2000; Sherrill & DePauw, 1997). For example, the book *Adapted Physical Activity, Recreation and Sport: Crossdisciplinary and Lifespan* (Sherrill, 1997) has been translated from English into Chinese, and likewise the book *Early Movement Experiences and Development* (Winnick, 1979) has been translated into Japanese and now widely used for elementary special education teachers in these
countries (Kobayashi, Nagamatsu, Shichikida, & Miyahara, 2000). As a result, Asian scholars have been inspired to promote the concepts of interdisciplinary and crossdisciplinary theory and practice, which relate to the lifespan physical activity of individuals with psychomotor limitations (Kobayashi et al., 2000). However, the number of adapted physical education (APE) graduate programs in Asian countries is very limited. Therefore, a number of students from various Asian countries enroll in APE degree programs at IHE in the USA America (Fujita, 2001).

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. Participants were seven Asian international APA doctoral students. The theoretical framework was assimilation theory, which refers to a process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing and explaining their experiences and history, incorporate with them in a common cultural life (Park & Burgess, 1969).

This study used an explanatory (holistic) multiple case study design (Yin, 2003). The principle premise of case study method is to better understand some complex social phenomena—while retaining the holistic and meaningful particularities of real-life circumstances (Yin, 2003). Data were collected using (a) a modified demographic
questionnaire, Doctoral Education and Career Preparation (DECP; Golde & Dore, 2001) survey; (b) face-to-face interviews (Yin, 2003); and (c) academic program of study from each participant.

Interview data were analyzed using constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which involves systematically examining and refining variations in emergent themes. The basic strategy of this analysis process is to do what its name implies – constantly compare. The researcher begins with a particular incident from an interview, program of study, and demographic questionnaire, for example to compare these data with other content in the same set of data or in another set (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Findings were presented descriptively in narrative as recurring themes. These recurring themes were: (a) academic experiences, (b) relationships, (c) barriers, and (d) identity, political, cultural, and diversity awareness. Implications of these findings are described for APA professional development programs.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States of America (USA) society and institutions of higher education (IHE) are more diverse now than at any previous time (Harvey & Anderson, 2005; Keller, 2001; U. S. Census Bureau, 2003, 2006). Knowledgeable observers both inside and outside the academy of higher education say that an important goal of IHE is to prepare culturally competent individuals with the ability to work effectively with people from different backgrounds (Carnevale, 1999; Mori, 2000; Sandhu, 1995; Smith & Schonfeld, 2000). International students constitute an ever more relevant and important source of diversity on college and university campuses. Attending American IHE, where substantial numbers of international students are enrolled may give American students an advantage in the market place, to the extent that such an experience increases their cultural sensitivities and skills in working with people from different cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds (Calleja, 2000; Carnevale, 1999).

According to the Institute of International Education (2002), the total international student enrollment at USA colleges and universities in 2001 was nearly 550,000. This represents a 6.4% increase over the year 2000 and the biggest single-year jump in 20
years. Moreover, students from Asian countries comprise over half (56%) of all international enrollments, followed by students from European countries (14%), Latin America (12%), the Middle East (7%), African countries (6%), and North America and Oceania (5%) (Institute of International Education, 2002). In fact, American colleges and universities enroll more international students than any other country in the world (Marcus & Hartigan, 2000). In addition, Asian Americans who were born in USA also receive more opportunities in attending higher education programs. For example, data shows that in 20 years the number of Asian Americans in USA higher education increased by over 400% to over 832,000 from 1976 to 1996 (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1998). Plus, Asian Americans are one of the fastest growing racial/ethnic groups in America (Escueta & O’Brien, 1995; Humes & MukKinnon, 1999). Interestingly, Asian Americans were more likely to complete their education, even though they were more dissatisfied with their experiences on IHE campuses than other groups (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990). They were more likely to seek treatment for career and academic concerns than social problems (Tracey, Leong, & Glidden, 1986).

In recent years, studies have shown that Asian Americans have concerns on safety and security issues at IHE campuses, particularly when campus diversity increases (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Helm, Prieto, & Sedlacek, 1999). On the other hand, they are the second largest regional group of Asian international students that study in USA colleges and universities. Although studying overseas (e.g., in USA) is a unique opportunity, Ying and Liese (1994) found that many Taiwanese students felt alienation, depression, loneliness, and withdrawal.
Thus, providing an example of how Asian and Asian American students encounter barriers while studying at predominantly White institutions of higher education (PW-IHE) in the USA.

Asian international students compose more than 10% of enrollments at PW-IHE in the USA and are primarily enrolled at research IHE (Institute for International Education, 1999). Students from countries outside of the USA are an important constituency for IHE in America due to the added cultural richness they bring to the academy (Tan, 1994). However, many Asian international students at PW-IHE in USA encounter difficulty when attempting to acculturate and may have difficulty adjusting to their environment (Uba, 1994). They rarely express concerns about emotional and social issues, because Asian international students tend to be more concerned with academic and career issues. These problematic issues are more role-salient to their personal traditions, beliefs, and cultural values (Kitano & Daniels, 1990). Although research indicates that Asian international students seem to be a resilient group, homesickness and loneliness are pervasive, and depression is common (Wehrly, 1988). Brislin (1981) suggested that irritability; excessive concerns with health, distrust, hostility towards members of the host culture, depression, and lowered work performance are common symptoms of the cultural shock that international students often experience.

A number of IHE in America prepare Asian international students for careers in government, business, law, journalism, agricultural life science, nutritional science, plant science, food science, applied economics and management, and biological and environmental engineering (Asian related academic programs at Cornell, 2005).
Moreover, a number of IHE in America (e.g. University of Illinoi, University of Michigan, Harvard University, Yale University) are committed to a goal of internationalization in teacher preparation programs including physical education with various Asian countries. Internationalization does not have an internal logic of its own. It is a result of a variety of socio-economical, political, and technological changes that have international and transnational ramifications. Rationale for internationalization of universities reflects a response to the change context and a strategic positioning to play a role in it (Prasad, 2006). Thus, the number of Asian international graduate students is increasing in teacher preparation programs in IHE in America every year.

Specific to adapted physical activity (APA), several Asian countries (e.g. China, Japan, and Korea) have received academic and pedagogy influences related to teaching physical activities and sports for individuals with disabilities from scholars in and beyond America (Doll-Tepper, Dahms, Doll, & von Selzam, 1990; Kobayashi, et al., 2000; Sherrill & DePauw, 1997). For example, *Adapted Physical Activity, Recreation and Sport: Crossdisciplinary and Lifespan* (Sherrill, 1997) has been translated into Chinese, and likewise the book *Early Movement Experiences and Development* (Winnick, 1979) has been translated into Japanese and now widely used for elementary special education teachers in these countries (Kobayashi, Nagamatsu, Shichikida, & Miyahara, 2000). As a result, Asian educators have been inspired to promote the concepts of interdisciplinary and crossdisciplinary theory and practice, which relate to the life span physical activity of individual with psychomotor limitations or needs into their pedagogies (Kobayashi et al., 2000). However, the number of adapted physical education (APE) graduate programs in
Asian countries is still sparse. Therefore, a number of students from various Asian countries consistently enroll in APE degree programs at IHE in America (Fujita, 2001).

On many college and university campuses across USA, students of color (e.g., African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Latina/Latino, Native American) have traditionally struggled with racial tensions in their relationships with White American students and other diverse ethnic groups. Of concern, African American students are far more likely than White Americans to be the target of various forms of direct personal racism (Ancis, Sedlacek, & Mohr, 2000; Fisher & Hartmann, 1995; Gossett, Cuyjet, & Cockriel, 1998; Hodge & Stroot, 1997). Research indicates that most students of color have experienced negative differential treatment at their respective PW-IHE compared to their White American cohorts (Hodge & Stroot, 1997). Moreover, research has been conducted on the interactions between African American graduate students and their student-faculty relationships in PW-IHE and historically Black colleges and universities (HBCU). Results indicate that African American graduate students who attended HBCU perceived more positive and meaningful interactions in their student-faculty relationships than those at PW-IHE. African American students felt more welcomed on HBCU campuses than at PW-IHE (Allen, 1987; Fleming, 1984).

Asia: A Word of Clarification

Asia is comprised of more than 40 countries and is the largest continent in both size and population. It encompasses nearly a third of the world’s land area and has about three-fifths of its populace (World Book Encyclopedia, 1990). Given its vast land mass
and diversities of countries, people, languages, and cultures. There is much confusion across countries with the term “Asian.” The fact that in American English, Asian refers to East Asian (Orientals), while in British English, Asian refers to South Asian which reflects this confusion (Wikipedia Dictionary, 2006). Due to political and national considerations, sometimes, it is not even clear exactly what countries Asia consists of (World Book Encyclopedia, 1990). For instance, some definitions exclude Turkey, the Middle East, or Russia. However, the Japanese government includes Turkey as one of the Asian countries, because Japan and Turkey have maintained good relations for over a century (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan, 2006). Moreover, Japan regards Turkey as one of the most important aid recipients in the Middle East and actively provides assistance. This stance reflects the following claims by The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan (2006). First, Turkey is an important nation, and is contributing to regional stability with its moderate and realistic foreign policy and by working harmoniously with the West maintaining friendly and cooperative relations with neighboring Eastern European countries and newly independent states. Second, Turkey need for aid is strong due to its large population. Third, Turkey is geographically important because of its location at the crossroads of Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Fourth, Turkey has traditionally maintained good relations with Japan. Thus, Japan and Turkey are considered as culturally and linguistically similar Asian countries (The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan, 2006). The term Asian is sometimes used more strictly in reference to Asian Pacific, which does not include the Middle East or Russia, but does include islands in the Pacific Ocean – a number of which may also be
considered part of Australia or Oceania (Wikipedia Dictionary, 2006). In the current study, native born Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Turkish graduate students were selected as participants and referred to as Asian international students.

Problem Statement

Empirical evidence confirms that Asian international students face multiple problems while studying at PW-IHE in the USA. For example, Asian international students often have communication difficulties caused by their lack of English proficiency (Wan, 2001). Thus, they face various cross-cultural adjustment problems such as adapting to new roles, academic difficulties, language difficulties, financial problems, homesickness, lack of study skills, and lack of assertiveness (Barratt & Huba, 1994; Charles & Steward, 1991; Hayes & Lin, 1994; Parr, Bradley, & Bingi, 1992). International graduate students are not eligible for USA federal funding support. Therefore, many international students face financial issues in studying at PW-IHE (Robert, 2002). Asian American students also have different types of problems (e.g., cultural adjustment difficulties and psychological distress) compared to Asian international students while studying at PW-IHE. As such Asian international students are dissatisfied more than other Latino and European international groups and not discuss about their experiences on the campuses of PW-IHE compared to other ethnic groups (Bennett & Okinaka, 1990). Asian international students encounter difficulty when attempting to acculturate and may have a hard time adapting to their environment (Uba, 1994).
Theoretical Framework and Purpose

The theoretical framework of this study was assimilation theory, which refers to a process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups and, by sharing and explaining their experience and history, incorporate with them in a common cultural life (Park & Burgess, 1969). The concepts of assimilation are used to describe the process by which a group’s cultural distinctive character disappears or is abandoned when faced with the majority society (Molina, 1997). Unlike integration, where the individual character or various group is not regarded as an obstacle to entering social life, assimilation is forced by way of tough demands concerning adaptation to the predominant norm of social behavior (Molina, 1997). The term assimilation refers to a person’s tendency to understand new experiences in terms of existing knowledge. The term experience consists of different levels or modes of adaptation (Portes & Zhou, 1993). Assimilation theory consists of social assimilation (Park, 1930), acculturation (Gordon, 1964), and identity presentation (Gordon, 1964).

Social assimilation refers to a process or processes by which people of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solitary sufficient at least to sustain a national existence (Park, 1930). Park (1930) spoke of assimilation as the end stage of “race-relations cycle” of “contact, competition, accommodation” (p. 281). Speaking of the race relations cycle, Park (1930) referred to the process in the modern world, including long distance labor migration, one that brings once separated people into closer contact. Competition is the initial, unstable
consequence of contact as groups struggle to gain advantages over one another, and it eventuates in the more stable stage of accommodation, where a social structure of typically unequal relations among groups and a settled understanding of group position have come into being (Shibutani & Kwan, 1965). But, no matter how stable, accommodation will be undermined by the personal relationships that cross group boundaries, according to Park. He wrote that “in our estimates of race relations we have not reckonedit up out of them” (Park, 1950. p. 150). Moreover, Park and Thomas (1927) asserted that social assimilation is a fundamental condition of sometimes called “Americanization,” which is the participation of immigrants in the life of the community in which they live. In the current study, the researcher examined the social assimilation or “Americanization” of Asian international doctoral students in APA programs at PW-IHE. Social assimilation is a redefinition of situational changes that characterize the action (Park & Thomas, 1927). In that regard, the immigration problem is unique in the sense that immigrants bring divergent definitions of their situations and this renders their participation in dominated cultural activities difficult (Park & Thomas, 1927).

Acculturation is defined as the level to which one incorporates the language, values, and practices of a new culture – is treated as an individual trait carried across domains and contexts (Monzo & Rueda, 2006). What is yet determined is whether or not Asian international doctoral students’ adoption of the “cultural elaborate” of the host society, comes first and is inevitable (Gordon, 1964). Gordon’s explanation for cultural elaboration proposed that elaboration could be a consequence of selection within uncertain environments. Gordon (1964) claimed that acculturation patterns extend
beyond the acquisition of English language, to dress and outward emotional expression, and to personal values. Acculturation distinguished intrinsic cultural traits, those that are vital ingredients of the group’s cultural heritage, exemplified by religion and musical tastes, from extrinsic traits, which tend to be products of the historical vicissitudes of the group’s adjustment to the local environment and thus are deemed less central to group identity (Gordon, 1964).

Identity assimilation has taken on importance in the contemporary discussions of assimilation with respect to both the descendants of Asian immigrants and new immigrant groups. This is defined as the development of a sense of peoplehood based exclusively on the host society (Gordon, 1964). Gordon (1964) recognized that ethnic identity was not an undifferentiated concept and distinguished between “historical identification” which derived from a sense of the “interdependence of fate” and extended to the ethnic group as a whole, and “participation identity” whose locus was the segment of the group most socially similar to the individual.

Assimilation can be result of either individual choices or imposed by political decisions aimed at cultural, linguistic, or religious conformity (Svanberg & Tyden, 1999). In the latter case, assimilation is enforced by political decisions and social norms that allow very little room for variations or deviations in these areas. Even the kind of assimilation that is result of individual decisions should be seen in relation to the majority society’s direct and/or indirect demands for adaptation and conformity (Svanberg & Tyden, 1999). To date, there are no studies published that have examined Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs. To this void,
the purpose of this study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. Stated differently, the end sought of the study was to explain how and to what degree Asian international doctoral students become like the people they are around at PW-IHE, adopting the attitudes and cultural patterns of the people (e.g., other graduate students, academic advisors and faculty) they encounter within their doctoral programs. This is the process of assimilation (Park & Burgess, 1969).

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study.

1. How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

2. How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

3. How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

Limitations of the Study

The potential for language barriers between the participants and researcher were considered a limitation in this study. Given that English was a second language for all participants, English may not have been the most appropriate language for collecting data via interviews and questionnaires. For example, these participants may have had difficulty in understanding the questions and effectively articulating their perspectives.
and experiences associated with assimilating within APA doctoral programs at Big Ten Conference institutions. The problem of the links between languages, identities, and speech are relevant for all cross-language researchers and participants (Temple, 2006). Wan (2001) indicated that language barriers often cause frustrations associated with communication difficulties and discrimination resulting from international students speaking differently from others.

Delimitation of the Study

In delimiting this study, the researcher selected doctoral students only in APA programs at Big Ten Conference institutions located in the Midwestern USA, which currently had only seven Asian international students in these programs who met the participant nomination and selection criteria (Yin, 2003).

Definition of Terms

The following key terms were used throughout this study and to ensure clarity of meaning and usage the terms were defined below.

Acculturation. Acculturation is defined as the level to which one incorporates the language, values, and practices of a new culture – is treated as an individual trait carried across domains and contexts (Monzo & Rueda, 2006).

Adapted Physical Activity is widely defined as the umbrella term that encompasses exercise, physical education, recreation, dance, sport, fitness, and rehabilitation for individuals with various impairments across the lifespan (DePauw & Doll-Tepper, 1989; Porretta, Nesbitt, & Labanowich, 1993; Sherrill, 1993).
Asian International Students. In this study, Asian international students were defined as those who: (a) used English as a second language, (b) declared themselves as “Asian” and were native to Asian countries (Wan, 2001), and (c) were APA doctoral students at Big Ten Conference Institutions.

Assimilation. The term assimilation refers to the tendency to understand new experiences in terms of existing knowledge (Park & Burgess, 1921). Moreover, assimilation is defined as “a process of interpretation and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons and groups, by sharing and explaining experience and history, which are incorporated with them in a common cultural life” (Park & Burgess, 1921 pp.64).

Collectivism. Collectivism refers to any moral, political, or social outlook, that stresses human interdependence and the importance of a collective, rather than the importance of separate individuals. Collectivism focuses on community and society, and seeks to give priority to group goals over individual goals. “An essential attribute of collectivist cultures is that individuals may be induced to subordinate their personal goals to the goals of some collective, which is usually a stable in group” (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988, p.324).

Doctoral Program of Study refers an agreement between school’s graduate program studies committee and the graduate student (Guideline for developing the Doctoral Program study from University of Texas, 1993).
Experience refers to the knowledge and skill that an individual gained through doing something for a period of time and the things that have happened to an individual that influences the way she or he think and behave (Webster’s New World Dictionary of American Language, 1959).

Identity Assimilation. Identity assimilation is defined as the development of a sense of peoplehood based exclusively on the host society (Gordon, 1964).

Individualism. Individualism refers to a moral, political, and social outlook that stresses human independence and the importance of individual self-reliance and liberty (Triandis et al., 1988; Wikipedia Dictionary, 2006).

Nominated Participants. In case study method, participants are nominated rather than sampled (Yin, 2003). In this study, therefore, Asian international doctoral APA students were nominated by faculty of APA programs at Big Ten Conference IHE.

Perspective refers to the ability to think about problems and decisions in a reasonable way without exaggerating their importance (Webster’s New World Dictionary of American Language, 1959).

Social Assimilation. This term refers to a process or processes by which people of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solitary sufficient at least to sustain a national existence (Park, 1930).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. According to Institute of International Education (2006), about 275,000 foreign students in 2005-2006 were pursuing American graduate degrees. Most recently, there have been significant increases from the two top source countries for foreign graduate students – India (up 23 percent between 2001-2006) and China (up 21 percent between 2001-2006). There was strong interest in fields where American universities are particularly dependent on foreign talent. However, the research examining students of color, from diverse backgrounds and international students’ assimilation into American colleges and universities is very limited (Wan, 2001).

This chapter highlights the literature on: (a) research on international students, (b) research on low SES (socio-economic status) students in USA, (c) research on students with disabilities in higher education, (d) research on doctoral students at IHE, and (e) issues in physical education and APA. The chapter ends with a summary.
Research on International Students

Asian International Students in USA

Wan (2001) conducted a case study on the cross-cultural learning experiences of Chinese students (graduate students and their wives) at a major eastern American university. These students described their experiences in the following areas: (a) motivations for learning, (b) frustrations and satisfactions, (c) strategies used to cope with language inefficiency, (d) assumptions of the impact of their learning on their lives, and (e) awareness of cultural differences in classroom and daily life. Results showed that these Chinese graduate students had both positive and negative experiences, reflective of the cultural conflicts between the USA and China. They experienced different types of frustrations in learning and living in the USA. These frustrations included communication difficulties caused by their lack of English proficiency, discrimination resulting from their looking and speaking differently from other persons, and disillusionment caused by their financial instability. Moreover, these students reported feelings of not learning as much as they expected from classes, stress in school work, and time loss in daily life.

Experience to a new culture is considered an important psychological process due to its effects on the performance and functioning of the individual (Robie & Ryan, 1996). Consistently, research has shown that international students in the USA are likely to face various cross-cultural adjustment problems such as adapting to new roles, academic difficulties, language difficulties, financial problems, homesickness, lack of study skills, and lack of assertiveness (Barratt & Huba, 1994; Charles & Steward, 1991; Hayes & Lin, 1994; Parr, Bradley, & Bingi, 1992). For example, Triandis (1991) described situations in
which international students experienced adjustment problems. He suggested that
adjustment is easier for students who visit a country from the same ethnicity. For instance,
a White German student in a predominantly White American college is likely to have
closer adjustment issues than a Middle Eastern student would at a PW-IHE. Moreover
international students are also likely to encounter adjustment issues as faced by their
American peers. However, because they are in a new country facing an unfamiliar
language and culture, international students are likely to experience a more difficult
college transition than White American students (Kazmarek, Matlock, Merta, & Ames,
1994). On the other hand, American students also face adjustment issues when they start
college. Lack and loss of social support, academic problems, loneliness, and drug and
alcohol use are the most common problems American students encounter during their
adjustment to college (Damsteegt, 1992; Johnson, Staton, & Jorgenson-Earp, 1995).

Tomich et al. (2003) studied the difference of Asian and European international
students’ personality and adaptation experiences in the USA using two instruments, the
California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough, 1987) and the Inventory of Student
Adjustment Strain (ISAS; Crano & Crano, 1993). The CPI consists of 462 true-false
items and 20 subscales to measure a specific personality trait (Gough, 1987). The 20
subsubscales are as follows: dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-
acceptance, independence, empathy, responsibility, socialization, self-control, good
impression, communality, sense of well-being, tolerance, achievement via conformance,
achievement independence, intellectual efficacy, psychological-mindedness, flexibility,
and femininity/masculinity. The ISAS assess participants’ perceptions of strain
relationships to six areas of adjustment to life in the USA. These are (a) education, (b) English, (c) problem, (d) personal, (e) social, and (f) host. In Tomich et al.’s. (2003) study, the participants consisted of 21 Asian international students and 15 European international students at graduate business schools in the South Western USA. They found that Asian international participants’ academic achievement scores were twice as high as European international students. Nevertheless, Asian international students experienced more adaptation difficulties than their European international counterparts. A few studies of Asian international students’ experiences at outside USA were conducted by Samuel (2004) and Kurachi (1998).

Asian International Students Outside USA

Samuel (2004) conducted a study on racism in peer group interactions of South Asian undergraduate and graduate students’ experiences in Canadian colleges and universities. Samuel used qualitative methodology involving 40 South Asian students (20 males and 20 females with ages ranging from 18 to 24) in a predominantly White Canadian university to examine how racism is prevalent among peers in the university environment. Aversive racism theory (Kovel, 1970) and democratic racism theory (Henry, Tator, Mattis, & Rees, 2000) were used to situate the study. Aversive theory refers to the belief in the superiority of the White group and the negation of that belief in reacting in a cold and polite way to racialized minorities. Findings revealed that differential treatment was evident in the everyday interactions between South Asian students and White Canadian students, which negatively affecting the overall academic performance of the South Asian students (Samuel, 2004).
Some countries have raised the issue of treatment of racial differences (Kanazawa, 1992). More specifically, there are many countries that do not readily accept persons of other nationalities or cultures into their societies. On student experiences, Kurachi (1998) conducted an ethnographic analysis of two Korean graduate students attending Japanese universities. Both students were excited to learn in Japanese universities before arriving to Japan. However, they began to develop negative attitudes against interacting with Japanese students. This was because Korean graduate students felt that the vast majority of Japanese students tended to isolate or compare them with others by looking at their socio economic status, academic achievement, and appearance (Kurachi, 1998). Part of what contributed their negative experiences living in Japan was that there was differentiated treatment between these Korean students and the Japanese students by their academic advisors. Thus, differentiated treatment began to influence their peers to develop negative attitudes toward them. Turkish college students had some adjustment issues or negative experiences in studying at IHE in USA.

*Middle Eastern International Students (West Asia)*

Poyrazli, Arbona, Bullington, and Pisecco (2001) used self-reports to examine the adjustment of Turkish college students in the USA. The relation between students’ adjustment levels and the following characteristics were examined: age, marriage status, year spent in the USA having governmental scholarship, English proficiency level, and socioeconomic status (SES) of the students’ parents. Results indicated that older students had more adjustment problems because their values, customs, and interests may have been set and that they may have had a harder time changing these values, customs, and
interests. They also found that students, who had better writing-reading proficiency in English, reported having less adjustment issues. Additionally, most of the intervention or orientation programs such as the clubs, fraternities, sororities, or other students’ activities at colleges were designed for freshman or younger students not for graduate students. In order to help older students, college and university should pay more attention to the needs of older students and set up programs to help them adjust better. Turkish student population in the USA has rarely been studied, and not much is known about the adjustment problems and help-seeking behaviors of these students (Towle & Arslanoglu, 1998). Financial pressures are great among all international and American students in IHE. Walpore (2003) studies students’ experiences from low socio economic families in IHE.

**Research on Low Socio-Economic Status Students**

*Students from Low Socio-Economic Families in IHE*

In the higher education literature, students from low SES families tend to face concerns associated with equity issues from other groups from high SES families (Walpore, 2003). Students from low SES families have been a part of the American higher education since its earliest days, although always in small numbers, and still today underrepresented in higher education (Hearn, 1984, 1990; McDonough, 1997). Walpore (2003) asserted that students from low SES backgrounds who attend four year IHE work more, study less, and report lower grade point averages (GPA) than students from higher SES families. Additionally, students from low SES backgrounds have lower income, lower levels of educational attainment, and lower levels of educational aspirations than
their peers from higher social strata nine years after college entry. Students from low SES families have more ability to convert their college education and experience into social and economic profit beyond that of their peers from low SES who did not attend college. Yet, both groups of students from low SES backgrounds have less ability to do this than their college peers from higher SES backgrounds. O’Connor (1997) also studied high school students’ (from low socioeconomic families) dispositions in the inner city school in USA.

*Students from Low SES in High School*

O’Connor (1997) conducted a study of dispositions toward (collective) struggle and educational resilience in the inner city in a case analysis of six White high school American students from low-income, who articulated an acute recognition of how race and class operated significantly to constrain the life chances of people like themselves. Findings showed that these students shared a number of characteristics with similarly aspiring youth who also were high achieving and optimistic. They had (a) strong evidence of their personal competence, (b) concrete experiences which conveyed that individuals could defy racial barriers, and (c) social interactions, which communicated strategies that would allow them to negotiate the financial limitations of their households in their pursuit of upward mobility. To relate this study, several literatures of doctoral students in IHE described doctoral students’ experiences at PW-IHE.
Research on Doctoral Students in IHE

African American and Latina/o Doctoral Students in IHE

In college student literature, African American undergraduate and graduate students' experiences on predominantly White campuses has been the focus of many research studies primarily highlighting these students' academic difficulties (Allen, 1992; Fleming, 1984). Lewis, Ginsberg, Davis, and Smith (2004) described the experiences of African American doctoral students at a PW-IHE in the USA. Key themes emerged from data analysis procedures on (a) feelings of isolation, (b) standing out, (c) developing relationships with peers, and (d) negotiating the academic system. The African American students felt like “uninvited guests in a strange land” on the campus of this PW-IHE. In essence, they were on their own, they stood out as being different, they had to find their own connection points and negotiate the system as best they could. These African American doctoral students faced different types of barriers in attending graduate programs at PW-IHE compared to their Asian counterparts also attending graduate schools at PW-IHE in the USA.

Likewise, Gonzalez, Martin, Figueroa, Morero, and Navia (2002) studied doctoral education in America as experienced by Latinas/os in pursuit of doctoral degrees. They used autoethnographic narratives (Ellis & Bochner, 2000) in phase one of the study to describe their experiences as Latina/o doctoral students and dialogical research methods (Padilla, 1993) to stimulate a dialogue about their experiences in the academy. Six Latina/o students participated in the study. Findings indicate that for Latina and Latino students’ doctoral education in PW-IHE entails negotiating a restrictive, conservative,
and racist institution and forces that perpetuated it. Gonzalez et al. concluded that the continuation of these forces preserves a restrictive, conservative, and racist institution that consequently fragments integral parts of their identities. They proposed an alternative reality of doctoral education – one which supports and validates the interconnectedness of one’s ethic, political, and intellectual identities (Gonzalez et al., 2002).

Gonzalez, Martin, Perez, Figueroa, Moreno, and Navia (2001) sought to better understand the nature and context of Latina/os doctoral students’ experiences. The purpose of their study was to produce a holistic picture of Latina/o doctoral students’ experiences. Six Latina/o doctoral students representing various Research-IHE participated in the study. The method of data collection involved the writing of autoethnographic narratives with focus group dialogue of their experiences as doctoral students. Findings revealed that their picture of Latina/o doctoral students experiences included lack of family understanding. That is, their parents did not understand the importance of graduate education. Nonetheless, it was clear that the role of family in supporting doctoral students was important. Another finding was that each participant shared her or his struggles and fears with peers who came from similar backgrounds. More specifically, they were burdened with feelings of isolation. A third finding was that participants who studied in PW-IHE felt like outsiders. Moreover, they described a lack of belonging and acceptance in PW-IHE doctoral programs. A fourth finding was that these participants’ encountered identity changes. Gonzalez et al. (2001) asserted that a great deal of important work remains to be done in the area of identity development at the doctoral level. The last finding was that these participants experienced enduring conflicts.
between two different worlds. They struggled with the circumstance of living in and between two different worlds: (a) their communities of origin and (b) their new academic environment. Each participant experienced notable and lasting conflicts concerning this circumstance. There was a comparative study of doctoral students’ experiences from different ethnic backgrounds in IHE by Nettle (1990).

_African American, Hispanic, and White Doctoral Students in IHE_

Nettles (1990) examined the differences among African American, Hispanic, and White doctoral students at four major universities (University of Florida, Rutgers University, The Ohio State University, and the University of Maryland at College Park). Survey method was used in this study. The study used a random sample of doctoral students (between 1976 and 1985) enrolled in these four year institutions. Two criteria were used for selecting doctoral students. First, they had to be either full-time or part-time students in graduate departments of education, the social sciences, humanities, biological, or physical sciences during the fall of 1986. Second, they had to have completed at least one year of their doctoral programs prior to the fall of 1986. The resulting sample totaled 1352 students of whom 313 (23.2 %) were African American, 143 (10.6 %) were Hispanic, 931 (68.9 %) were White. A survey instrument, the Doctoral Student Survey (DSS) containing 142 items (demographics, undergraduate education, transition between undergraduate and doctoral program, students’ experiences, interactions, and involvement in doctoral program, financial assistance, outcome measures) was mailed to the participants. The overall response rate for this study was 74.1%, that is, 953 doctoral students responded to the survey, including 194 African
Americans, 92 Hispanics, and 667 Whites. The survey revealed that Hispanic doctoral students were found to be better off than African American doctoral students. More specifically, Hispanic doctoral students were from higher SES backgrounds, received higher grades in undergraduate schools, attended more selective undergraduate institutions, and were more likely to major in the sciences in undergraduate schools. Compared to Hispanic students and White doctoral students, the African American students came from the poorest SES backgrounds, received their baccalaureate degrees from the least selective undergraduate institutions, received the lowest grades in both their undergraduate and doctoral programs, were far less likely to be graduate research and teaching assistants, were more reliant upon personal resources and loans to support the majority of their doctoral program expenses, and had greater feelings that their graduate institutions were racially discriminatory. Sotello and Rann (1993) conducted a comparative study of women of color and white women doctoral students’ socialization in IHE.

Women of Color and White Women Doctoral Students in IHE

Sotello and Rann (1993) conducted a study of socializing women doctoral students. Socialization theory helped to determine a person’s ability to fulfill the requirements for membership in a variety of life group work, and school, and family (Kozier & Erb, 1988). Purposeful sampling technique was used and identified thirteen women of color and twenty White doctoral students at a Midwestern university. The researchers conducted interviews in which they used a semi-structured questionnaire as a guide to examine the process of personal and professional development of women doctoral students. They
found that women of color reported less access to such experiences than White women, a finding verified by information from tenured faculty at the university. Thus, they could conclude that women of color have less opportunity for successful academic careers. Moreover, women of color in the study reported relative isolation, a lack of faculty mentoring experiences, and a lack of collegiality with other doctoral students. On the other hand, White women doctoral students report more mentoring relationships and experiences, both students-initiated and faculty – initiated.

**Issues in Physical Education and Adapted Physical Activity**

*Research on Physical Education*

Historically and contemporarily in the USA, most physical educators, coaches, and sport leaders are White Americans (Burden, Harrison, & Hodge, 2005; Smith, 1991, 1993). There is only a small portion of African Americans who become physical education professionals. Much of the research in the physical education literature on career development has involved the study of White American men, and to a lesser degree women’s career socialization (Goc Karp & Williamson, 1993). Hodge and Stroot (1997) conducted a national surveying of African American and White American physical educators to determine and describe barriers and support structures perceived by these graduates during their career development. They found that African American physical education graduates expressed significantly greater concerns to their organizational socialization with regard to such variables as personal financial issues, funding tuition and fees, and ability to succeed and/ or compete academically during teacher preparation period compared to their White American counterparts. While
matriculating within their respective graduate programs, many of these African American graduates had had opportunities to interact with White classmates. In some cases, the African American students encountered various types of discrimination. This was compounded because for most African Americans and other students of color, there is often no sufficient number of faculties of color in higher education, especially in physical education (Burden et al., 2005; Crase & Walker, 1988; Hodge & Stroot, 1997). International students have little or no access to federal welfare benefits, loans and scholarships, and have responsibility for paying out of state tuition (Lin & Yi, 1997).

**Federal Funding of Adapted Physical Activity**

USA federal funding of APE personnel preparation programs was first made available in Title IV, Section 501, of Public Law 90-170, Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act (Hilliman, 1986). Title V of this legislation authorized the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants available to IHE for research and personnel preparation in physical education. More specifically, there have been multiple USA federal grants that support competency-based special education teacher education personnel training. Federal grants have been available which support competency-based professional preparation in APA (Jansma & Surburg, 1995). Several variables seem to be interconnected: (a) the APA teacher competency-based professional preparation, (b) funding (federal grants to promote preparation), and (c) learner outcomes. For those APA professionals who graduate as competent teachers and who can effect change for better learner outcomes funds spent on their training is justified. However, international students are not eligible to receive
federal money to matriculate in APA graduate programs in USA (Robert, 2002). Therefore, international students in general face financial issues such as difficulties paying tuition and fees at PW-IHE (Robert, 2002). Thus, international APA doctoral students may rely on financial aid or personal loans.

**Chapter Summary**

There is limited research on Asian international graduate students’ assimilation at IHE in USA. Most of the literature in this area focuses on African American or Latina/Latino graduate students’ social adjustment and experiences at IHE, but not related to APA. Hodge and Stroot (1997) surveyed African American and White American graduates on perceived barriers and support structures during their career development. They found that African American adapted and general physical education graduates expressed significantly greater concerns to their organizational socialization during teacher preparation period compared to their White American counterparts.

Along similar lines, a number of Asian international graduate students in general face financial issues such as difficulties paying tuition and fees at PW-IHE (Robert, 2002). Moreover, they often experience different types of frustrations in learning and living in the USA. These frustrations include: (a) communication difficulties caused by their lack of English proficiency, (b) discrimination resulting from their looking and speaking differently from other persons, and (c) disillusionment caused by their financial instability (Wan, 2001). These issues cause difficulty to acculturate and to adjust socially to PW-IHE in USA (Uba, 1994). Asian international students rarely expressed concerns about emotional and social issues, because they tended to be more concerned with
academic and career issues (Wan, 2001). In addition, these problematic areas are more role-salient to their personal traditions, beliefs, and cultural values (Kitano & Daniels, 1990). All of these factors impact the assimilation and matriculation of Asian international in graduate programs at PW-IHE in USA. It is clear that research is needed to examine the assimilation of Asian international doctoral students in APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference.

This chapter presents the research design (i.e., explanatory holistic multiple-case study design), instrumentation and data collection, procedures, and data analysis which were used to address the study’s purpose and research questions.

Research Design

This study used an explanatory (holistic) multiple case study design (Yin, 2003). The principle premise of case study method is to better understand some complex social phenomena—while retaining the holistic and meaningful particularities of real-life circumstances (Yin, 2003). In this study, the intent was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. For reasons explained below, explanatory multiple (holistic) case study (Yin, 2003) was judged a suitable method. Explanatory case study (Yin, 2003) is most often referred to as interpretative case study (Merriam, 1998; Thomas & Nelson, 1996). Such case studies are “used to develop conceptual categories
or to illustrate, support, or challenge theoretical assumptions held prior to data gathering” (Merriam, 1998, p. 38). Yin (2003) asserts that case study method “should not be confused with ‘qualitative research’” (p. 14, emphasis added). Rather, case studies can accommodate both quantitative and qualitative strategies. Further, Yin (2003) asserted that researchers “can use multiple strategies in any given study (e.g., a survey within a case study or case study within a survey)” (p. 9). In this multiple-case study, data were gathered from each selected graduate student at her or his IHE using a demographic questionnaire, program of study documents, and focused interviews.

Case study method is a logical sequence that connect empirical data to a study’s research questions and ultimately, to its conclusions (Yin, 2003). Moreover, this design is a logical plan for getting from here (initial set of questions) to there (some set of conclusions-answers). “The main purpose of case study is to help to avoid the situation which the evidence does not address the initial research questions” (Yin, 2003, p. 21). A major insight of multiple case studies is to consider multiple cases as one would consider multiple experiments – that is to follow “replication logic” (Yin, 2003, p. 41).

Replication logic approach in multiple case study indicates that the initial step in designing the study must consist of theory (e.g., assimilation theory as used in this study) and then shows that case selection and the definition of specific measures are important steps in the design and data collection process (Yin, 2003). An important step in replication logic is to develop a rich theoretical framework. The theoretical framework supports the conditions which a particular phenomenon is likely to be found (i.e., literal replication which predicts similar results) and as well as the conditions when it is not
likely to be found (i.e., theoretical replication which predicts contrasting results but for predictable reasons) (Yin, 2003). Explanatory case studies emphasize more “how” and “why” type questions than “what” type questions (Yin, 2003). Yin recommend that if a study raises some “why” or “how” types of research questions, a researcher must draw on a wider array of documentary information (e.g., demographic data and program of study documents), in addition to conducting interviews using multiple case studies. A holistic approach was used. This approach was used in examining the holistic nature of each case, which was the APA doctoral students. This design becomes advantageous when no logical subunits can be identified or when the relevant theory of this study is itself of a holistic nature (Yin, 2003).

Research Sites

Research sites for this study were determined by the nomination and eventual selection of Asian international students at APA doctoral programs across the eleven Big Ten universities (Quiocho & Rios, 2000). The rationale for selection of this conference was to have participants from comparable universities within the same Midwestern geographical region of the USA and because a number of higher education programs in Big Ten institutions have recruited students from diverse backgrounds in recent years. More specifically, Big Ten Conference initiatives in particular have encouraged students from diverse backgrounds to enter educational fields through a variety of approaches, such as offering university credit for courses geared around career, financial aid, faculty mentorship, and peer group support (Quiocho & Rios, 2000).
During the conduct of this current study, only four IHE of the Big Ten Conference had APA graduate programs. The other six universities in this conference had sport pedagogy or kinesiology programs at the graduate level, but not APA. The graduate school at Western University had no sport related programs at the graduate level.

**Participant Nomination and Selection**

In case study, a nomination process is used (Yin, 2003). For these cases, the nomination process consisted of collecting relevant information about APA programs at IHE within the Big Ten Conference (Yin, 2003) and then, the researcher defined the relevant criteria (Asian international students within APA doctoral programs) for nominating participants. The selection of case study participants involved contacting APA faculty at Big Ten Conference institutions seeking nominations of Asian international doctoral students matching the selection protocol criteria (Yin, 2003). More specifically, the researcher sought out Asian international doctoral students, and seven participants from four APA programs were nominated and selected for this study. However, only two had Asian international doctoral students. These students had varied educational experiences and diverse cultures and languages from a variety of institutions and Asian countries. Selection of these students (cases) was based on the aforementioned criteria.

To gain access to these Asian international doctoral students in their various APA programs across the respective Big Ten Conference institutions, approval were sought from The Ohio State University’s Behavioral Sciences Institutional Review Board (IRB)
(Appendix D). All seven Asian international APA doctoral students were asked to volunteer to participate in this study and asked to sign consent forms indicating their willingness to do so.

**Instrumentation and Data Collection**

Data were collected during the 2006 summer quarter. Data collection included: (a) a demographic questionnaire, Doctoral Education and Career Preparation (Golde & Dore, 2001); (b) face-to-face open-ended focused interviews with each participant (Yin, 2003), and (c) academic programs of study from each participant. After approval was granted from the lead researcher’s Dissertation Committee and IRB, the study was initiated.

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The Doctoral Education and Career Preparation (DECP; Golde & Dore 2004) (Appendix A) survey was used with slight modifications to collect descriptive quantifiable data from the participants. This instrument was designed to measure how well doctoral students are being prepared for future careers (e.g., faculty positions). The DECP instrument emphasizes differences in the nature of knowledge and how knowledge is produced in each discipline (Golde & Dore, 2004). The nature of the discipline must be considered in analyzing, understanding, and seeking to improve doctoral education (Golde & Dore, 2004). DECP survey consists of three different components (a) questions to ask to determine respondents’ goals and what the doctoral degree is all about (e.g., motivation of attendance in doctoral program, career goals, and job market); (b) questions to ask to investigate the program (e.g., general information, student progress, department climate and culture, funding); and (c) questions to ask to help respondent select an
advisor (e.g. research interests, advising style, work environment) across five major sections (Section A. Experiences as graduate student, Section B. Description of doctoral programs and department, Section C. Career plans, Section D. Career expectations of faculty jobs, and Section E. Background information). The instrument was modified slightly to support the purpose of the current study.

Specifically, Section A, B, and E were modified and used for this study. But, Sections C and D were eliminated from the study. Section A asked questions of respondents, rationales of why they wanted an APA doctoral degree (Golde & Dore, 2004). Section sought information on participants’ rationale for area of study, program characteristics and requirements, and advising process. Section B was used to glean information on participants’ experiences (e.g., socialization and relationships, and program climate). Doctoral study brings people from different backgrounds (participants’ academic advisors) into closer contact (social assimilation) (Park, 1930). Section E (background information) helped the researcher to know a little more about each participant such as her or his native country, first language, and major or minor areas of her or his doctoral study.

Sections C and D were eliminated from this study, because the researcher and committee members agreed that these sections did not address the research questions appropriately in this study. For example, Section C asks participants about their career plans for future jobs. These participants consider a wide range of career options such as becoming a professor in an American or Asian college or university, or becoming an administrator/ manager in Ministry of Education at their native countries. Section D also
asks participants about their expectations of their future faculty positions. More specifically, in this section, the researcher wants to learn about participants’ interests in various aspects of faculty job and their preparation. Thus, their future plans change over time throughout her or his doctoral study in APA.

Face-to-Face Open-Ended Focused Interviews

According to Yin (2003), the researcher has two jobs in conducting interviews: (a) to follow the interview case study protocol, and (b) to ask the researcher’s actual (conversational) questions. A combination of open-ended questioning in which the researcher asked participants factual questions as well as their opinions about people, places, and events related to their potential assimilation into APA programs at PW-IHE (Yin, 2003) using a face-to-face focused interview approach in which the participants were interviewed for a short period of time (approximately 60 to 90-minutes) (Yin, 2003). In these cases, the interviews remained open ended and assumed a conversational manner. Moreover, the interviews were guided by a pre-established set of questions which were originally developed by Lewis et al. (2004) and Gonzalez et al. (2001). For this study, the specific questions were modified and carefully worded for relevancy to the current investigation of students in APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE (Yin, 2003).

Interview Questions

Students were interviewed using an open-ended interview protocol of 22 questions (Lewis et al., 2004) (Appendix B). The questions were derived from the literature on student diversity, retention, recruitment, and factors associated with the successful completion of graduate degrees. The first eight questions focused on definitions of an
inclusive culture, satisfaction issues, key aspects of graduate school experience, factors impacting on success and areas needing development in doctoral training (Lewis et al., 2004).

Questions 9 through 22 were developed by Gonzalez et al. (2001) (Appendix B) and were used as additional interview questions in this study. Gonzalez et al. (2001) noted that these interview questions direct the researcher to see the essential nature of how doctoral student experience the academy as well as the context contributing to that culture.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted with two international graduate students using the aforementioned demographic questionnaire (Golde & Dore, 2004) and interview questions (Gonzalez et al., 2001; Lewis et al., 2004) during winter quarter 2006. This pilot study was used to meet an assignment in a qualitative research method course (Edu P&L 966). The procedures of this pilot study were that the researcher identified and recruited two international graduate students in education. Before conducting face–to–face open ended focused interviews, the demographic questionnaire (Golde & Dore, 2004) was mailed to their home addresses. Participants’ open–ended focused interviews, which took between 60 – 75 minutes, were conducted by the researcher. The language of preference in this pilot study was English. All interview responses from these participants were audiotaped. Once data collection was completed, the researcher transcribed the interviews and analyzed the data using constant comparative analysis method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Then, an APE graduate student who was familiar with qualitative
research was recruited as a peer debriefer for seeking meaning and pursuing clarity of findings from the researcher. This process helped the researcher to refine the data collection plans prior to conducting the principal study with respect to both content of the data and the procedures to be followed (Yin, 2003). Moreover, this pilot study allowed the researcher to develop even more relevant lines of questions (demographic and interview questions) and provided some conceptual clarification for the research design as well (Yin, 2003).

Follow-up Telephone Interview

Telephone follow-up interview questions were used as warranted. Shuy (2002) identified some advantages of using telephone interviews, which were that (a) data quality is high in telephone interviews, because interviewers can provide clarifications and probe for responses; and (b) telephone interviews do not rely on a respondent’s reading and writing ability (Shuy, 2002). But, the researcher is unable to capture the nuances of body language, facial gestures, or the intimacy of face-to-face interviews (Shuy, 2002).

Follow-up E-mail Interview

Electronic mail (e-mail) interviews were used to follow-up face – to –face interviews (as warranted) in this study. According to Young, Persichitte, and Tharp (1998), e-mail follow - ups are used when clarifications, illustrations, explanations, or elaborations are needed. E-mail is also useful to check for messages from participants regularly and if necessary, summarize the participant’s responses to previous questions and return the summery to participants for verification.
Doctoral Program of Study (Archival Record)

The participants’ academic doctoral programs of study (archival record) were used in conjunction with other sources (demographic data and interview transcripts) of information in exploring these case studies. The rationale for examining the participants’ doctoral programs of study is those documents serve as an agreement between a school’s graduate program studies committee and the participants regarding: (a) chosen area(s) of interest; (b) the intended professional goals; (c) the background of previous courses and relevant experience; (d) the expected time schedule for undertaking the required doctoral topical seminars and writing seminars; (e) the courses anticipated to meet minimum requirements of school and outside the school, accompanied by a statement of rationale; (f) the anticipated additional courses beyond the minimum of course work exclusive to co-requirements, accompanied by statement of rationale, and (g) the anticipated courses that will meet the tool requirement, accompanied by a statement of rationale (Guideline for developing the Doctoral Program study from University of Texas, 1993).

Procedures

On June, 16th 2006, the Behavioral and Social Science IRB approved to proceed with this study by expedited review (Appendix D). The researcher contacted the department of Kinesiology at Midwest University (MU) and the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services at Central University (CU) and asked APA faculty to nominate prospective participants (Asian international doctoral students) for this study. A total of 8 students ($n = 6$ from MU and $n = 2$ from CU) were nominated. The researcher explained
the study to the nominated participants with regard to all pertinent information via telephone and e-mail communication. Seven of the eight agreed to participate in this study. One female participant declined to participate in this study, because she had recently had a baby earlier and was uncomfortable in bringing her baby to the interview site, plus she was not allowed to be with other males except her husband in the same room for face-to-face interviews (due to religious reasons). Thus, she needed to withdraw from this study. The interviews were held after the researcher had received signed consent forms from all seven participants and university’s institutional review board’s approval to conduct the study.

During a visit to each participant’s campus, the researcher explained the study’s purpose, procedures to be used for data collection and analysis, how the information would be used, and how the names and data would be treated during and after completion of the research. All seven Asian international doctoral students received and volunteered consent to participate in this study. Incentives ($30 gift certificate from Amazon book store) were provided to all participants in this study. Each participant handed to the researcher a copy of her or his program of study and returned completed copies of the “Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation” (Golde & Dore, 2001) before the researcher conducted the interviews. The researcher attempted to organize a focus group interview with participants. The purpose of the focus group interview was to assess the nature of the group itself as expressed through the interaction of the members, the flow of the discussion, and the evolution of their experiences described (Carey, 1994).
However, two students left MU at the end of July 2006. One student moved to California State University at San Bernadino and was employed as an assistant professor in APE. The other student returned to Japan while searching for a university faculty position and working on his dissertation at the same time. The other Taiwanese student was in the middle of his candidacy exam. Thus, the researcher decided not to proceed with hosting a focus group interview.

The consent process took place after receiving IRB approval during summer 2006 (Appendix D). The selection of case study participants involved contacting professors and graduate students of APA programs at Big Ten Conference institutions seeking nominations of Asian international doctoral students matching the selection protocol criteria via mail (informing prospective participants about the opportunity to participate in this study) (Yin, 2003). After the investigator received messages (willing to participate in this study) from the nominated participants via telephone or e-mail communication, the next step of this process was that the investigator explained the study to the nominated participant providing all pertinent information (purpose, procedures, risks, and benefits) and allowed them ample opportunity to ask questions via telephone and e-mail communication. Next, the investigator mailed the written consent form (Appendix E) to each nominated participant. This step helped develop the basis for meaningful exchange between the investigator and the nominated participants. After allowing the potential participant’s time to receive and read the consent form, the investigator asked any additional questions from the potential participants about this study. Moreover, it was important that the nominated participants were provided with a written consent form.
(Appendix E) and afforded sufficient time to consider whether or not to participate in this study. Lastly, the investigator ensured that the nominated participants comprehend the information and obtained the participants’ voluntary agreement to participate in this study. The participants provided their signed consent forms and return them to the investigator.

Prior to initiating the study, the researcher attempted to recruit language translators (bilingual graduate students in education related fields including physical education from the Central University). This was to use back translation strategy which is used as the most appropriate to insure cross-cultural translation and validation (Vallerand, 1989) requires at least three or four translators who speak the same dialect of the native language. The researcher investigated an issue of recruiting translators. For example, spoken Chinese comprises many regional variants and the variations in spoken Chinese language into seven to ten groups (Mandarin, Wu, Hakka, Min, Cantonese, Xiang, Gan, and so forth). The general situation is one of dialect continuum where one can understand perfectly people speaking the local dialect and that the intelligibility decreases as the speaker comes from more and more distant regions. This results in the common situation where A can understand B, B can understand C, but A cannot understand C (Wikipedia dictionary, 2006). In this case, the researcher had limited access to translators from each native country and region that were fluent in participants’ native languages and dialects. However, this became moot as the participants preference was using English to communicate in the conduct of this study. That is, the participants asked to respond to the questionnaire and interview questions in English. Thus, all data were collected using English.
Before visiting each research site, the modified demographic questionnaire “Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation” (Gold & Dore, 2001) (Appendix A) was mailed to each participant’s address. Later at their campuses, open-ended focused interviews (Yin, 2003), which typically took between 60-90 minutes, were conducted with each participant. A combining of the interview questionnaires developed by Lewis et al. (2004) and Gonzalez et al. (2001) were used in this study (Appendix B). All interviews were conducted using English. Potential language barriers were considered a limitation in this study. Language barrier is defined a figurative phrase for the difficulties of learning a new language. It is usually applied to international students who come to the USA at an adult age (Wikipedia dictionary, 2006). The rationale of using English in this study was that the participants preferred using English, and the researcher felt obligated to accommodate their preference.

All interview responses from the students were audio taped. To have the interviews conducted, each participant chose a confidential and quiet place in the department office building at her or his university. Follow-up questions or clarifications of participants’ comments were asked by telephone (Shuy, 2002) and e-mail contacts (Meho, in-press). Once completed, the researcher transcribed the interviews and returned all transcribed data to all participants for member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002) via e-mail (Meho, inpress). This process was used to ensure that the transcribed data accurately represents the participants’ perspectives and experiences in studying at PW-IHE.
Construct Validity and Reliability

Yin (2003) described three tactics which are available to increase construct validity in explanatory case study method. The first is the use of multiple sources of evidence (triangulation), in a manner, encourages convergent lines of inquiry, and this tactic is relevant during data collection. A second tactic is to establish a chain of evidence (reliability) and relevance during data collection. In this study, the researcher consistently followed the same procedures of data collection and focused the same case study protocol (from case study questions, protocol, citations to specific evidentiary sources in the case study database, to the case study reports) for each case (Yin, 2003). The goal was to minimize errors and biases (Yin, 2003). The third tactic was used to have the draft case study reports received by the participants for their review (member checks), feedback, and confirmation of the data accuracy (Yin, 2003).

Trustworthiness

A major concern commonly voiced by conventional scientists regarding qualitative types of inquiry is whether or not the findings from such analyses are trustworthy. Lincoln and Guba (1985) asked questions such as: “How can an inquirer persuade the audience and also self that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to or worth taking into account?” “What arguments could be raised or criteria invoked or what questions asked would be persuasive regarding the issue at stake?” Trustworthiness is established through the use of a variety of methods. Glesne (1999) posited that the use of
multiple data-collection methods contribute to data trustworthiness. Trustworthiness in the current study was established through triangulation, member checking, and peer debriefing.

_Triangulation_

Triangulation involves the use of multiple perspectives to receive and analyze information. Triangulation does hold some cautionary ground for the qualitative inquirer, who must at all times remember that it is a process directed at a judgment of the accuracy of specific data items as opposed to one concerned with seeking universal truth (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The purpose of triangulation is to explore differing perceptions not to determine the “truth” of the matter under investigation (Merriam, 1998). This study utilized different sources of data, which included interview transcriptions and personal documents (survey and program of study) from participants.

_Member Checking_

Member checking was used to reduce the impact of subjective bias, while establishing trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2000). For member checking, the researcher took data and tentative interpretations back to the people (APE doctoral students) from whom they were derived and asked them if the results were plausible (Merriam, 1998). That is, all tapes are transcribed and sent back to each participant for confirmability. Confirmability includes getting the evidence from informants by the researcher or by repeated interpretations (Morse, 1994). This process was used to ensure that the transcribed data accurately represented the participants’ experiences in studying within doctoral APA programs at PW-IHE in the Big Ten Conference.
Peer Debriefing

Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined peer debriefing as the process of exposing oneself to a distinguished peer in a manner paralleling an analytic session and for the purpose of exploring aspects of inquiry that might remain only implicit with the inquirer’s mind. One of its major purposes is to help keep researchers honest by challenging the suppositions that lead to their interpretations. By so doing, peer debriefers probe basis, seek meanings, and pursue clarity of interpretation from researchers.

For this study, the researcher had three peer debriefers from diverse ethnic backgrounds (White American, Latino, and Asian) who were recruited from the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services at Central University. These peer debriefers were experienced interviewers. All peer debriefers were trained for reviewing transcribed interviews using a training protocol (James-Brown, 1995). The peer debriefers and the researcher focused on the data the researcher collected. They did their work in pairs. Two debriefers formed one subgroup and the researcher and other debriefers formed the other. Each subgroup discussed the data and draft analysis. The detail peer debriefer training protocol is described in Appendix C.

External and Internal Validity

External Validity

External validity establishes the domain in which a study’s findings can be generalized. The external validity problem has been a major barrier in doing case studies (Yin, 2003), because small cases offer a poor basis for generalizing. Therefore, the
analogy of samples and universes is incorrect when dealing with case studies. Yin (2003) asserted that case studies rely on **analytical generalizations**, which means making generalizations from findings of the case study using theoretical propositions. Thus, theory does not only facilitate the data collection phase of the ensuring case study, it also is the level at which the generalization case result will occur (Yin, 2003). Analytical generalization is used to extend the results of the case study to multiple cases. The results may be considered more if two or more cases support the same theory, but may not support equally plausible (rival theory) (Yin, 2003).

*Internal Validity*

The purpose of internal validity in this study was to analyze the case study data by building an explanation about the case of Asian international doctoral APE students (Yin, 2003). In this study, explanation building occurred in narrative form from data collected and analyzed (Yin, 2003). The better case studies are the ones in which the explanation reflects theoretical explanation (e.g., assimilation theory) for objectifying the narratives. In multiple case study one goal is to build a general explanation that fit individual cases, even though the cases will vary in their details (Yin, 2003).

**Data Analysis**

*Tabular Materials*

In case study method “tabular material” refers to the process of describing, organizing, analyzing, and presenting quantitative data such as participant’s demographic data and survey responses (Yin, 2003). In this multiple-case study, the tabular materials (raw
scores and median responses) were used to display the participants’ demographic data and their responses to the modified Doctoral Education and Career Preparation (Golde & Dore, 2001) questionnaire. In brief, these data were organized, analyzed, and presented descriptively for each case and across cases using tabular displays (Miles & Huberman, 1984; Yin, 2003).

**Constant Comparative Analysis**

Constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) involves systematically examining and refining variations in emergent themes. The basic strategy of this analysis process is to do what its name implies – constantly compare. The researcher begins with a particular incident from an interview, program of study, and demographic questionnaire, for example to compare these data with other content in the same set of data or in another set (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In this study, this process of constantly comparing data from several sources led to tentative categories that were compared to each other and to other data, which is the process of category construction (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

**Category Construction**

For this study, the researcher’s challenge was to move beyond basic descriptions to data interpretations; that is, “the challenge is to construct categories or themes that capture some recurring pattern that cuts across the preponderance” of the empirical evidence (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 139). Categories and subcategories were constructed through constant comparative method. The researcher was mindful that a unit of data was any meaningful segment of data, which can be as small as a word a participant used to describe a feeling or phenomenon, or as large as several pages of field
notes describing a particular incident (Merriam, 1998). According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), a unit of analysis meets two criteria. First, it should be heuristic, which means the unit should reveal information relevant to the study and stimulate the reader to think beyond the particular bit of information. Second, the unit should be “the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself” (Guba, 1985, p. 345). A unit of data “must be interpretable in the absence of any additional information other than a broad understanding of the context in which the inquiry is carried out” (Guba, 1985, p. 345).

The Step-by-Step Process

In this study, category construction began with reading the first participant’s interview transcript, his responses to the survey questionnaire, and the participant’s program of study document (Merriam, 1998). As the researcher read down through the transcript, for example, he jotted down notes, comments, observations, and queries in the margins. These notations were bits of data that struck the researcher as interesting, potentially relevant, or important to the study (LeCompte, Preissle, & Tesch, 1993). After working through the entire transcript in this manner, the researcher went back over his marginal notes and comments and attempted to group those comments and notes that seem to go together (Merriam, 1998). For each participants’ set of data (transcript, questionnaire responses, or program of study document), the researcher followed it in exactly the same process as just outlined above. The researcher checked to see all lists of grouping which the researcher extracted from the first transcript in subsequent data set. He made a separate list of comments, terms, and notes from the data set and then compared the lists from across data sets (Merriam, 1998). Next, categories were named.
Naming Categories

Naming of thematic categories can come from at least three sources such as the researcher, the participants, or sources outside the study such as the literature in a particular area of inquiry (Merriam, 1998). In this multiple-case study, the researcher came up with terms, concepts, and categories that reflected what he gleaned from the data (Merriam, 1998). In addition, the data were organized into schemes suggested by the participants themselves. This approach required an analysis of the verbal categories used by the participants with regard to the complexity of their realities within their APA doctoral programs. According to Merriam (1998), several important guidelines can be used to determine the efficacy of categories derived from the constant comparative method of data analysis. These guidelines are:

1. Categories should reflect the purpose of the research. Categories are the answers to the research questions.

2. Categories should be exhaustive. The researcher should be able to place all data that the researcher decided were important or relevant to the study in a category or subcategory.

3. Categories should be sensitizing. The naming of the category should be as sensitive as possible to what is in the data. An outsider should be able to read categories and gain some sense of their nature.

4. Categories should be conceptually congruent. This means that the same level of abstraction should characterize all categories at the same level.
Cross-Case Analysis

Multiple-case studies involve collecting and analyzing data from several cases. In a multiple-case study, there are two commonly used stages of analysis, the within-case analysis and the cross-case analysis (Yin, 2003). Procedures used for collecting and analyzing the data have direct linkages to address the research questions that guided the study. For this study, within-case analysis and cross case analysis (Yin, 2003) using tabular materials and constant comparative procedures to analyze the participants’ interview responses, questionnaire responses, and documentations [programs of study documents], which were gathered during the researcher’s visits to the participants’ respective APA graduate programs were used.

Specific to within-case analysis, each case was treated as a comprehensive case in and of itself. Data were gathered so the researcher could learn as much about the contextual variables as possible that have a bearing on the case (Merriam, 1998). Once the analysis of each case was completed, cross-case analysis was initiated (Yin, 2003). The researcher sought to build a general explanation that fit each of the individual cases, although the cases varied in detail (Yin, 2003). Further the researcher sought to glean contradictions and commonalities that occurred across several cases, to understand how the participants’ individual circumstances represented other’s realities, which led to the development of full, rich descriptions and explanations of the phenomena under study (Miles & Huberman, 1994).
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of the study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. To address this purpose, data were collected and analyzed based on a modified demographic questionnaire “Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation” (Golde & Dore, 2001), programs of study, and open-ended focused interviews (Yin, 2003). Three major research questions guided the study.

1. How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

2. How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

3. How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

This chapter presents: (a) a description of research sites; (b) general overview of demographic information; (c) overview of the students’ programs of study; (d) findings from each individual case including demographic information and their APA doctoral
program contexts; (e) findings specific to each research question for each of the seven cases; and (f) findings from cross-case analysis of all seven cases (Asian international doctoral students) including the overall findings across cases specific to each research question. The findings were extracted from analysis of the multiple data sources of a modified demographic questionnaire “Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation” (Golde & Dore, 2001), programs of study, and open ended focused interviews (transcripts), and follow-up interviews. Themes that emerged from the data are presented as they correspond to the research questions.

Description of Research Sites

All seven Asian international doctoral students were enrolled in classes at either Midwestern University ($n = 5$; Female = 1, Male = 4) or Central University ($n = 2$, Female = 2). Both institutions are considered Division I Research Institutions. In general, there were both differences and similarities at Midwestern University and Central University. For example, the APA program is offered by the Department of Kinesiology at Midwestern University, Bloomington, Indiana. The department’s doctoral programs at Midwestern University are designed to prepare professionals for faculty positions at colleges and universities as well as in preparing persons for jobs in industry. Currently, available programs at the doctoral level in the Department of Kinesiology at Midwestern University are APE, biomechanics, exercise physiology, motor control, and sport management. For admission to the doctoral program, applicants must have a minimum
general record examination (GRE) score of 600 in one of the following criteria: verbal, quantitative, or analytical: an undergraduate grade point average (GPA) of at least: 3.0 and graduate GPA of at least 3.5. For international students whose native language is not English, TOEFL (Test of English as Foreign Language) score of at least 500 is required on the paper test, or 213 on the computer based test. For the doctoral degree, all students are required to complete a minimum 90 credit hours (semester system) beyond the Bachelor of Science degree. This includes 30 credit hours in the major area (Kinesiology) and 15 credit hours in a minor area outside of the Department of Kinesiology, 20 hours of elective courses, and 25 hours of dissertation. Each candidate for the doctorate is also required to satisfy a tool skill requirement. This requirement consists of 9 credit hours in statistics, computer programming and/or research tools classes (as appropriate to the field of study) with a minimum grade of B. These research tool credits are separate from the 90 credits necessary for degree completion (http://www.indiana.edu/~kines/grad_phd.html).

The purpose of APE doctoral program at Midwestern University is to prepare individuals to assume leadership roles at the collegiate level. A unique aspect of this program is the development of the teacher/movement scientist. Graduates from this program will have developed a set of competencies to be effective teachers in the classroom and practicum settings and to be productive researchers investigating motor development and motor learning/integration topics as related to persons with disabilities. The foundation of this program is 18 credit hours of course-work in APE. An addition to
this foundation is a group of movement science courses that add breath and depth to a
student's preparation. Field experiences that involve the teaching of graduate and
undergraduate components and supervising practicum prepare the doctoral student to be a
master teacher. A research core of classes and immediate and continuous involvement in
research projects prior to the dissertation prepare the doctoral student to begin an
academic career with excellent research capabilities. The courses in the Kinesiology
major include lecture courses in APE, motor control, motor development and statistics
within the Department of Kinesiology, as well as courses consisting of readings and
research. A student’s minor will usually be in psychology or educational psychology, and
the skills requirement consists of 9 credits in statistics
(http://www.indiana.edu/~kines/phd_adapted.html).

Although, there were similarities Central University (CU), School of Physical Activity
and Educational Services (PAES) had different types of research foci, educational
systems, and requirements for APE doctoral students. The APE program is offered within
the Sport and Exercise Education program in the School of PAES. The school’s doctoral
program at CU is designed to prepare graduates to become members of the profession
and enables them to: (a) prepare physical education teachers and APE specialists, (b)
conduct and disseminate educational research, and (c) provide leadership in sport
pedagogy. Currently, available programs at the doctoral level in the School of PAES are
counselor education, school psychology, special education, sport and exercise education
(sport pedagogy/APE), sport and exercise humanities, sport and exercise management,
sport and exercise science, and workforce development education. For admission to the doctoral program, applicants must have GRE scores that indicate an ability to meet the research and language requirements of the program and a graduate grade point average (GPA) of at least: 3.3. For international students whose native language is not English, TOEFL score of at least 500 is required on the paper test, or 213 on the computer based test. For the doctoral degree, all students are required to complete a minimum 135 credit hours (quarter system). Students with a master’s degree typically transfer 45 credit hours of master’s coursework into their doctoral program. The faculty prefers that doctoral level students enroll for full time study (at least 10 credit hours each quarter). Doctoral students who enroll for full time generally complete the program in 3 to 4 years (12-16 quarters) (http://education.osu.edu/paes/newacademic/ses/spexed/phdsee.htm).

The major purpose of the Sport and Exercise Education doctoral program is to help students acquire skills and predispositions to become contributors to the expanding knowledge base in APA sport pedagogy. Students are expected to acquire research skills through apprenticeship experiences in the dissertation research of peers and through cooperative research projects with faculty. At least one publishable research project in conjunction with the advisor is expected prior to completion of the dissertation. The foundation of this program is 15 credit hours of core coursework in APE including physical growth and motor development, inclusion in sport and exercise education, grant writing, research or teaching physical education, and supervision in physical education and 9 credits of content related to coursework in APE including programming for severe
physical impairments, motor and physical assessment for children with disabling 
conditions, and advanced study in APE. In addition, all doctoral students are also 
required to complete 15-30 credit hours in research courses, cognate courses (minor field 
15-30 credit hours), seminar (18 credit hours), and dissertation (20-36 credit hours).

General Overview of Demographic Information

All seven participants were originally from various Asian countries (Japanese = 1, 
Korean = 3, Taiwan = 2, Turkey = 1). All seven participants had earned a bachelor degree 
in physical education, biomechanics, social welfare, or sport psychology in their native 
countries. They also had earned a master’s degree in APE, physical education, 
bioengineering, or sport psychology from either USA (n = 2), Canada (n = 1), or their 
native countries (n = 4). Two participants were married and one had a son. One Korean 
participant had earned a doctoral degree in June, 2006 and was hired as an assistant 
professor at California State University at San Bernadino. Participants’ ages ranged from 
30 to 36 years old. Four participants were funded from either their department or native 
countries. Participants’ demographic data are presented in Table 4.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Years USA</th>
<th>Year USA</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>PhD</th>
<th>Master Degree</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Native Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hang-Meeng</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Sport Psy (Korea)</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byung-Soon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>APE (Korea) P.D. (MU)</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eun-Su</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>2 APE (Korea Canada)</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayfun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>PE (FSU)</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>APE (MU)</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin-Hong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>MU</td>
<td>APE Taiwan</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Chinese (Mandarin)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi-San</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Biomechanics Taiwan</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Chinese (Mandarin)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1: Demographic Information on Asian International Doctoral Students in APA Graduate Programs**

*Note.* Years USA = Total Years of Living Experience in USA; APE = Adapted Physical Education; PE = Physical Education; GA = Graduate Assistant; Ph.D. = Philosophy of Doctor; Y = Yes; N=No; MU = Midwestern University; CU = Central University; FSU = Florida State University; M = Male; F = Female
Overview of the Students’ Programs of Study

Most participants \( (n = 5) \) were required to take a number of English as Second Language courses before they could enroll in their APA doctoral program’s courses. Five participants had received master’s degrees from their native countries (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) and two participants (Tayfun and Hiroshi) had earned their master’s degree from Florida State University in pedagogy and Midwestern University in APE respectively. The latter two, Tayfun and Hiroshi were not required to take any English as Second Language courses, because of their previous enrollment at American universities. The participants had taken approximately 15 to 18 credit hours of APE or APA content related courses such as motor assessment for students with disabilities (both MU and CU), movement performance for students with disabilities (MU), problems in APE (MU), exercise and physical activity for people with disabilities (MU), inclusion in sport and exercise education (CU), Sport and Disability (CU), and programming for severe physical impairment (CU). MU emphasized and focused on academic and research field in motor development for people with disabilities. On the other hand, CU’s APE program emphasized academic and research areas in pedagogy for people with disabilities.

All seven participants had one or two cognate areas beyond the primary major requirements. Four out of five students from MU had a cognate in Therapeutic Recreation (TR). They had taken approximately 15 credit hours including professional development of TR, advanced TR process, social psychology of TR, program development and
consultation in TR, higher education in recreation, park, and leisure services, and research in human performance. The other student Tayfun had a cognate in special education. He had taken some special education courses such as seminar in special education (6 credit hours), and rehabilitation of persons with physical disabilities.

At CU, the participants had two cognates (minimal of 15 credit hours each) for the requirement of graduation. More specifically, Eun-Su had cognates in disability study and special education and Yi-San had motor development and early intervention. These two participants had recently completed the first year of their doctoral program. Thus, they will be required to take their cognate courses in coming years. All seven participants were required to take approximately 15 to 18 credit hours of research courses. Participants from MU had taken a research course which was offered by the Department of Kinesiology, single subject research design course, experimental analysis and design, statistic technique research, and a multivariate statistic course. But, the students from CU had not taken many research courses yet. Yi-San had taken an introduction of research methods course. Eun-Su will begin to take a qualitative research course series in the second year of her doctoral program. Three out of seven participants had passed their candidacy examinations, Sin-Hong was in the preparation stage for his candidacy exam, and the other three students needed to complete some course requirements before taking their candidacy exams. Table 4.2 provides descriptive data of each student’s program of study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Cognate</th>
<th>Candidacy exam</th>
<th>APE courses</th>
<th>minor courses</th>
<th>research courses</th>
<th>ESL courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hang-Meeng</td>
<td>Therapeutic Recreation</td>
<td>not taken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byung-Soon</td>
<td>Therapeutic Recreation</td>
<td>passed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eun-Su</td>
<td>Special Education &amp; Disability study</td>
<td>not taken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayfun</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>passed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroshi</td>
<td>Therapeutic Recreation</td>
<td>passed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin-Hong</td>
<td>Therapeutic Recreation</td>
<td>in process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi-San</td>
<td>Motor Development &amp; Early intervention</td>
<td>not taken</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Program of Study on Asian International Doctoral Students into APA Graduate Programs**

*Note:* ESL = English as Second Language
Responses to the Doctoral Education Career Preparation Survey

All participants were asked and completed a modified version of the Survey on Doctoral Education Career Preparation (DECP; Golde & Dore, 2001). DECP questionnaire (Section A, B and E) required approximately 40 to 45 minutes to complete. The DECP survey consisted of three major sections: (a) questions to ask to determine participants’ goals and what the doctoral degree is all about (e.g., motivation to attend in doctoral program); (b) questions to ask to investigate the program (e.g., general information, student progress, department climate and culture, funding); and (c) question to ask to help select an advisor (e.g. research interests, advising style, work environment). Section A (Experience as a doctoral student) asked questions on respondent rationale for why they wanted an APA doctoral degree (Golde & Dore, 2004). More specifically, the researcher sought to learn about where participants were in their doctoral programs and about any on-going research projects and their relationship with their advisors. Section A consists of eleven different subsections (field of study, year of attendance of doctoral program, enrollment status, name of department, completed or incomnpleted course requirements, participants’ relationship with their advisors, reasons of selection process of advisors, description of advisors’ behavior). Section A. 1 through A.4 asked questions about respondents’ field of study (A.1), participants’ academic years (A.2), full time or part time enrollment (A.3), and name of department and program (A.4).

Section A.5 asked eight different questions about requirements that participants must fulfill. Typical requirements are listed below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>Classes and Course Work</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam in the middle of the program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Written proposal of planned dissertation work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Oral defense of planned dissertation work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Required teaching or teaching assistant position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Advancement to candidacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Oral defense of Completed dissertation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table. 4.3: Doctoral Students Requirements of APA Doctoral Program (section A.5)**

*Note: Scoring Scale: 1 = Not a requirement in my program; 2 = Remains to be completed; 3 = I have completed*
The participants’ raw scores indicate that three participants (Byung-Soo, Tayfun and Hiroshi) had completed their required classes or coursework and the other four participants had not (Hang-Meeng, Eun – Su, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) (Table.4.3). All seven participants had completed their masters’ degree at their home countries or in the USA.

Similarly, the participants’ raw scores of 3 or 2 respectively indicate that three participants (Byung-Soo, Tayfun and Hiroshi) had completed their comprehensive exams and the other four participants had not (Hang-Meeng, Eun – Su, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San). Two participants (Byung-Soo, and Tayfun) had completed their required written proposal of planned dissertation work and other five participants had not (Hang-Meeng, Eun – Su, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).

Two participants (Byung-Soo and Tayfun) had completed their oral defense of planned dissertation work and the other five participants had not (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).

Only Byung-Soo had completed her required teaching or teaching assistant position and the other six participants had not (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).

Three participants (Byung-Soo, Tayfun and Hiroshi) had completed their advancement to candidacy status and the other four participants remained to complete their candidacy exams (Hang-Meeng, Eun – Su, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).
Byung-Soo had completed her required oral defense of her dissertation and the other six participants had not (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).

On subsections A.6 through A.11, questions asked about participants’ advisor. Advisor means the one faculty member each participant had as her or his academic advisor, dissertation chair, or research supervisor whom she or he considered her or his primary formal advisor. Section A.6 asked whether each participant currently had an advisor or not. Section A.7 asked whether participants had an advisor immediately upon beginning the doctoral program. Section A.8 consists of four different questions about participants’ relationship with their academic advisors.
Of my advisor, I would say

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soo</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a I currently have the advisor I want</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b I am satisfied with the process by which I came to have my current advisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c The manner in which I came to work with my advisor is typical in this department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d I am satisfied with the amount and quality of time spent with my advisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median response</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.4: Relationship with Academic Advisor (Section A.8)**

*Note: Scoring Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree.*

The participants’ raw scores indicate that all seven participants agreed (Sin-Hong and Yi-San) to strongly agreed (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, Tayfun and Hiroshi) with the statement that they currently have the advisor they want (Table 4.4).

Six participants were in agreement (Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, Tayfun and Hiroshi) with the statement that they were satisfied with
the process by which they came to have their current advisor. However, one participant (Sin-Hong) disagreed with the statement that he was satisfied with the process by which he came to have his current advisor.

Six participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soo, Hiroshi, Yi-San) to strong agreement (Eun-Su, and Tayfun) with the statement that the manner in which they came to work with their advisor is typical in this department, but Sin-Hong disagreed with the statement that the manner in which he came to work with his advisor is typical in this department.

Five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng) to strong agreement (Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, Tayfun and Hiroshi) with the statement that they were satisfied with the amount and quality of time spent with their advisor. However, Sin-Hong and Yi-San were in disagreement with the statement indicating that they were dissatisfied with the amount and quality of time spent with their advisor.

On Section A. 9, participants and their advisors match up in a variety of ways. Participants were asked to select the one statement and best described the way they matched up with their advisors. Participants’ responses indicated that they all came to their doctoral programs planning to work with their advisors.

On Section A.10, participants chose to work with a particular faculty member as their advisor for a variety of reasons. This section consisted of 13 different reasons of selecting their academic advisors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I selected my advisor because she or he</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Is doing interesting research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Has a reputation for getting students through the process in a timely manner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Had money to support me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Has intellectual interests that match mine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Will make sure I do a rigorous dissertation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Was recommended to me by other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Has a reputation for being a good researcher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Has a reputation for being a good teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Has a reputation for being a good advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued

Table 4.5 Reasons of Selecting My Academic Advisor (Section A.10)

Note. Scoring Scale: 1 = Not at all a Reason; 2 = Minor Reason; 3 = Major Reason.
The participants’ raw scores indicated that six participants indicated a minor reason (Hiroshi) to major reason (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Yi-San) that they selected their advisors was because she or he was doing interesting research. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to any of the statements in this subsection (Table 4.5).

Two participants indicated a major reason (Byung-Soon and Yi-San), three participants indicated a minor reason (Hang – Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi), and one participant did not indicate at all a reason (Eun – Su) that they selected their advisors
because she or he had a reputation for getting students through the process in a timely manner. Sin – Hong decided to not respond to the statement. Two participants had as a major reason (Byung-Soon and Hiroshi), one participant had as a minor reason (Eun – Su), and three participants did not have as a reason at all (Hang – Meeng, Tayfun, and Yi-San) that they selected their advisors because she or he had money to support them. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to the statement.

Four participants indicated was a major reason (Hang – Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun – Su, and Hiroshi), and two participants had it as a minor reason (Tayfun and Yi-San) that they selected their advisors because she or he has intellectual interests that match theirs. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

Two participants had as a major reason (Byung-Soon and Eun - Su), three participants had as a minor reason (Hang – Meeng, Tayfun, and Yi-San), and one participant did not have it at all as a reason (Hiroshi) that they selected their advisors because she or he will make sure they do a rigorous dissertation. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to the statement.

Hiroshi indicated it was a major reason, two participants had as a minor reason (Byung-Soon, and Tayfun), and three participants did not have it at all as a reason (Hang – Meeng, Eun-Su, and Yi-San) that they selected their advisors because she or he was recommended to them by other people. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.
Four participants had as a major reason (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Hiroshi), one participant had as a minor reason (Yi-San), and one participant did not have it as a reason at all (Eun-Su) with the statement that they selected their advisors because she or he had a reputation for being a good researcher. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond this statement.

Byung-Soon and Hiroshi had as a major reason, two participants (Hang-Meeng and Yi-San) had as a minor reason, and two participants did not have it at all as a reason (Eun-Su and Tayfun) that they selected their advisors because he or she has a reputation for being a good teacher. Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Byung-Soon and Hiroshi had as a major reason, Hang Meeng and Yi-San had as a minor reason, and Eun-Su and Tayfun did not have it at all as a reason that they selected their advisors because she or he has a reputation for being a good teacher. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants had as a major reason (Byung-Soon, Tayfun and Hiroshi), one participant had as a minor reason (Yi-San), and two participants did not have it at all as a reason (Hang Meeng and Eun-Su) with the statement that they selected their advisors because he or she has a reputation for being a good advisor. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants had as a major reason (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi), and two participants had as a minor reason (Hang-Meeng, and Yi-San) with the statement that they selected their advisors because she or he is knowledgeable in the techniques and
methods they will employ. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement. Four participants had as a major reason (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi), one participant had as a minor reason (Yi-San), and one participant did not have it at all as a reason (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that they selected their advisors because she or he was willing to take them on. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement. Three participants had as a major reason (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Tayfun), two participants had as a minor reason (Byung-Soon, and Hiroshi), and one participant did not have it at all as a reason (Yi-San) with the statement that they selected their advisors because she or he posters a working environment they like in his/her research group. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

Two participants had as a major reason (Byung-Soon, and Eun-Su), two participants had as a minor reason (Hang-Meeng and Hiroshi), and two participant did not have it at all as a reason (Tayfun, and Yi-San) with the statement that they selected their advisors because she or he can write a good recommendation letter that will carry their careers a long way. One participant (Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

On Section A.11, participants considered academic advisors to be their mentors. This section asked participants describe the behaviors of their academic advisors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My advisor</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Is available to me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when I need help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with my research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Is available to me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>when I need to talk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about my program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and my progress in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Treats my ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Gives me regular</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and constructive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feedback on my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Teaches me the</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>details of good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Provides me with</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ongoing research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevant to my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Teaches me</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>survival skills for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>my graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Helps me secure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>funding for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graduate studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Description of Advisors’ Behavior (Section A.11)

Note: Scoring Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree.
Table 4.6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Assists me in writing presentations or publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Teaches me to write grant and contract proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Advocates for me with others when necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Provides emotional support when I need it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Is sensitive to my needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Takes an interests in my personal life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Has my best interests at heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Cares about me as a whole person-not just scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Provides direct assessment of my progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 4.6 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Would support me in any career path I might choose</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sees me as a source of labor to advance his/her research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expects me to work to many hours that it is difficult for me to have a life outside of school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives me regular and constructive feedback on my progress toward degree completion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information about career paths open to me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solicits my input on matters of teaching and research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants’ raw scores indicate that five participants were in agreement (Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that
their advisors were available to them when they need help with their research. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement (Table 4.6). Five participants were in agreement (Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors were available to them when they need to talk about their programs and their progress in the program. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to the statement.

Five participants were in agreement (Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors treat their ideas with respect. Two participants (Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants were in agreement (Eun-Su) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors gave them regular and constructive feedback on their research. On the other hand, Yi-San disagreed with the statement that her advisor gives her regular and constructive feedback on her research. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Five participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng and Tayfun) with the statement that their advisors taught them the details of good research. Again, Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants were in agreement (Tayfun) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, and Eun-Su) with the statement that their advisors provide them with information about ongoing research relevant to their work. On the other hand, Hiroshi disagreed with the
statement that his advisor provides him with information about ongoing research relevant to his work. Three participants (Byung-Soo, Sin – Hong, and Yi-San) decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that their advisors taught them survival skills for their graduate work. On the other hand, one participant (Hiroshi) was in disagreement with the statement that his advisor taught him survival skills for his graduate work. Byung-Soo, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Two participants were in agreement (Hiroshi) to strong agreement (Eun-Su) with the statement that their advisors help them develop professional relationships with others in the field. However, Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Yi-San were in disagreement with the statement. Two participants (Byung-Soo, and Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Eun-Su and Hiroshi) with that statement that their advisors assisted them in writing presentations or publications, but Tayfun disagreed. Byung-Soo, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Yi-San agreed with the statement that their advisors taught them to write grants and contract proposals. In contrast, Tayfun, and Hiroshi disagreed. Byung-Soo, and Sin – Hong) decided to not respond to this statement.
Four participants were in agreement (Tayfun, and Hiroshi) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, and Eun-Su) with the statement that their advisors advocated for them with others when necessary. On the other hand, Yi-San disagreed. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants were in strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors provided emotional support when they need it. However, Yi-San disagreed and Tayfun strongly disagreed. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors were sensitive to their needs, but Yi-San disagreed. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, and Hiroshi) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with that statement that their advisors took an interest in their personal lives. In contrast, Yi-San disagreed and Tayfun strongly disagreed. Byung-Soo, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that their advisors had their best interests at heart. On the other hand, Yi-San disagreed. Byung-Soo, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement. Three participants were in agreement (Tayfun, and Hiroshi) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that their advisors cared about them as a whole person-not just scholar, but Eun-Su disagreed and Yi-San strongly disagreed. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.
Four participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors provide direct assessment of their progress. However, Eun-Su disagreed. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors would support me in any career path she or he might choose. In contrast, Tayfun and Yi-San disagreed. Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Eun-Su was in strong agreement with the statement that her advisor saw her as a source of labor to advance his/her research. On the other hand, four participants were disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) and strongly disagreed (Tayfun). Byung-Soo and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Hiroshi was in agreement with the statement that his advisor expected him to work to many hours that it is difficult for him to have a life outside of school, but three participants disagreed (Tayfun and Yi-San) and strongly disagreed (Hang-Meeng). Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng) and to strong agreement (Tayfun and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisor gave them regular and constructive feedback on their progress toward degree completion. In contrast, Yi-San disagreed. Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

Hiroshi was in agreement with the statement that his advisor provided information about career paths open to him. However, three participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng,
Tayfun, and Yi-San) with the statement that their advisors provide information about career paths open to them. Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond this statement.

Three participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that their advisors solicited their input on matters of teaching and research. On the other hand, Yi-San disagreed. Byung-Soo, Eun-Su, and Sin – Hong decided to not respond to this statement.

On Section B, the researcher was interested in learning about the details of participants’ doctoral programs and their perceptions of their experiences. Doctoral program means their current APA programs and departments at their current universities (MU and CU). Section B consisted of seven different subsections, which were: (B.1) structure of doctoral program, (B.2) doctoral students in the program act, (B.3) faculty members in the program act, (B.4) participants’ issues and concerns, (B.5) availability of participants’ resources and programs, (B.6) opportunities that university has for doctoral students, and (B.7) If you could go back in time and start your doctoral program over, knowing what you know now, which decisions would you change?

Section B.1 asked participants their aspects of the structure of doctoral program. Participants were asked to circle the number that best applied to their situations.
Of my doctoral program, I would say

| a | My coursework has laid a good foundation for doing independent research | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| b | I understand the requirements of program | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| c | Some of the exams and other hurdles (qualifiers, prelims, orals, etc) seem arbitrary and unhelpful | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| d | My coursework has given me a broad foundation of knowledge, including related fields and subspecialties | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| e | My doctoral program is highly flexible, and I can tailor it to my needs and interests | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| f | I am annually reviewed to assess my progress | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Median Response | 2.5 | 3 | 2.5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |

Table 4.7: Aspect of a doctoral program’s structure (Section B.1)

*Note:* Scoring Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree.
The participants’ raw scores indicate that five participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that their coursework has laid a good foundation for doing independent research. On the other hand, Byung-Soon disagreed (Table 4.7).

All seven participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) with the statement that they understand the requirements of doctoral program in APA.

Two participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, and Hiroshi) with the statement that they would say some of the exams and other hurdles seem arbitrary and unhelpful, but four participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San). Eun-Su decided to not respond to this statement.

Six participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, and Sin-Hong) with the statement that their coursework has given them a broad foundation of knowledge, including related fields and subspecialties. However, Hiroshi disagreed.

Four participants were in agreement (Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) with the statement that their doctoral programs were highly flexible, and they could tailor it to their needs and interests. In contrast, three participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng and Eun-Su) to strongly disagreed (Byung-Soon).

Two participants were in strong agreement (Byung-Soon, and Sin-Hong) with the statement that they were annually reviewed to assess their progress. On the other hand,
four participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to strongly disagreed (Tayfun). Eun-Su decided to not respond to this statement. Section B.2 asked participants for another aspect of the ways the doctoral students in the program act. Participants were asked to circle the number that best applied to their situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a There is a sense of solidarity among the students who enter the program at the same time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Many students complain of feeling exploited by the faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Students have an active role in program decisions that affect them</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Students freely share information with each other about opportunities and how to get through the program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Students have little contact with each other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Students must compete with each other for faculty time and attention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Experienced students mentor new students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h I am part of a supportive student community in my program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8: An Aspect of Doctoral Students’ Program Act (Section B.2)

*Note.* Scoring Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree.
The participants’ raw scores indicate that five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, and Hiroshi) with the statement that there was a sense of solidarity among the students who enter the program at the same time, but two participants disagreed (Eun-Su and Yi-San) (Table 4.8).

Three participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Yi-San) with the statement that many students complain of feeling exploited by faculty. In contrast, four participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong).

Four participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, and Hiroshi) to strong agreement (Eun-Su) with the statement that students had an active role in program decisions that affect them. However, three participants disagreed (Sin-Hong and Yi-San) to strongly disagreed (Tayfun).

All seven participants were in agreement (Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong) with the statement that students freely shared information with each other about opportunities and how to get through the program.
Yi-San was in agreement with the statement that students had little contact with each other. On the other hand, six participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, and Sin-Hong) to strongly disagreed (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi).

Three participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) with the statement that students must compete with each other for faculty time and attention, but four participants disagreed (Byung-Soon) to strongly disagreed (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi).

Five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Sin-Hong) with the statement that experienced students mentored new students. In contrast, Hiroshi disagreed. Eun-Su decided to not respond to this statement.

Four participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Sin-Hong and Yi-San) with the statement that they were part of a supportive student community in their programs. However, two participants disagreed (Eun-Su, and Hiroshi) to strongly disagreed (Tayfun).

Three participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Sin-Hong and Yi-San) with the statement that they were part of a supportive student community outside their programs. On the other hand, four participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Hiroshi) and strongly disagreed (Tayfun).

Section B.3 asked participants for another aspect of the ways the faculty members in the program act. Participants were asked to circle the number that best applied to their situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty in the program have the best interests of students at heart</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty value individual research over collaborative research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty make sure that students feel like members of the program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty care about students in the program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Some faculty here make sexist, racist, or homophobic remarks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty appear to give most of the attention and resources to a select group of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty collaborate with students on publications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty treat students with respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: An Aspect of Faculty Members’ Program Act (Section B.3)

*Note.* Scoring Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree.
Table. 4. 9 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Faculty are willing to bend the rules for some students, but not others</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Faculty carefully guard results and new ideas from others in the field</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Faculty seem more concerned with furthering their own careers than with the well-being of the program as a whole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Faculty really care about their teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Faculty really care about research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Faculty really care about advising students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Faculty are explicit in their expectations of students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Faculty carefully supervise teaching assistants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Faculty carefully supervise research assistants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r</th>
<th>Faculty regularly socialize with students</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Faculty are generous with their time, and help students to grow as a scholars, researchers and writers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Faculty have high ethical standards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>There are tensions among program faculty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Faculty are accessible to students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>Faculty seem to believe that students are here to help faculty fulfill their research and teaching obligations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw scores indicate that five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon) with the statement.
that faculty in the program had the best interests of students at heart, but Yi-San disagreed. Eun-Su decided to not respond to this statement (Table 4.9). Five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, and Eun-Su) with the statement that faculty valued individual research over collaborative research. However, two participants disagreed (Tayfun and Sin-Hong).

All seven participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, and Eun-Su) with the statement that faculty made sure that students felt like members of the program.

Six participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, and Tayfun) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) with the statement that faculty cared about students in the program. In contrast, Yi-San disagreed.

All seven participants were in disagreement (Hang-Meeng, and Yi-San) to strong disagreement (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) with the statement that some faculty made sexist, racist, or homophobic remarks.

Six participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, and Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty appeared to give most of the attention and resources to a select group of students. On the other hand, Eun-Su disagreed.

All seven participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Sin-Hong and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty collaborated with students on publications.
All seven participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Sin-Hong and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty treated students with respect.

Four participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that faculty were willing to bend the rules for some students, but not others. However, three participants disagreed (Eun-Su, and Tayfun) and strongly disagreed (Sin-Hong).

Five participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng) with the statement that faculty carefully graded results and new ideas from others in the field, but two participants disagreed (Eun-Su, and Tayfun).

Five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) with the statement that faculty seemed more concerned with furthering their own careers than with the well-being of the program as whole. On the other hand, two participants disagreed (Eun-Su, and Tayfun).

Six participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) with the statement that faculty really cared about their teaching. However, Tayfun disagreed with the statement that faculty really cared about their teaching.

Five participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi and Yi-San) with the statement that faculty really cared about research. On the other hand, two participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng and Yi-San).
All seven participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, Tayfun and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) with the statement that faculty was explicit in their expectations of students.

Six participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, and Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty carefully supervised teaching assistants. Tayfun decided to not respond to this statement.

Five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong) to strong agreement (Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty carefully supervised research assistants, but Yi-San disagreed. Tayfun decided to not respond to this statement.

Three participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Sin-Hong) with the statement that faculty regularly socialized with students. In contrast, four participants disagreed (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Hiroshi).

Six participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty were generous with their time, and helped students to grow as a scholar, researchers and writers, but Hang-Meeng disagreed.

All seven participants were in agreement (Eun-Su, Sin-Hong and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty had a high ethical standard.

Five participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon) with the statement that there were tensions among program faculty. However, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong disagreed.
All seven participants were in agreement (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to strong agreement (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) with that statement the faculty were accessible to students.

Three participants were in agreement (Byung-Soon, and Sin-Hong) to strong agreement (Hiroshi) with the statement that faculty seemed to believe that students are here to help fulfill their research and teaching obligations. On the other hand, two participants disagreed (Eun-Su, and Yi-San). Tayfun decided to not respond this statement.

On Section, B.4, participants were asked a list if items of issues and concerns that often face doctoral students. Since they started doctoral program, have they developed clear understandings regarding the following items?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue or Concern</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Commitments regarding the funding of your graduate studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Length of time you would be a student</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Criteria for determining that you were ready to graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Amount of time to be spent with your advisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Fulfilling teaching assistant obligations: number of courses, number of hours spent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Customary practices regarding publication: when and how to submit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Customary practices about determining authorship of research papers: order of authors, who is included, etc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Customary practices for the appropriate use of research funds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued

Table 4.10: Issues and Concerns that often Face Doctoral Students (Section B.4)

Note: Scoring Scale: 1 = Not Clear At All; 2 = Somewhat Clear; 3 = Very Clear.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>Customary practices for generating, handling, and using, research data responsibly</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Customary practices for reviewing and refereeing academic papers fairly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Customary practices involving biosafely, human subjects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Customary practice regarding appropriate sexual and romantic relationship with undergraduate students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Commitments regarding the funding of your dissertation research project</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Customary practices for using copyrighted materials or materials written by others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Customary practice for grading student work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 4.10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>Customary for avoiding conflict of interest: industry funding, consulting, etc</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Customary practices regarding patent policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Median Response               | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |

The raw scores indicate that six participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng) to very clear (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) on commitments regarding the funding of their graduate studies, but Tayfun was not clear at all on commitments regarding the funding of his graduate studies (Table 4.10).

All seven participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) on length of time they would be a student.

Six participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) with the criteria used for determining when they were ready to graduate. However, one participant was not clear at all (Yi-San) with the criteria for determining that when she would be ready to graduate.
All seven participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to very clear (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) with the amount of time to be spent with their advisors.

All seven participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) on fulfilling teaching assistant obligations: number of courses, number of hours spent.

Six participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, and Tayfun) on customary practices regarding publication: e.g., when and how to submit. However, Yi-San was not clear at all on customary practices regarding publication: e.g., when and how to submit.

Six participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) to very clear (Byung-Soon) on customary practices for the appropriate use of research funds. In contrast, Tayfun was not clear at all on customary practices for the appropriate use of research funds.

Six participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, and Tayfun) on customary practices for generating, handling, and using, research data responsibly. On the other hand, Yi-San was not clear at all on customary practices for generating, handling, and using, research data responsibly.

Six participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, and Byung-Soon) on customary practices for reviewing and refereeing academic paper fairy, but Yi-San was not clear at all on customary practices for reviewing and refereeing academic paper fairy.
Six participants were somewhat clear (Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) on customary practices involving biosafety, human subjects. However, Yi-San was not clear at all on customary practices involving biosafety, human subjects.

All seven participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng and Yi-San) to very clear (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) on customary practices regarding appropriate sexual and romantic relationships with undergraduate students.

All seven participants were somewhat clear (Tayfun, and Yi-San) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) on commitments regarding the funding of their dissertation research projects.

All seven participants were somewhat clear (Sin-Hong) to very clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) on the customary practices for using copyrighted materials or materials written by others.

All seven participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Yi-San) to very clear (Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) on customary practices for grading student work.

Four participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng, and Byung-Soon,) to very clear (Hiroshi, and Yi-San) on customary practices for avoiding conflicts of interest: industry funding, consulting, etc, but two participants were not clear at all (Eun-Su, and Tayfun) on customary practices for avoiding conflicts of interest: industry funding, consulting, etc. Sin-Hong decided to not respond to this statement.
Four participants were somewhat clear (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) on customary practices regarding patent policies. However, two participants were not clear at all (Eun-Su and Tayfun) on customary practices regarding patent policies. Sin-Hong decided to not respond this statement.

On Section, B.5, participants were asked a list if items of resource or program that MU and CU have for doctoral students. For each resource or program listed below, tell us if it is available to doctoral students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource and Program</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a An orientation for new graduate students in the program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b A university-wide orientation for graduate students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c A graduate student handbook for the program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d A graduate student handbook for university</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e A graduate student center (i.e., center with resources, hang out space)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f A written policy on research misconduct</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g A person or office to help students explore options for action when they perceive abuse or misconduct in their program.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h A teaching development center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Availability of Resource and Programs that MU and CU have for doctoral students (Section B. 5)

*Note: Scoring Scale: 1 = No; 2 = Do not know; 3 = Yes.*
Table 4.11 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A teaching assistant training course, lasting at least one term</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>A mentor for your professional development who is not your advisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>A seminar or course designed to develop you as a prospective faculty member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>A career planning workshop on the academic job search</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants’ raw scores indicate that four participants knew (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) about an orientation for new graduate students in their programs, but three participants did not know (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) (Table 4.11).

All seven participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) about a university-wide orientation for graduate students.

Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) about a graduate student handbook for their programs. In contrast, Eun-Su did not know. Sin-Hong decided to not respond this statement.
Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) about a graduate student handbook for their universities. On the other hand, Eun-Su and Tayfun did not know.

Four participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) about their graduate student centers. However, three participants did not know (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong).

Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) about a written policy on research misconduct, but two participants did not know (Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong).

Four out of seven participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and, Yi-San) about a person or office to help students explore options for action when they perceive abuse or misconduct in their programs. In contrast, three participants did not know (Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong).

Two participants knew (Hang-Meeng, and Byung-Soon) about their teaching development centers. But, five participants did not know (Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).

Two participants knew (Hang-Meeng and Sin-Hong) about their teaching assistant training courses, lasting at least one term. However, five participants did not know (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San).

Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) about a mentor for their professional development who is not their advisors, but two participants did not know (Eun-Su, and Tayfun).
Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) about seminars or courses designed to develop them as a prospective faculty member. In contrast, two participants did not know (Eun-Su and Yi-San).

Two participants knew (Hang-Meeng and Sin-Hong) about their career planning workshops on the academic job search. However, five participants did not know (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San).

On Section, B.6, participants were asked a list of opportunities that MU and CU have for doctoral students. For each opportunity listed below, tell us if it is available to doctoral students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Workshop/ seminar on teaching in your discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b An organized trip to another campus to learn about being a faculty member in another setting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c A workshop on career opportunities outside of academia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Progressively more responsible role of teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Progressively more responsible role in research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Opportunity to participate in campus (e.g., teaching a course)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Internship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued

Table 4.12: Opportunity (Section B.6)

*Note: Scoring Scale: 1 = No (not available); 2 = Do not know; 3 = Yes (available)*
The participants’ raw scores indicate that six participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) about an opportunity of workshop/seminar on teaching in their disciplines, but Eun-Su did not know in her program (Table 4.12).
Five participants did not know (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Yi-San) about an opportunity an organized trip to another campus to learn about being a faculty member in another setting. In contrast, two participants indicated there was no such opportunity available (Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong,) in their programs.

Two participants knew (Hang-Meeng, and Byung-Soon) and two participants did not know (Eun-Su, and Yi-San) about an opportunity of workshop on career opportunities outside of academia. However, three participants indicated that there was no such opportunity available (Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) in their programs.

Three participants knew (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) and three participants did not know (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Yi-San) about an opportunity of progressive and responsible role of teaching. But, Tayfun indicated that there was no such opportunity available in his program.

Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) and two participants did not know (Eun-Su, and Tayfun) about an opportunity of progressive and responsible role in research.

Two participants knew (Tayfun, and Yi-San) and three participants did not know (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong) about an opportunity to participate in their campuses (e.g., teaching a course), but Hiroshi indicated that there was no such opportunity available at his campus. Yi-San decided to not respond to this statement.

Two participants knew (Tayfun, and Yi-San) and two participants did not know (Hang-Meeng and Eun-Su) about an opportunity of internship.
Two participants knew (Tayfun, and Yi-San) and two participants did not know (Hang-Meeng, and Eun-Su) about an opportunity to work on another campus (e.g., teaching a course). However, three participants indicated that there was no such opportunity available (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) on another campus (e.g., teaching a course).

Five participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and, Hiroshi) and Yi-San did not know about an opportunity to make a presentation at a regional or national meeting. On the other hand, Sin-Hong indicated that there was no such opportunity available to make a presentation at a regional or national meeting.

Two participants knew (Hang-Meeng, and Byung-Soon) and five participants did not know (Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and, Yi-San) about workshop/seminar on faculty roles and responsibilities at their campuses.

Four participants knew (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Tayfun) and three participants did not know (Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and, Yi-San) about workshop/seminar on research ethics at their campuses.

Hang-Meeng knew and four participants did not know (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and, Yi-San) about workshop/seminar on history, mission, and purpose of higher education. In contrast, two participants (Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) indicated that there was no such opportunity available in their programs.

Hang-Meeng knew and four participants did not know (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi, and, Yi-San) about workshop/seminar on organizational and administration of colleges and universities.
On Section, B.7, participants were asked that if they could go back in time and start their doctoral program over, knowing what they know now, which decisions would they change?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>If I did it over, I would</th>
<th>Hang-Meeng</th>
<th>Byung-Soon</th>
<th>Eun-Su</th>
<th>Tayfun</th>
<th>Hiroshi</th>
<th>Sin-Hong</th>
<th>Yi-San</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Select a different field or sub-field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Select a different advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Select a different university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Select a different dissertation topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Change my decision about taking time off before entering my doctoral program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Change my decision about taking time off during my doctoral program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Not go to graduate school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Take more courses outside of department</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.13**: If you could go back in time and start your doctoral program over, knowing what you know now, which decisions would you change? *(Section B. 7)* *Note*: Scoring Scale: 1 = No; 2 = Maybe; 3 = Yes.
The participants’ raw scores indicate that five participants would not select a different field or sub-field if they had it to do over again (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong), but Yi-San might would select a different field or sub-field if she had it to do over. In contrast, Hiroshi would select a different field or sub-field if he had it to do over (Table 4.13).

Six participants would not select a different advisor if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Yi-San) but Sin-Hong would select a different advisor if he had it to do over.

Four participants would not select a different university if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong), but two participants might would select a different university if they had it to do over (Tayfun and Yi-San). However, Hiroshi would select a different university if he had it to do over.

Six participants would not select a different dissertation topic if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) but Yi-San would select a different advisor if she had it to do over.

Five participants would not change their decision about taking time off before entering their doctoral program if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong) but Yi-San might would change her decision about taking time off before entering her doctoral program if she had it to do over (Yi-San), and Hiroshi definitely would change his decision on taking time off before entering his doctoral program if he had it to do over.
Five participants would not change their decision about taking time off during their doctoral program if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Hiroshi and Sin-Hong) and Yi-San might change her decision about taking time off during her doctoral program if she had it to do over. On the other hand, Tayfun would change his decision about taking time off during his doctoral program if he had it to do over.

All seven participants would select to go to graduate school if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San).

Four participants would like to take more courses outside of department if they had it to do over (Hang-Meeng, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) and Eun-Su would take more courses outside of department if she had it to do over. In contrast, two participants would not want to take more courses outside of department if they had it to do over (Byung-Soon, and Tayfun).

**Summary**

Participants’ responses varied across each section. For example, Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su and Tayfun showed high satisfaction with their relationship with their advisors. In contrast, Sin-Hong and Yi-San had low to moderate level of satisfaction in their relationships with their advisors. Further, the participants’ reasons for selecting their advisors were differed from each other. Byung-Soon and Hiroshi chose their academic advisors because the advisor had good reputations as good researchers, teachers, and advisors. On the other hand, Eun-Su and Yi-San had different responses such as intellectual interest match with advisor, and their academic advisors’ willingness to take them on. Although their relationships with their advisors (e.g., Hang-Meeng, Byung-
Soon, Eun-Su and Tayfun) within the doctoral program were positive, it did not mean that they agreed with the structure of the doctoral program. For example, Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, and Tayfun, responses ranged from agreement to disagreement on aspects of the structure of their APA/APA doctoral program. Likewise, Eun-Su disagreed with some aspects of the structure of her doctoral program. Thus, each participant’s response tended to vary from each other.

Moreover, participants’ levels of understanding of issues and concerns that face doctoral students also tended to vary. The evidence showed that each participant had different types of issues and concerns while attending doctoral programs in APA. Participants’ levels of understanding of resources, programs, or opportunities that MU and CU have for doctoral students also differed. For example, Hang-Meeng indicated a clear understanding of the learning opportunities that MU offered doctoral students. In contrast, Tayfun did not know much about the learning opportunity MU offered for doctoral students. Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, and Sin-Hong were satisfied at selecting a doctoral program in APA as a field of doctoral study, but Hiroshi and Yi-San showed that they might would change their field of study, if they could go back in time to start their doctoral programs over.
Findings from Each Individual Case including Demographic Information, Programs of Study, and Participants’ APA Doctoral Program Contexts

Case I: Hang-Meeng

This section presents findings specific to the first case study. The purpose of this particular case study was to describe and explain an Asian international doctoral student [i.e., Hang-Meeng] assimilation into an APA graduate program while attending a PW-IHE within Big Ten Conference.

Hang-Meeng’s Personal Demographic Information

Hang-Meeng was a single male from Seoul, South Korea (Table 4.1.). He had earned both a bachelor and master’s degree in sport psychology at universities in South Korea. He had applied to a number of universities (i.e., University of Michigan, University of Georgia, Michigan State University, Minnesota State University, State University of New York at Brockport, and Midwestern University) for admission into a doctoral program. He was accepted for admission by five of these universities (Midwestern University, Minnesota State University, University of Georgia, and State University of New York at Brockport). However, SUNY Brockport had only a master’s degree program in APE. Hence, Hang-Meeng eliminated this university from his choices. His current academic advisor at Midwestern University sent him an e-mail message indicating that he was very interested in Hang-Meeng’s research. This advisor was the only person to personally contact Hang-Meeng. This encouraged Hang-Meeng’s decision to attend the APA doctoral program at Midwestern University. Several themes and subthemes (Table 4.14)
emerged from analysis of Hang-Meeng’s interview transcripts. These themes were: (a) language barriers, (b) strategies for solving problems, (c) lack of social interactions, (d) academic improvement- improved relationships, (e) dilemma between insider and outsider status, and (f) religious beliefs and personality.
List of Themes and Subthemes from Hang-Meeng’s Case Study

Hang-Meeng

**Theme 1: Language Barriers**
Subtheme:
(a) Language Barriers Adversely Affect Academic Performance
(b) Negative Relationship with his Academic Advisor
(c) Lost Funding Opportunity
(d) First Year Most Difficult
(e) Exam Format Impact Performance

**Theme 2: Strategies for Solving Problems**
Subtheme:
(a) Tutoring: a Ministry
(b) Change Church
(c) Help from Asian International Students

**Theme 3: Lack of Social Interaction**
Subtheme:
(a) Limited Interaction with Peers
(b) White American Peers’ Attitudes
(c) Discriminatory Attitudes Related to Language
(d) Opportunities to Interact
(e) Identity Assimilation

**Theme 4: Academic Improvement – Improved Relationships**
Subtheme
(a) Improved Language, Improved GPA, and Improved Relationships

**Theme 5: Dilemma between Insider and Outsider Status**

**Theme 6: Religious Beliefs and Personality**

Table.4.14
Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

While Hang-Meeng attended the APA doctoral program at Midwestern University, he had some difficulties communicating with students and faculty members at the university including his academic advisor. Moreover, he struggled to maintain a certain grade point average (GPA) during his first two years within the program. Consequently, he received probation from the graduate school at the end of his first academic year.

Language Barriers

I mentioned that I could not speak English when I came here. I could not hear and understand anything. At the first year, it was the most difficult time for me. First time, when I went to a class, you saw my GPA, but I got two Cs for my major area. These classes were taught by another PE professor in Department of Kinesiology. I just understood that I could not listen and understand her English. That is why I got this grade. (Hang-Meeng Interview)

Several subthemes emerged from the recurrent theme of language barriers. First, language barriers adversely affected Hang-Meeng’s academic performance. Hang-Meeng described the details of these issues during his interview.

Subtheme: Language Barriers Adversely Affect Academic Performance

Language barriers adversely affected his academic performance. He received a letter of probation from the graduate school of MU.

I received double Cs from my major field of study in APE during summer session of my first year of doctoral study. As a result, I received a letter of probation from graduate school. At the time, there was an international conference at IFAPA Korea 2003, so I had to prepare for the presentation. I could not spend much time for studying summer classes. Presentation is considered as my issue, I focused on so much (Hang-Meeng interview).
This quote illustrates how Hang-Meeng had difficulties completing multiple tasks (preparing for his presentation for the international convention in APA and studying for two APE required courses at the same time). He spent a tremendous amount of time preparing his presentations for the international convention which was held in his native country. Therefore, he could not concentrate fully on studying for two required courses in APE.

Subtheme:

Negative Relationship with Academic Advisor

Hang-Meeng also explained that after he received the letter of probation from the graduate school, his social relationship with his academic advisor became negative. His academic advisor refused to discuss this probationary situation for two weeks and was upset at his academic performance. Hang-Meeng described the details:

My academic advisor sent an e-mail to me that my writing is not good, reading speaking and everything, he was really embarrassed for the department, himself, and other professors. I think department also disappointed with my academic performance. When I met my academic advisor, he said Hang-Meeng you have good ability about my research area or respect my knowledge about the other areas, but your problem is language (Hang-Meeng interview).

Hang-Meeng also believed that miscommunication with his academic advisor became a factor leading to the negative social relationship they had as well.

I just listened to the comments from my academic advisor. It was during time that I could not express my feelings using English. I used to listen to what he was saying, but I did not understand most of the stuff he mentioned. We had some misunderstandings with each other. We had some communication problems (Hang-Meeng interview).
Hang-Meeng described that his academic advisor assumed that he understood everything from the conversation with him. However, Hang-Meeng did not know how to ask questions of his academic advisor, because he did not understand half of the substance of their conversations. Thus, he strongly believed that language barriers negatively affected his academic performance as well as his relationship with his academic advisor.

Subtheme: Lost Funding Opportunity.

Hang-Meeng was supposed to receive funding from his university before he received double Cs from APE courses. However, he received a report from his academic advisor and department that the university could not offer any funding to him.

Before low grade happened, my academic advisor mentioned that I got funding, and then this happened. This department decided that we cannot provide any funding for me (Hang-Meeng interview).

Hang-Meeng was supposed to receive a graduate assistantship from the department for his second year. He lost the opportunity to receive this funding, because of his low GPA. Consequently, he has received no funding from the department since he began his doctoral program. He discussed these experiences during the interview. Hang-Meeng also described now although his GPA has improved over the last two years, he has never received funding during the four years of his doctoral study. His academic advisor and department judged that he should focus on only working on his academics through his doctoral program, because he had language barriers not only speaking, but also listening, reading, writing, and presenting. These multiple different types of
language barriers appeared throughout his doctoral study. He reflected and said that he
did not understand much (e.g., academic coursework, communication with other faculty
members and other students) during the first two years of his doctoral study.

Subtheme: First Year Most Difficult

First year as a student was Hang-Meeng’s most difficult due to language difficulties.
Hang-Meeng did not have any opportunity to use English before arriving at Midwestern
University (MU). He explained his experiences specific to language barriers such as
speaking and writing in English before he arrived at MU. In fact, he received also C
grade from his first semester of his doctoral study.

I cannot speak English very well. Actually, I never speak English before I came. I
could write a little. I never spoke English in Korea. As I mentioned that I could not
speak English. I could not hear anything. At the first year, it was a difficult time for
me. First time, when I went to a class, you saw my GPA, but I got a C for my major
area. The class was taught by another PE professor in Department of Kinesiology. I
just understood that I could not listen and understood her English. That is why I got
this grade (Hang-Meeng interview).

Subtheme: Exam Format Impact Performance

Hang-Meeng believed that exam format was strongly related to his low GPA during
his first year of the doctoral program. First year of his experiences in the doctoral
program was the most difficult period for him. More specifically, he explained that exam
format became an issue of language difficulties for passing some courses. For example,
he preferred to take multiple choice types of exams rather than essay types of questions,
because he had low ability in writing sentences in English. Thus, exam format was
strongly related to his low GPA as well.

Some classes are required me to take multiple choice or essay type exams. There 5
questions and choose 3 from that questions something like that. Which one preferred
to do that? I like multiple choice questions better, because I should circle one answer, but essay type of questions are much tougher for me. Let me say writing is another issue for me so far (Hang-Meeng interview).

Although, Hang-Meeng would have a preference for multiple choice type exams, he was required to take some essay type of exams during the first year of doctoral study. However, he could not describe well the content knowledge in English and made a number of grammatical errors while taking essay exams. As a result, he received low grades from some required courses.

**Strategies for Solving Problems**

Hang-Meeng investigated and used some strategies for adjusting to his doctoral program such as using English tutors for improving his writing skills, asking for help from other doctoral students in APA, and following academic advisors’ guidance.

I had an English tutor right now. He read my paper and edited my paper, so there were many grammar mistakes and sentence mistakes happened, so he modified and edited my paper. Then, First and second years, I spent time with only Korean friends, because I need some information about living here. I could get information from American students as well, but I usually contact my Korean friends. I realized that this was not good for my language, so I changed the Church. At third year, I changed my church from Korean to American one. Do you know what I mean? So right now, I do some volunteer works for American church. This kind of activity helps to involve in American society. The church gave me some kind of expectations of language to me, but I spent time with people who involve in the church, they understood my personality and respect who I am. (Hang-Meeng interview)

Hang-Meeng continued:

Hiroshi helped me a lot. I had a professor who had a strict standard for students in the class. When I took the class, I was worried about my grade. Hiroshi helped me big time. I think without his help, I could not pass the course. I really appreciate his effort. Hiroshi was always asking how my grade was. This was another adaptation for this program. (Hang-Meeng interview)
Hang-Meeng used different strategies for solving his academic and language problems such as improving his language proficiency and improving his GPA. These strategies were Hang-Meeng (a) received tutoring service on revising his papers and assignments and also editing grammatical errors, (b) decided to change churches from Korean church to American church for language and socialization purposes, and (c) asked for help from other doctoral students for improvement of his GPA.

Subtheme: Tutoring: a Ministry

Hang-Meeng received tutoring service in revising his papers and assignments and also editing grammatical errors. Hang-Meeng was recommended to have an English tutor by his Korean friends on campus. This tutor was organizing an MU student community and international student organization.

He is a white American. He is not a student or a professor of this university. He is not English major, he is a minister. Korean friends introduced him that he organized MU student community and International students Institutions. My friend told me that one minister really is helping international students’ lives, so he introduced me and we met for a couple of times. I told my academic problems and language, the minister mentioned that he could help some kind of such as modifying my paper. He said to me that I can help you (Hang-Meeng interview).

Hang-Meeng mentioned that this tutor was the only American friend he had on campus. They made an agreement that this tutor promised to help him improve his writing performance on papers. Since from the time he started working with this tutor, his writing performance had improved tremendously.
Subtheme: Change Church

Hang-Meeng decided to change where he attended church from a Korean church to an American one for language and social purposes. Hang-Meeng was recommended to attend American churches by his academic advisor for improving his language proficiency and enhancing his social life. His academic advisor was concerned that he would not improve his English proficiency if he continued attending Korean church, because he did not have any opportunity to use English there. Thus, Hang-Meeng decided to change from attending Korean to American churches.

My academic advisor concerns about my social life, because I have the language problem. My academic advisor knows I attend the Korean church. He also concerned about that. Because my English does not improve. He advised me that I should be a good scholar in Korean or America, so if you accomplish the goal in America, you should go to American church. He recommended me like that. I followed his recommendation, because I changed the church which is best for me to improve my English. Korean church has some English services, but not like American church. Korean church is the majority of service used the Korean language, so I decided that it was not good for me (Hang-Meeng interview).

He also described his feeling that changing from Korean church to American church was considered as awareness of American identity. But, following guidance from his academic advisor was beneficial for Hang-Meeng in developing a positive social relationship with his academic advisor. However, he prioritized improving his language proficiency as the most important factor of his doctoral program, so he decided to leave Korean church to attend White American Church to improve his speaking proficiency.
Subtheme: Help from Asian International Students

Hang-Meeng asked for help from other doctoral students for improvement of his GPA. Hang-Meeng expressed his great appreciation to other doctoral students who helped him academically through his doctoral program.

My colleague told me that I significantly improved. Currently, when I do the presentation, I write a scenario at first, and then show the scenario to my tutor. He proofread and gave me feedback. I practiced several times before the presentation (Hang-Meeng interview).

Moreover, Hang-Meeng asked other students for help in improving the quality of his assignments. He self analyzed that he did not have adequate ability to enhance the quality of assignment by himself. Therefore, he began to use some strategies in asking for other students’ feedback on his assignments.

Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

Hang-Meeng struggled to communicate with other students especially White American students who were in the same APA doctoral program. He felt that they had discriminatory attitudes toward him, and felt that they ignored him, and he believed this was because he was an Asian international student and could not speak English well. Thus, he did not often communicate with other students and faculty members in the department. Moreover, he did not often visit the lab (all doctoral students in APE major could access) for social interactions with other students or faculty members, because of
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this social distance from peers and faculty and because the environment was so noisy and was not an appropriate place for studying. Thus, he only had limited opportunity for social interaction with other students while taking classes. He provided a detailed description of his lack of social interaction with fellow White American graduate students while studying in the APA doctoral program at MU.

**Lack of Social Interaction**

First two years, there were two White American students. One was a doctoral level, and the other one was a master level. Second year, he became a professor at University of New Mexico, and she graduated a master degree and did not apply doctoral program, because she got married. After that there were no American students. I had only two chances of speak with them through my doctoral study. I could not speak English enough. They told me how are you? or something likes that. There were one or two sentences I spoke with them (Hang-Meeng interview).

Two findings emerged from Hang-Meeng’s comments, these were that (a) there were very few White American students in the APA program at MU and there where no other students of color (e.g., African American or Hispanic), and (b) there was limited interaction between Hang-Meeng and the few White American peers within the APA program.

**Subtheme: Limited Interaction with Peers**

There was limited interaction between Hang-Meeng and his White American peers within the APA program. Hang-Meeng had limited interaction with White American graduate students in APA at MU. He only had very brief greetings with these students such as:

Hang-Meeng: Hi, how are you?
A White American student: Good, you?
Hang-Meeng: Fine Thanks (Hang-Meeng interview).
Hang-Meeng felt that he could not expand the conversation with these students, because he did not have enough proficiency in communicating with them in English. Thus, he commented that there was a social barrier with them due to language differences.

Subtheme: White American Peers’ Attitudes

Some of his White American peers held favorable attitudes toward him, whereas others held negative or even discriminatory attitudes toward Asian students.

The guy [White American doctoral student] did not have any problems that I did not speak English well, but for the lady [White American master student] had an attitudinal problem. I felt that she input some degrees of discrimination to me. When I entered the lab, I eye contacted her, then she ignored. She did not want to talk and say anything to me. The other guy [White American doctoral student] could get along with Byung-Soon [other Korean doctoral student]. She spoke English very well. At that time, she did not have problems with the students. For the female master student, I felt some degrees of discrimination from her (Hang-Meeng interview).

This quote captures Hang-Meeng’s belief that some of his White American peers held favorable attitudes toward him, whereas others held negative or even discriminatory attitudes toward Asian students.

Subtheme: Discriminatory Attitudes Related to Language

Hang-Meeng identified discriminatory attitudes from White American students as

There were some American students who tried to avoid having a conversation with me. When I eye contacted them, they ignored and never talked me. My definition of discriminatory attitude was that some American students avoided opportunity of having conversation with other international students who had low language proficiency (Hang-Meeng interview).

Hang-Meeng felt that these American students social interactions differed based on students’ language proficiency. For example, he explained that Byung-Soon [Asian
international colleague] who had adequate English language proficiency in communicating with American students had more opportunity in social interactions with them. Thus, he felt some degree of social isolation from these students.

Subtheme: Opportunities to Interact

Hyun-Kyoung and Hiroshi would study in our lab, so they had more opportunities to communicate with the faculty in the department. In my case, I studied in the library or my home, so I think Hiroshi used to stay with one of professors’ house and pet sit from Dr. Larry Smith. I think this kind of opportunity helped to develop social assimilation for international students. I did not have any opportunities like that. I never studied in my lab, because it was noisy and many people came in and chat each other. Many students did not know about me (Hang-Meeng interview).

This quote reveals that (a) some Asian international students interacted with the faculty within the department, but Hang-Meeng self-selected, social isolation due to noisy environment typified by people chatting with each other and Hang-Meeng’s unfamiliarity with his peers; and (b) some Asian international students worked for their professors beyond the academic area, for example, watching the professors’ pets at their homes.

Subtheme: Identity Assimilation

Hang-Meeng commented that he would have preferred to be an American while studying in the APA doctoral program at Midwestern University.

Sometime, I want to be an American. If I was born in USA, I had no problems about the language. No problem about the culture (Hang-Meeng interview).

Hang-Meeng would like to be American, because becoming American indicates that he must have adequate language proficiency to pass the required courses. In essence, he felt it would be beneficial to dissimilate his Korean identity into American culture while attending his APA doctoral program.
Hang-Meeng’s GPA had improved tremendously over the last two years (from below 3.0 to now at 3.4). He described factors contributing to improving his GPA. He began to take research courses from the end of his second year through fourth year. He did extremely well in all of his research courses especially statistical courses. This improved his overall GPA. Hang-Meeng felt that research was the only course work he could excel in. His academic advisor was impressed with his knowledge relative to research and statistics and realized that Hang-Meeng had excellent potential in research. Since then, Hang-Meeng’s relationship with his academic advisor was much better, because they began to share their knowledge and ideas on research.

Academic Improvement-Improved Relationships

I just listened to the comments from my academic advisor. It was time that I could not express my feelings using English. I used to listen to what he talked about, but I did not understand most stuff he mentioned. We had some misunderstanding with each other. We had some communication problems. Now, I improved my grade. I am working research project with him. He knew that I got very good grade from my research courses. He recognized that I had potentials to do the research, but the problem I have is the language. He is trying to change my language ability now. First and second year, I had the communication problems (Hang-Meeng interview).

This quote uncovers that he believed improving his language proficiency and his GPA helped establish a positive social relationship with his academic advisor.

Subtheme: Improved Language, Improved GPA, and Improved Relationships

Improving his GPA helped establish a positive social relationship with his academic advisor. He explained the details of social relationship before and after his GPA improved.
When I talk to my academic advisor, I feel like I am choking, because there are some power relationships each other. I feel some degree of pressure that I have to perform really well [academically]. He thinks that my English is getting better, but not reaching his expectation. He is waiting for meeting his expectation some day, but he praises me my research project (Hang-Meeng interview).

After Improving Hang-Meeng’s GPA

When I met my academic advisor or other faculty members, they say, Hang-Meeng you have good ability about my research area or respect my knowledge about the other areas, but your problem is language. They want to share some information with me, they have some ideas that I could meet their expectations (Hang-Meeng interview).

These quotes capture the essence that (a) when Hang-Meeng talked to his academic advisor, he felt that (a) he was choking, (b) he felt pressure as being a good student, and (c) he needed to improve his language proficiency. Although Hang-Meeng had difficulties in using the English language, his academic advisor and other faculty members recognized that he had research potential and was knowledgeable particularly on research and statistical applications. Therefore, they emphasized and encouraged his participating in research projects.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Hang-Meeng thought that living and studying doctoral coursework was to face a dilemma between insider and outsider status. More specifically, he explained that as an “outsider” it was difficult for him to explain his ideas or thoughts to other people using English as a second language as a communication tool.
This issue negatively impacted his perspectives about his doctoral program. However, he commented that his religious beliefs sustained and motivated him to continue his doctoral study.

**Dilemma between Insider and Outsider Status**

I cannot express my thinking to other people. The other people think that I do not understand anything. That is not true. This dilemma makes me shift from insider to outsider. Some people (White Americans) assume that I do not understand anything, so whenever they organize some occasions, they make decision without telling me. They also made jokes about me. In my case, I did not understand when I was in first and second year. They laughed, I did not know why they did, because of me? This kind of stuff happened. That made me outsider, because I could not catch. I saw some cultural and social differences of experiences which became the contributing factors between insider and outsider (Hang-Meeng interview).

Hang-Meeng’s quote exemplified that (a) he had difficulty expressing his thoughts to other people [other students and faculty members]; (b) this difficulty brought him to have a dilemma between feeling as an outsider and not an inside within the program; (c) he felt that White Americans assumed that he did not understand anything, even though it was not true. These factors had an adverse impact on Hang-Meeng’s perspectives about attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten conference; and (d) when White American students laughed, he felt that they laughed at him.

However, Hang-Meeng believed that selecting this APA field for doctoral study was strongly connected to his religious beliefs.

**Religious Belief and Personality**

As I mention that I am a Christian, so I always ask myself that why I change my major from sport psychology [Master’s degree area] to APE. Religious component strongly influence my decision to come to MU for studying APE. Before I studied in USA, I was interested in sport marketing. My friend and previous academic advisor
from Korea advised me that choose the majors which relate to your religious beliefs. I believe that this major is matching with my personality as well. Therefore, religious background is a component for selecting my major (Hang-Meeng interview).

This quote illustrates that Hang-Meeng’s (a) religious beliefs guided him to change a field of study from master’s degree (Sport Psychology) to doctoral study (APA); (b) his previous academic advisor suggested he should choose a doctoral field of study related well to his religious beliefs, although aspects of his doctoral program had an adverse affect on Hang-Meeng’s perspectives, his religious beliefs helped him continue within the APA doctoral program, and (c) he also believed that this field was a good match to his personality.

Summary

In all of Hang-Meeng’s interview responses he related his comments to language barriers. He believed that language and thought were strongly associated with each other. He made his academic advisor upset when he receive double C grades in two major courses in APE. Hang-Meeng stated that they always had some degree of miscommunication. He did not know how to express his feelings to his academic advisor. During the first two years of his doctoral program, every time Hang-Meeng saw his academic advisor, he felt like choking, because there was pressure that he had to meet his advisor’s expectations as a qualified doctoral student. Hang-Meeng was currently preparing for his candidacy exam to be taken next year. His academic advisor was concerned that he may not be able to pass the candidacy exam, but they agreed to work together toward Hang-Meeng passing the examination. He greatly appreciated his academic advisor and other students from his doctoral program. He was also glad to be
involved in this doctoral program. At this time, only international students were enrolled in the APA doctoral program at MU. Previously when there were a few White American graduate students in the APE program, Hang-Meeng was socially ignored by these students. Hang-Meeng thought that living and studying doctoral coursework was to face a dilemma between insider and outsider status. More specifically, he explained that it was difficult for him to explain his ideas or thoughts to other people using English as a communication tool. This issue negatively impacted his experiences and perspectives within the APA doctoral program. However, he commented that his religious beliefs sustained and motivated him to continue his doctoral study.

Case II: Byung-Soon

Byung-Soon Personal Demographic Information

Byung-Soon was a single female from Seoul, South Korea (Table 4.1.). She had recently earned a doctoral degree in APE from MU on June, 2006. She had also recently accepted an assistant professor position from Department of Kinesiology at California State University at San Bernadino. She had earned both bachelor and master’s degrees in APE/ pedagogy at universities in South Korea. Before she applied to doctoral programs in APA, she attended the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) 2002 National Convention held in San Diego, California. While at the AAHPERD National Convention, she met a number of faculty members from Midwestern University, Oregon State University, and Central University. She struggled to find an institution which guaranteed her funding during her doctoral studies.
Unfortunately, the APE program at Oregon State University rejected her admission application, because she was not eligible to receive funding from the federal government. Funding from the federal government require that students hold American citizenship. Then, her current academic advisor contacted her and he promised to offer her funding for 4 years of her doctoral program. She decided to attend MU immediately after she received a letter from her current academic advisor. Before she attended the doctoral program at MU, she needed to improve her English proficiency, such as speaking, presenting, writing and reading. She attended English as Second Language program at Georgia Tech University for 6 months. She struggled to adjust to the doctoral program’s environment during her first year, because she was required to teach 4 activity classes, was enrolled in 9 credit hours of course work per semester, and conducted research. Several themes and subthemes emerged from analysis of Byung-Soon’s interview transcripts (Table 4.15). These themes were: (a) difficulties of time management, (b) cultural and language disconnect: language barriers, (c) difficulties of dissertation, and (d) becoming an insider.
List of Themes and Subthemes from Byung-Soon’s Case Study

Byung-Soon

Theme 1: Difficulties of Time Management
Subtheme:
(a) Stress in Managing Time to Complete Multiple Tasks
(b) Differing Priorities and Expectations

Theme 2: Cultural and Language Disconnect: Language Barriers
Subtheme:
(a) Need More Time
(b) Cultural Disconnection with Peers: Language Barriers
(c) Cultural Disconnection with Advisor: Language Barriers

Theme 3: Difficulties of Dissertation
Subtheme:
(a) Collaboration on Dissertation with Advisor
(b) Committee Members’ Disagreement
(c) Unable to Change Committee Members’ Perspective

Theme 4: Becoming an Insider

Table. 4.15

Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

Her experience in the doctoral program was mostly reflected upon as concerns with time management to complete multiple tasks such as teaching, researching, and taking courses. She struggled to meet expectations from her academic advisor, because her and
his (academic advisor’s) priorities of her doctoral program were different. She explained her experiences during the first year of the program around issues of time management in completing multiple tasks.

**Difficulties of Time Management**

I think research and coursework, and teaching equally, because my advisor always said, teaching my coursework, and research three components. His priority was research component at first. It took 50% of my time, and then coursework and teaching. For me personally, I did not want to fail multiple tasks. First semester, I spent most of time for teaching, because I deal with students and I did not want to get many compliments from my students. It was my personality, but I wanted to be a perfect. I wanted to be a good teacher, so first year; I occupied my priority as 1) teaching, 2) coursework and 3) research. I did opposite. My academic advisor always said to me that coursework just get a B. I do not want you to get A every class. I told my advisor that if I tried to get B, I would get C. I always tried to get A for every class. I tried to get some classes for A, sometime I got B, so if I tried to get B, made me lazy. He did not understand what I was talking about. He did not understand and then years later, my teaching skills got better. I was comfortable, and then I shifted to the other way. I think that was the way I adjusted. I respect my life priority what is important at the moment and then move on (Byung-Soon interview).

This quote illustrates how (a) Byung-Soon had difficulties with time management at completing multiple tasks such as teaching activity courses, conducting research projects, and taking classes through her doctoral studies; (b) she and her academic advisor had different priorities and expectations of doctoral study; and (c) they had some misunderstandings associated with their different expectations.

**Subtheme: Stress in Managing Time to Complete Multiple Tasks**

Byung-Soon was stressed from time management issues regarding the completing of multiple tasks during her doctoral study.

It was like 7 days I stayed in this lab, almost 15 hours working everyday, because I had to prepare and do the research at the same time. I was so stressful. That was the most struggling time period at the first year. I had to figure out what was going on around the school. APE research, teaching workload (Byung-Soon interview).
This quote exemplifies that she had an issue of time management and stress at the first year of her doctoral study. For her graduate teaching assistantship (GTA), she spent a tremendous amount of time preparing to teach her undergraduate activity classes, because she was afraid of receiving a letter of low evaluation scores submitted by her students, and if she were to receive low scores on her evaluations she would risk losing her funding for the following year. Thus, her priority of completing tasks was different from her academic advisor.

**Subtheme: Differing Priorities and Expectations**

Byung-Soon and her academic advisor had different priorities of her doctoral studies. Byung-Soon indicated that her academic advisor expressed his expectation of her doctoral work. She struggled to respond to his expectations, because she had different priorities in completing tasks than her academic advisor.

You know when you have advisor, he or she required high expectations. If I did not reach the expectations, his pressure is high. For example, research should be my priority, if I did not take this task as my priority, he told me that why did not I do this way or something like that. First 2 years, I never said NO. I could do this bra bra bra, but time went through, I struggled a little, because course works were too much workload. I taught 4 activity classes and I took 3 classes, and I was doing 2 research projects, so it was critical, dead. Every week, there were 2 deadlines, because I had write down the manuscripts and communicated with advisor. At the time, I had a meeting with my advisor every week. I had to show him something I made a progress every week. We struggled and why were you doing this week. I said to him, I am doing my best. He wanted me to do more. I was done (Byung-Soon interview).

This quote exemplified that from Byung-Soon’s perspective (a) her academic advisor pressured her toward aligning with his guidance and expectations, (b) she was required to submit her weekly progress on research projects to her academic advisor,
(c) she was also assigned to meet with her academic advisor weekly for evaluating her weekly progress, and (d) she had a hard time meeting his expectations throughout her doctoral studies. Thus, she received tremendous amount of pressure meeting high quality of work from her academic advisor.

**Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Byung-Soon provided a rich description regarding academic assimilation particularly in relation to writing papers or manuscripts and reading the assigned texts or materials from coursework. She tried to complete multiple tasks perfectly. However, there were some tasks which she could not complete satisfactorily. She mentioned these issues to her American friends and/or academic advisor.

**Cultural and Language Disconnect: Language Barriers**

Byung-Soon asserted that White American friends did not quite understand issues and concerns of an international student.

We could talk about our problems. Even I had really good White American friends, sometime they did not understand what I was talking about issues of studying. It was like that we had to read 200 pages before attending the class. American students felt a piece of cake. International students need more time to read and conceptualize like Americans. They did not understand culture and language, they did not read some pages, but they could speak out. They could speak to other students in the class. I told my friend that I could not do that way. If I have some knowledge or background about the topic, just speak out no matter what. It was hard for me to do that. They could not understand my perspective (disconnect on meeting academic requirements) (Byung-Soon interview).
This quote captures the essence that (a) Byung-Soon had time management difficulties in completing her assignments which were associated with her limited English language proficiency, heavy course work, and GTA teaching responsibilities; and (b) American classmates disconnect in understanding international students’ issues and concerns associated with completing the required tasks from classes.

Subtheme: Need More Time

Byun-Soon had time management difficulties in completing her assignments, and expressed that she needed to have more time for completing her assignments.

There were some cultural disconnecting and Asian international students need more time. Especially for timeline, reading and writing were tough. You have to read if you want to do your work, I can skim through, but if you capture the depth of knowledge that takes more time. Especially for international students, we never type and hand in. We had to read through and revise it multiple times. Did I miss something? Time wise that was the most difficult thing (Byung-Soon interview).

This quote reveals that it took a long time for Byun-Soon to capture the depth of content knowledge and enhance the quality of writing papers, because international students were required to revise multiple times before submitting papers.

Subtheme: Cultural Disconnection with Peers: Language Barriers

American classmates never fully can understand international students’ issues and concerns of completing required tasks from classes according to Byung-Soon. She noted that American students did not understand international students’ language barriers or concerns in passing classes.

I think American students assumed that international students could read, write and present at native level. However, we could not perform like them. They never understood any language issues and concerns of international students. They did not how we felt about language while enrolling classes (Byung-Soon interview).
This quote illustrates that Byung-Soon’s perspective was that American students believed that international students did not have any issues in using English as a second language through their doctoral programs. Therefore, they also never understood Byung-Soon’s option on how international students felt about taking classes with American students. Byung-Soon noted that her academic advisor also did not understand international students’ language issues and concerns throughout her doctoral studies.

Subtheme: Cultural Disconnection with Advisor: Language Barrier

Byung-Soon asserted that her academic advisor did not understand international students’ language issues and concerns associated with their doctoral studies. She also mentioned a misunderstanding with her academic advisor.

I think my academic advisor understood to some degree my issues and concerns as being international students, but sometime, he did not quite fully understand. We had talked about English proficiency. My English was ok, it was not a problem, speak out in front of the people, but I did not think so, in my mind, there were a little bit of stress and bugging me that this was not good enough. He kept saying that it was not the problem, but it is a problem sometime in class. Some undergraduate students may say that I did not understand what you said (Byung-Soon interview).

This quote exemplifies that her academic advisor also did not always understand her language issues and concerns during her doctoral studies. Her academic advisor assumed that her speaking ability was good enough for presenting to other students and faculty. However, she was not confident speaking English in front of students or faculty.

Byung-Soon said that writing papers or manuscripts was the most difficult task through her doctoral study. In addition, she had a hard time in writing her dissertation. She and her academic advisor collaborated well with one another which enhanced the quality of her dissertation. However, she commented that one of her dissertation
committee members disagreed with some aspects of her study. Thus, she felt that completing the dissertation satisfactorily was a difficult task in terms of writing to please all committee members.

**Difficulties of Dissertation**

I and my advisor had good agreement each other. This topic was not new topic. I have been done and developing ideas for this dissertation. Between committee members, there is a little disagreement between faculty members. I think it was hard to deal with. Cultural perspectives did not matter for some committee members. There are some faculty members who were not showing the cultural thing, but the others did, so they had some kind of arguments. I wanted to speak out something, but I did not, because I did that, I had a problem. It was happening my oral defense of my dissertation. Then, my advisor helped me for control the environment. I really recommend that talk to advisor first and go from there.

This quote illustrates that (a) Byung-Soon and her academic advisor did well in their collaborative working relationship on her dissertation, (b) some committee members disagreed on aspects of her study, and (c) she could not convince these committee members (who believed that cultural perspective did not matter for students’ emotion) about her dissertation.

*Subtheme: Collaboration on Dissertation with Advisor*

Byung-Soon and her academic advisor collaborated well while working on her dissertation.

My academic advisor wanted me to write everyday for my dissertation. One page. It is not easy, everyday we have different thing, sometime I did the last minute writing. If you do last minute writing, you can tell. Especially, it is all about time. If you do not have time, you always be hurry and make mistake (Byung-Soon interview).
This quote captures that her academic advisor recommend that she spend time regularly writing on her dissertation. However, she struggled to write regularly, because of time management in meeting multiple responsibilities.

Subtheme: Committee Members’ Disagreement

Committee members disagreed with aspects of her study.

My dissertation topic was “validating an instrument of emotionality of students with behavioral disorder” I conceptualized and developed this study spending multiple years. I believed that cultural perspective strongly influence students’ learning. However, the other committee members did not believe that culture does not influence students’ learning at all. Thus, there were two different opinions about my study (Byung-Soon interview).

This quote reveals that some committee members disagreed on some questions from Byung-Soon’s instrument. Moreover, she also suffered from committee member’s opposition on this matter during her final oral defense of the dissertation.

Subtheme: Unable to Change Committee Members’ Perspective

She could not convince these committee members, who believed that cultural perspective did not matter for students’ emotion about her dissertation.

My committee members did not believe that cultural perspective components did not influence students’ learning. I and my academic advisor believed that without understanding cultural perspective, we lose some important essence of our study. However, I was afraid of convincing my committee members. It was huge challenge for me, because I was not offensive person, so my academic advisor finally supported me for our justification of my study. I really recommend that working and making agreement with academic advisors was the most important thing of dissertation (Byung-Soon interview).

This quote exemplifies that it is important to work closely with one’s academic advisor, because many international students tend to have some difficulties in convincing all committee members of the relevancy and quality of their work.
Therefore, working and making agreement on the dissertation with academic advisor was a most important aspect of completion of her dissertation.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Byung-Soon’s perspective on attending graduate school at a PW-IHE was that she had developed positive social relationships with other graduate students, faculty members, and other personnel (e.g., janitors and secretaries) and learned from others and who welcomed her as a member in the doctoral program. She believed that these social relationships brought her into an insider position within the doctoral program. Attending social occasions such as graduate student association of Department of Kinesiology was important for living and learning in USA, according to Byung-Soon’s perspective.

**Becoming an Insider**

I think it is very important in living and studying in American is I became an insider. That was the most important thing. I know the janitors here. I know the working staffs here. That is the benefit for me to be as the insider. Social interaction is the most important thing. Attending social events also was important for me to become insider as well. For example, we have many social events here. Ice cream social, it is strange, we share all doctoral students and faculty members and talk about something. We have graduate student association (Department of Kinesiology). They do a lot of research projects and socials, funding guideline, proposal guideline or something. I learned from others and they learned from me. If you are really active in this kind of events, you make this contributing factor easily. I have more benefits as being graduate assistant, because many doctoral students have graduate assistant meeting, graduate assistant social, so that is another thing.

Byung-Soon’s quote captures her perspective that the most important thing in living and studying at doctoral program in USA was that she got accepted and others welcomed
her as a full member within the Department of Kinesiology. Moreover, communicating with faculty members and other students was important, but it also was important to bring her as an insider with social interacting with janitors, secretaries, and other staff who remembered her name. Participating in research projects was beneficial for her communicating with other graduate students and from her perspective. Being a graduate assistant had more social opportunity than students who do not have graduate assistantships. Becoming an “insider” was movement toward assimilating within the APA doctoral program.

**Summary**

Byung-Soon was well assimilated culturally and socially into APA doctoral program. The main aspect she struggled with was time management issues in completing multiple tasks and pressure she felt from her academic advisor as well as department (graduate assistant workload). Her relationship with her academic advisor was positive, but she realized that her academic advisor assumed that whatever she did was fine. Therefore, she expressed some degree of anxiety through the overall academic program. She also pointed out that when other students struggled a lot, they could receive tremendous support from academic advisor as well as from other faculty, but she did not receive much support from them at any point throughout her doctoral studies. She was considered as insider when her academic advisor and other faculty treated her like an American graduate student. Byung-Soon’s perspectives were positively and negatively impacted during her doctoral study. Her comments indicate that developing social relationships with other graduate students, faculty members, or other personnel (janitors, secretaries)
and learning from each other and them welcoming her as a part of the membership in doctoral program were seen as important to Byung-Soon. She believed that these social relationships brought her to an insider’s status within the doctoral program.

**Case III: Eun-Su**

*Eun-Su’s Personal Demographic Information*

Eun-Su was a single female from Pusan, South Korea (Table 4.1.). She received her bachelor degree from a university in South Korea. She had earned two master’s degrees in APE from universities in South Korea and Canada. She was currently attending a doctoral program in APE within the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services (PAES) at Central University (CU). She was also assigned to a graduate administrative associate (GAA) position for the College of Education’s Office of the Assistant Dean for Equity and Diversity since 2005. Her interests in attending the doctoral program at OSU were that she preferred to maximize her experiences for a number of qualitative studies in APE through the doctoral program. Before she applied to the doctoral program, she was reading a journal, *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly* and she found a phenomenological study which was authored by her current academic advisor. She contacted him via e-mail and indicated that she would like to begin a doctoral program under him. At the same time, she was also looking for financial support from a potential doctoral program. Fortunately, she did receive funding and then began her doctoral program last year.

Several themes and subthemes emerged from analysis of her interview transcripts (Table4.16). These were: (a) academic experiences (b) marginalized (c) one program, separate and unequal, (d) terminology adjustment, and (e) becoming more mature.
List of Themes and Subthemes from Eun-Su’s Case Study

Eun-Su

Theme 1: Academic Experiences
Subtheme:
(a) Social Interactions with Classmates Outside of Department
(b) Experience Lacking
(c) Cultural Change

Theme 2: Marginalized
Subtheme:
(a) Academic Hierarchy – Korean
(b) Marginalization – outsider and female

Theme 3: One Program, Separate and Unequal
Subtheme:
(a) One Program, but Separate and Competitive
(b) Competitive Environment

Theme 4: Terminology Adjustment
(a) Terminology in Korea

Theme 5: Becoming More Mature

Table. 4.16

Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?
Eun-Su had unique learning experiences within three different countries (South Korea, Canada, and USA). The focus of her response during the interview with her was mostly on her experiences in master’s programs within South Korea and Canada and her current doctoral program at OSU. The major finding from her responses was that she expressed her satisfaction in studying at the doctoral program, in contrast she did not have adequate course work experiences from her master programs (one or two classes through her master’s programs). In contrast, her current program offered various types of coursework and learning experiences for doctoral students. She revealed her strong satisfaction as being a doctoral student at this university. However, one negative theme emerged from the data analysis of her responses and it was that she was not familiar with academic quarter systems. She expressed her feeling that she struggled to adjust to the academic culture (schedule) of this university.

**Academic Experiences**

I was kind of happy, because I did my master’s both countries Korea and Canada. The school did not provide any activities. They just had only one faculty member who was interested in research in this area, so I took only one course from university. I had to find the practicum experience by myself. I took four different classes at the first quarter (which I am not familiar with this academic schedule). I took the assessment, inclusion, programming severe and profound disability course, disability sport. I liked all of these classes (Eun-Su interview).

This quote captures the essence that Eun-Su (a) was satisfied with her academic courses in APE within her doctoral program, (b) had a lack of experiences of APA coursework from undergraduate and graduate program in APA from South Korea and Canada, and (c) was not familiar with the academic quarter system of her current doctoral program.
Subtheme: Social Interactions with Classmates Outside of Program

Eun-Su had positive social interactions with classmates within her academic courses outside of the APE doctoral program. Eun-Su described her rationale for why she socially interacted with her classmates within various courses.

I am kind of close to all classmates. I am conformable dealing with people from the outside of department, because they do not know me. That made me more comfortable. When you are inside, you know everyone. During the master’s program, I did not speak much. My speaking was not really good, so I spent 4 years in Canada, but it is the same thing. I did not like to speak up much there, because I felt like they knew me that I did not speak well (Eun-Su interview).

This quote exemplifies that she was not only satisfied taking various types of APA graduate classes, but also she had more opportunities for social interactions with other students from outside her APE program such as students in the special education or disability study program. In other words, she had opportunities and felt more comfortable developing positive social relationships outside the APE program than within. She also noted that her speaking proficiency was much better than while she attended graduate program in Canada. Thus, her improvement of her speaking skills helped enhanced her satisfactory level now in her doctoral program.

Subtheme: Experience Lacking

She had a lack of experiences in coursework within her undergraduate and graduate programs in APA from South Korea and Canada. Eun-Su informed the researcher that she had a lack of taking adequate number of classes within her undergraduate and graduate programs. For example, when she was in the master’s program in Korea, there were limited resources which were written in Korean (most APA textbooks and journal...
articles were published in English). Thus, she was required to read her academic materials in English. Moreover, when she was in Canada, there was no APE practicum experience within her graduate program. She took only one class which related to APA content through her graduate program in Canada.

I used all English books. I read book by Sherrill and Winnick in English. I struggled during that period. I chose to read. In Korea, academic advisor was not really an academic person. He was more administrative person. When I was doing my master’s program, nobody gave me any instructions. I just did one class, it was the organizational workshop APA or APE whatever. Actually in Korean during my master program, there is no specific APE. I was in the master and one Korean university has undergraduate program. It is not APE, they call special physical education. One undergraduate program and one university had it. Lately a couple of universities have it. Some institutions still call special physical education. The master’s program in Canada was not focusing on well my academic advisor was doing disability and also women study and elderly types of study. I struggled a lot, because of the language difficulties, limited resources focus on APA in my master’s program. Here is like at CU heaven (Eun-Su interview).

This quote reveals that (a) her undergraduate and graduate programs from Korea and Canada had limited resources for designing APE course work, (b) she was assigned to use English written text books while attending her graduate program in Korea, (c) her graduate program advisor in Canada primarily focused on disability study and elderly types of research not necessarily related to APA.

Subtheme: Cultural Change

Before now, Eun-Su was not familiar with the academic quarter system of her current doctoral institution. Eun-Su exposed her difficulty in adjusting to the academic schedule.

CU is the quarter system. It is kind of tough for me. One quarter in 10 weeks. Cultural change. Canada was semester. Korea as well had. 12-13 week semesters. Ten weeks are kind of short and the amount of information is the same comparing semester types of school. That is tough. I never stayed up at night before I came here, but I do now.
I have a tight schedule here, and then I do not or cannot sleep at the night time, doing assignments. Before I came here, I did not take classes during the master’s program. I always wake up 6 am and always went to bed around 12 am midnight. That was my routine. Here is not, if I have time, I go to sleep (Eun-Su interview).

This quote illustrates that (a) intentionally for Eun-Su, her APA doctoral program was a cultural change, (b) she had difficulty in adjusting to a quarter system, and (c) she now regularly experience sleep deprivation since she started attending the APA doctoral program at her current university.

She was not familiar with quarter system before she attended this doctoral program. She struggled in adjusting to this academic schedule, because she felt that her doctoral course input tremendous amount of content information within a short period of time. Thus, she indicated that time management became an issue for her during the doctoral program.

**Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Among other things, Eun-Su discussed a social disconnection with faculty members and students from pedagogy field. She felt some degree of separation between faculty members and students from physical education teacher education (PETE) and APE programs.
Marginalized

Subtheme: Academic Hierarchy - Korean

I have been here as the fourth university (including undergraduate through doctoral level). I love it. My first master’s program in Korea was really hard, nobody talked with me even faculty members. I had a good relationship with my advisor. One day I took in a class in first semester and there were five students taking one class exercise physiology. Three students were from the same universities and two students were from different universities. Then faculty member roughly said that my master’s program in the university was high class, and I was from different city in Korea, people looked down on my undergraduate program. There was an academic hierarchy based on the location. Therefore, faculty members said that I am from the lower level of university, and then this is not a place you want to be famous? (Eun-Su interview)

This quote captures that Eun-Su felt marginalized by a faculty member at her master’s graduate program. More specifically, she was roughly told from a faculty member that her undergraduate program from Pusan (where she had earned B.A.) was a low achieving university. Thus, Eun-Su did not have a positive relationship with faculty members and students from her master’s graduate program in Korea.

Subtheme: Marginalized

Outsider and Female

In master program in Canada, there were 11 students and 10 of these students were White Canadians. I was only one international student in our department. There were 11 students and 3 females and 8 males, 1 female dropped out a year later. Another female was a physical therapist and had full time job in university hospital. She only took some classes. I could see her in some classes, but I never talked to her. All males were all young. They all finished undergraduate and came to the master’s program. That was really tough for me, because they never talked with international students in their lives. I struggled for becoming an insider. I felt that we all were competitive each other in this department. When we were doing a discussion, I felt that it was not the discussion. It was competing with each other (Eun-Su interview).
This quote exemplifies that she did not have positive social interactions with other graduate students in APA program while matriculating at the university in Canada. More specifically, she revealed that she struggled at becoming an insider during her master’s program, because other graduate students were competitive and they had not interacted with international students in their past. Thus, she felt that she was psychologically marginalized from the department.

**One Program, Separate, and Unequal**

My experience, I did not get close to the faculty members. I took some classes, our department had 2 majors pedagogy and APE. I felt like these are separated. Pedagogy faculty members care about pedagogy doctoral students only. APE faculty students care about only APE students. It seemed that they looked like they were close, but they were not, so I just took classes and was not interested (I do not care). I feel like all faculty members and students competitive with each other in this department (Eun-Su interview).

This quote illustrates that Eun-Su’s perspective was that (a) APE and PETE faculty members only care about their own advisees or other students who are in the same specialization area, and (b) she felt that this separation established competitive environment between APE and PETE doctoral students.

**Subtheme: One Program, but Separate and Competitive**

APE and PETE faculty members only care about their advisees or other students who are in the same field, according to Eun-Su.

I see that PETE faculty members’ offices were located at a third floor in the building. On the other hand, APE faculty members’ offices are located at second floor. Moreover, doctoral seminar only focuses on pedagogy related contents. When APE faculty members facilitated the doctoral seminar, they tried to bring some neutral topics between PETE and APE. Moreover, PETE and APE students have different research interests, so they really do not care what they were doing. Thus, academic advisors tended only to take care only their advisees or students who are in the same field (Eun-Su interview).
This quote reveals that (a) faculty members’ separation was obvious between APE and PETE specialization areas, and (b) doctoral seminars (all doctoral students from PETE and APE) become an issue that some faculty members do not facilitate a neutral topic which captures all doctoral students’ attention, particularly there exists a lack of APE-related content.

**Subtheme: Competitive Environment**

She felt that this perceived separation established a competitive environment between doctoral students.

I feel like we all are competitive each other in this department. I felt like that. Well, if some people are listening, I do not have any problems with that, but many people are not listening, so I want to say something, but I cannot. For example, there is a nice girl, but topic she is not interested, she does not care she is doing something else. That was really hard to interact. I think research method is also influenced each other too. Quantitative person does not care qualitative researchers. Something likes that (Eun-Su interview).

This quote exemplifies that a number of doctoral students showed their careless attitudes toward students who were from different specialization areas. Eun-Su felt that it was hard to interact with PETE students who were not interested in her area of research or were from a different specialization, but the same doctoral program.

Eun-Su had a number of unique educational backgrounds in studying APE within three different countries. She evaluated herself that there were different types of struggles in studying at universities within various countries. Since she began to take some APE classes from CU, she struggled because the focus was tremendously different from her experiences in South Korea and Canada.
CU emphasized more educational related content than adapted physical activity (APA). She had also different types of struggles to assimilate into this program culture.

**Terminology Adjustment**

In Korea, we said one word [Adapted Physical Activity]. Here at CU in people people say adapted physical activity and adapted physical education. It is terminology. CU talks about education and schools, so people use APE, but Canada use APA, so they talked about the whole society. I struggled to deal with this terminology and these cultures. I always change the words. In Korea, I am not an APE teacher. I did not work at school. I worked at hospital setting and rehabilitation setting, but I was a rehabilitation and physical education teacher in English. We are doing the same thing, but different environment I guess. In Korea, I got lot materials of English written. I had to read text books in English. We have some translated books, but it depends on faculty members (Eun-Su interview).

This quote captures the concern that Eun-Su struggled in adjusting to various definitions of terminology in APA from various countries. For example, Korean universities still used different terminology: special physical education instead of using APA.

**Subtheme:**

**Terminology in Korea**

I was in the master’s and one Korean university has undergraduate program. It is not APE, they call special physical education. One undergraduate program and one university had it. Lately a couple of universities have it. Some institutions still call special physical education (Eun-Su interview).

A few universities in Korea still use this terminology. Thus, she was required to adjust to terminologies which were provided by various universities.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**
Eun-Su’s perspective was that living and studying in a doctoral program at a PW-IHE in USA led her to become more mature. She communicates with her mother on the telephone frequently and her mother realized that Eun-Su was more confident and knowledgeable. Eun-Su commented that she initially during first and second quarter of her doctoral study thought she would not be able to teach at an American PW-IHE, because of language barriers. However, after attending the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD) 2006 Convention held in Salt Lake, Utah, and listening to speakers there, she began to feel that it may be possible that she could teach at an American PW-IHE.

**Becoming More Mature**

Become more mature…. I do not feel like I changed, my mom said I change. My mom said that I have more confident. We usually talk with each other twice a week. My mom said I am more confident. She said that I could get more knowledgeable. I always talk about my study to my mom on the phone, so she knows everything. I felt like after the AAHPERD conference of [American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance 2006 Convention held in Salt Lake, Utah], I am more comfortable studying here. First and second quarter, I will not be able to teach in USA, because of my language or something like that. After the conference, I feel it may be possible. Eun-Su’s quote illustrates that (a) she was becoming more matured as a result of her living and studying in APA doctoral program at PW-IHE in America; (b) Eun-Su communicated with her mother on the phone frequently and her mother realized that she had became more confident and knowledgeable while attending her doctoral program in APA; and (c) she recently thought that minimizing her language barriers has enhanced her confidence in teaching at a college or university in USA in the future.
Summary

Eun-Su articulated her cross cultural experiences throughout the interview. She expressed her feelings about some degree of satisfaction as being a student within the APA doctoral program and as having a supportive academic advisor. However, her program was comprised of two different areas (i.e., APE and PETE). From her perspective, faculty members and students from PETE and APE were completely separated. They did not care about the other field of study. Thus, she had some difficulties in adjusting to the new learning environment at CU. Through her educational experiences, she prioritized that funding was the most important factor as a selection of doctoral program. Hence she initiated contact and had the same research interests with her academic advisor, and she received funding from her university. She also added that if CU at any point stopped her funding, she would not be able to afford paying her tuition and would need to leave the program. She also provided the detail information regarding cross cultural processes of her academic programs within three different countries. Eun-Su’s perspective was positively impacted while attending her doctoral program in APA. She indicated that living and studying in the USA led her to become more mature. She communicated with her mother on the phone frequently and her mother realized that Eun-Su was now more confident and knowledgeable. Eun-Su felt that she may possibly be able to teach at the college or university level at a PW-IHE in the future.
Case IV: Tayfun

*Tayfun Personal Demographic Information*

Tayfun was a married male from Turkey (Table 4.1.). He had earned his bachelor degree in Sport Marketing from a university in Turkey. He had earned a master’s degree in physical education pedagogy from Florida State University (USA). He was currently attending a doctoral program and working on his dissertation in APA within the Department of Kinesiology at MU. While he attended Florida State University (FSU), he had an internship at a school that provided services for students with disabilities. FSU offered him a job during the summer coaching some students with disabilities. After those experiences, he was motivated to study more about APE and APA at the doctoral level. He visited MU campus six months before he applied to the doctoral program. He met all professors of APE there and observed the program in general at the Department of Kinesiology. Thus, he only applied to MU for the doctoral program in APE. Several themes and subthemes emerged from analysis of Tayfun’s interview transcripts. These themes were: (a) relationship with academic advisor (b) socio-economical difficulty, (c) social adjustment and distance with doctoral students, (d) academic struggles, (e) maintaining Turkish cultural and religious values, and (f) cultural adjustment (Table 4.17).
List of Themes and Subthemes from Tayfun’s Case Study

Tayfun

Theme 1: Relationship with Academic Advisor
Subtheme:
(a) Missed Deadline, Burnout
(b) Negative Social Relationship with Academic Advisor

Theme 2: Socioeconomic Difficulty
Subtheme:
(a) Partial Financial Support
(b) Paying Extra

Theme 3: Social Adjustment and Distance with Doctoral Students
Subtheme:
(a) Good Relationships and Distance with Some Peers
(b) Lack of Social Interactions
(c) Positive Social Relationships with Asian Doctoral Students in APA

Theme 4: Academic Struggles
(a) Difficulty: Passing Courses
(b) Limitation of Doctoral Program

Theme 5: Maintaining Turkish Cultural and Religious Values

Theme 6: Cultural Adjustment

Table. 4.17

Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?
Tayfun’s reflections of his doctoral program during the interview were mostly about his relationship with his academic advisor and financial issues particularly after passing his candidacy exam in 2004. After he passed his candidacy exam, he analyzed himself and realized that he was burned out and stopped making progress in his doctoral program. Then, he lost financial aid from MU and had a negative social relationship with his academic advisor for nine months. Nonetheless, his dissertation proposal was approved on June 8th 2006. He was trying to complete his doctoral degree at the end of this year 2006.

**Relationship with Academic Advisor**

We had … very bad time about 9 months. At the time, he was not my advisor, because we decided that he was not going to be my advisor. From last September to this May. The thing was that I could not finish my dissertation proposal of this summer and missed the deadline. My reason was I was trying to make it, I gave two drafts at that time. I tried to submit third draft. It was going to distribute for all my committee members, but I could not finish before the deadline and my mistake was I did not communicate with him. I could not finish on time, still working on it, but I was kind of scared that he would not like it. I postponed and delayed it. By the time, when I met him, it was too late. He told me that it was better for me to find new advisor. That period was very tough. That was a reason that I was delayed my completion of my study, but now we are very good relationship. I am putting double efforts. I am making sure that my dissertation is finishing on time (Tayfun interview).

This quote illustrates that (a) Tayfun had missed the deadline in the submission of his dissertation proposal, and (b) since he had delayed submitting his dissertation proposal, he began to have a negative social relationship with his academic advisor. He was anxious about meeting his academic advisor’s expectation of a high quality dissertation.
Subtheme: Missed Deadline, Burnout

Tayfun missed the deadline in submission of his dissertation proposal.

That was little tough for me and then another problem was that after the qualifying exam 2004, I lost my appetite for studying (burnout). I had hard time returning back in and catch the same pace it used to. I have better time management skill now. It helps me for planning for my life too. I am not a laid back person now. I may have some times off, but I deserve first. I may have half day off. I get back to business. Time management wise has been useless for me.

This quote exemplifies that he was burnout and stopped making progress in his doctoral studies after he passed his candidacy exam. Moreover, he was afraid of communicating with his academic advisor in reporting progress on his dissertation. As a result, he missed submitting his third draft, and then he began to have a negative social relationship with his academic advisor. However, he had now developed better time management skills for making progress on his dissertation.

Subtheme: Negative Social Relationship with Academic Advisor

Since he had delayed submitting his dissertation proposal, he began to have a negative social relationship with academic advisor.

He told me that it was better for me to find new advisor. That period was very tough. That was a reason that I was delayed my completion of my study. It was my mistake that it was my fault not his. When we stop making progress of our doctoral study, everything went negative, particularly social relationship with academic advisor. However, I asked him for giving me one more chance. Then he told me that there is no single day you do not conceptualize at least half hour. That is what he said to me. That is true, when we think about it. If we are away from, or you can be researcher anytime, but off course you are emphasizing one of them. You start loosing literature information you have and forgetting what you have in your mind, so he told me those (Tayfun interview).

This quote reveals that (a) Tayfun promised his academic advisor that he would make progress in his doctoral studies, and (b) his academic advisor pointed out to him that
consistent alignment and conceptualization of dissertation project (relationship with purpose statement, theory, research questions, literature review, and procedures) was important, and (c) at one point, his academic advisor told him to find a new advisor.

**Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral student assimilates into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Tayfun stated that after he stopped making progress in his doctoral program, he began to have socio-economic issues. More specially, he was required to pay his tuition, which was approximately $5,000 per semester from his personal budget. Currently he was receiving a small amount of scholarship funding from the Turkish government. Moreover, he was married and needed to support his wife as well. Thus, socio-economic difficulties was a major issue for Tayfun during his APA doctoral program.

**Socioeconomic Difficulty**

I had a scholarship for four years including master’s and PhD, but after that currently, I do not have it. I have not received funding since January of 2006. Last 6 months, I am funding by myself. It is difficult. Good thing is I do not have to take courses now. In spring, I had to pay $5000 from my budget. Luckily, I got a grant from International services from Turkey for $2000. That paid a part of it. My parents supported my rent. Good thing is that they are able to support me. In master degree, I was working at the school, do you want me to name the school? Grinich everpark. I was getting paid from there too, so I had a chance a little saving for my PhD, but it is not easy for me. One thing killing me is the health insurance. There is the minimum requirement, but it has to be equal coverage. In fact, I never use it (Tayfun interview).

This quote captures the reality that Tayfun (a) received a partial financial support from his parents, and (b) was responsible for paying not only his tuition, but also was required to pay his health insurance, and support his wife as well.
**Subtheme: Partial Financial Support**

Tayfun received partial financial support from his parents. Tayfun was worried about paying his tuition, because he was required to pay out of state tuition. Thus, he needed to ask his parents for support toward his living expenses. Moreover, he recently married his wife and they were struggling and suffering financially.

Finances, because I had scholarship from Turkish government before you know. They gave me an extended time, if I finish by the time they gave, that will be ok. If not, they will start ask for paying money back. Probably I need to finish before May of next year, but I want to finish earlier. I feel some degrees of pressure on me. Also family responsibility, because I am married now. We need salary. My wife quit the job, because she had to take care of wedding. It takes a lot of times. Returning back to the cultural thing, Turkish culture is more like guy is responsible for the house. I have to work and making sure the house salary is enough. She can choose to work if she wants to. She chooses not to work it is my responsibility. I need to finish as soon as possible and get a job (Tayfun interview).

This quote illustrates that (a) Tayfun needed to ask his parents for financial support, because he had family responsibilities in supporting his wife and financial obligation toward his doctoral program, and (b) he felt pressure culturally as the Turkish culture indicates that a husband must independently take care of his family financially.

**Subtheme: Paying Extra**

Tayfun did not pay only his tuition, but also was required to pay for his health insurance as well.

University required all international students have their health insurances. However, this fee is not included in tuition. I have not used any health insurance while attended graduate studies in USA. However, I was required to pay health insurance. Moreover, this university also required students pay parking fees, and facility fees. This university tried to take students’ money as much as they can (Tayfun interview).
This quote exemplifies that he needed to pay extra fees (e.g., health insurance, parking fees, and facility fees) as a doctoral student. Tayfun believed that the university tried to withdraw students’ money as much as they could.

**Social Adjustment and Distance with Doctoral Students**

Tayfun was socially well adjusted with fellow doctoral students in the APE program. He was willing to help other students as much as he could in terms of helping them with data collection and data analysis on research. He was caring toward other doctoral students. Whenever they needed him, he was there for them. He indicated that the most important thing within doctoral program was to maximize social interaction with other doctoral students. In fact, all doctoral students had taken a road trip to attend the AAHPERD 2004 National Convention in New Orleans and this became a bonding experience. He revealed that the trip made them “additional bonds of their social relationship.” He believed that social activities among students were very important.

**Good Relationships, but Distance with Some Peers**

We have very good relationships. All of them, not single one out, I would like to continue my friendship in future. Maybe not in USA, but I want to keep in touch. We help our research project each other. Like we are doing for you for collecting data. We collaborate each other whenever someone needs. I like that. On the other hand, we had two students who were White Americans. All relationship with them and my relationship with them were not like this. We had distance. I did not helping each other out. There was a Taiwanese student. The relationship of helping each other was excellent. One of American students was master student, she was doing the research. She did not have much time either. The other American guy was doing his dissertation. He was spending much time for that, but the time I entered this school, he spent one more year in the department. If we spend more time, we might have better social relationship (Tayfun interview).
This quote captures the essence of Tayfun’s (a) positive social relationships with other Asian doctoral students in APA, but (b) negative social relationships with American graduate students in the APA doctoral program.

Subtheme: Lack of Social Assimilation

Tayfun had negative social relationships with White American graduate students in the APA doctoral program.

I could not find some commonalities with other two White American students. I was not sure that it may be language barriers, but I had distance between us. I think that one student was working on his dissertation and the other student finished her master program. Maybe they did not have much time for caring other students. Anyway, I had negative social relationship with them. Our social relationship was not like with other Asian international doctoral students (Tayfun interview).

This quote reveals that Tayfun could not find some commonalities for engaging in conversations with some White American students. Moreover, he believed that language barriers may have become social barriers between them.

Subtheme: Positive Social Relationship with Asian Doctoral Students in APA

Tayfun had positive social relationship with Asian doctoral students in APA. Our relationship, travel that we made together also helped. New Orleans AAPERD (American Alliance Health Physical Education Recreation and Dance) 2004. We did a road trip together. It was so much fun. It was great. That put additional bonds to our relationships. You can ask Hiroshi. We drove all the way from Indiana to Louisiana. Hiroshi came form Japan. He drove back on the way with us. On the way, we went to Atlanta and Florida like vacation too. We traveled together. I would say that for PhD program, social activities within the students were very important. I would strongly suggest in future. Traveling together is kind risky, we may be getting along with, that was a nightmare, but ours were perfect. We were greatest time together. Our characteristics were well matched (Tayfun interview).
This quote exemplifies that he developed positive social bonds with other Asian doctoral students while on a road trip to attend the AAHPERD 2004 National Convention in New Orleans. However, he had negative social relationships with White American graduate students.

Tayfun was not academically well adjusted within the doctoral program. Doctoral program in APE required students to take at least 15 credit hours of research coursework. Tayfun struggled to pass some research courses particularly a multivariate statistic course. He described the detail rationale of why he felt the class was so difficult. He also suggested that the doctoral program at MU must recommend more practicum experiences such as CAMPABILITIES organized by SUNY Brockport, Wright State University, and OSU for graduate students. From his perspective, Tayfun felt that collaborating with other universities is very important for all students to make social connections and share students’ learning experiences together.

**Academic Struggle**

I struggled was the statistic class. Multivariate statistic was the one I struggled most. The teacher helped a lot and was helpful. He tried to make a class as easy as possible. It is difficult class. Information was building up from the previous courses, so that was the final step which was difficult. I managed to pass. I do not feel like really very competent in statistics. I was struggling about that. When you conceptualize your research, the limitation is very important. You have to have good literature and theoretical foundation why you did it. I spend a lot of time there. Why I should limit my self for certain aspect. In terms of publication, they want theoretical foundation. To be honest, we are not provided enough information about theory from coursework. I do not think any programs can do. There is also the limited thing you cannot get from the class (Tayfun interview).
This quote illustrates that (a) Tayfun had academic struggles in certain courses within his doctoral program, and (b) Tayfun felt that his doctoral program was limited in the course offerings.

**Subtheme: Difficulty: Passing Courses**

Tayfun had academic struggle of a certain course within his doctoral study.

It was not that we did not take the required courses or anything like that, but there some things that I have to. I am very visual person, there are some things that I have to conceptualize visually. In statistics, there are some concepts that I could get really grasp of it. Now I am using three dimensional graphics that explains some statistical concepts. For example, chronicle correlations, if you have something like spherical shape, lines coming through the different size. When you see from paper, you will see from one dimension. If you have it in your hand physically, you see the different shapes and then you can understand about the chronicle correlations. Something likes that. That is the hardest part of research. May be when I do more research, it will get used more (Tayfun interview).

This quote captures the difficulties that Tayfun had in passing research method courses. Therefore, he used various strategies for a better understanding of difficult concepts. Tayfun also discussed limitations of his doctoral program. He suggested how in his perspective APA doctoral program should be reformed.

**Subtheme: Limitation of Doctoral Program**

Tayfun felt limitations within doctoral program in APA.

I think our academic program could be better if we have more number of professors. We have only 2 now and maybe the number of students should increase. That helps to increase the options and activities or variety of classes we can take. Here I feel like we need more practicum. It is not required. Like I was reading your e-mail, I heard CU students attend Can Ability at SUNY Brockport something like that. We should do something like that. We have strength we did publish, we did a number of research. We collaborated school for blind and made new curriculum for the. That was good. In terms of visiting some other programs, or taking classes with other institutions together. CU and Indiana are very closed each other. We could have done at least one semester and come here or go there and learn together. We are lucking that. I wish I have some opportunities like that (Tayfun interview).
This quote exemplifies Tayfun’s opinion that (a) practicum experiences and related coursework need to be offered to doctoral students and, (b) collaboration with other graduate programs in APA is necessary for doctoral students.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Tayfun’s perspective was that since living and studying in USA, he had become more aware of his Turkish cultural and religious values than what he was aware of while living in Turkey. He stated that Turkish culture is more relaxed and American culture is more competitive and aggressive. Thus, he also commented that he thought that his doctoral program was about deadlines. When he stopped making progress, he had a negative relationship with his academic advisor, and lost his funding. He realized that maintaining his own cultural and religious values helped him continue his doctoral program at PW-IHE in the USA.

**Maintaining Turkish Cultural and Religious Value**

You can say I am assimilated, but in other way you cannot say. I try to be for example on time. I used to have Turkish standard time. I had a transition in term of relax behavior in my social life. One time I was visiting Turkey, my aunt told me Tayfun, you are very relaxed. The cultural value is opposite here in USA. It seemed that USA is competitive and aggressive. Before I was coming to USA, I could say I was a fun of USA, but since I came here I valued my culture more being the circle of Muslim. I have seen that life in USA, culture in USA is not seen the movies. It is totally different. Therefore, I started my cultural value more.
Tayfun’s quote reveals that (a) he valued his more Turkish cultural background now more than he did while living and studying in Turkey (e.g., relax), but American culture is opposite (competitive and aggressive); (b) his aunt was surprised that he did not change much while attending doctoral program at MU; and (c) he believed that his cultural value consisted of his religious beliefs as a Muslim. Thus, he shared his thoughts about the overall experiences of the doctoral program at MU.

**Cultural Adjustment**

The deadline. Hahahahaha so I have better time management skill now. It helps me for planning for my life too. I am not a laid back person now. I may have some times off, but I deserve first. I may have half day off. I get back to business. Time management wise has been useless for me. When you stopped making progress of your doctoral study, everything went negative like advisors’ relationship and financial issues.

Tayfun’s quote exemplifies that (a) he learned that making cultural adjustments was necessary in order to complete his doctoral program (e.g., time management in meeting deadlines); and (b) he felt that when he stopped making progress in his doctoral studies, he had a negative social relationship with his academic advisor and lost his funding.

**Summary**

Tayfun had a negative social relationship with his academic advisor for nine months from his perspective, because he stopped making progress in his academic work (dissertation). He explained that when a student stopped making progress, everything he did went negative such as losing good relationship with academic advisor or losing scholarship. He rebuilt a positive social relationship with his academic advisor. He appreciated his academic advisor’s support as well as understanding of his personal
issues and concerns through the doctoral study process. At the time of their study, he was at the data collection stage of his own dissertation and he was required to complete his doctoral degree by this December 2006. His partial scholarship from Turkey supported his completion of the dissertation research until the end of the year. He also appreciated friendships of students and faculty members in contributing to his academic achievement. He noted that he was willing to keep in touch with all doctoral students for the rest of his life. He gladly expressed his feeling that he had the best social relationships with other students, because all doctoral students are international students. Tayfun’s perspective was that since living and studying in USA, he was more aware of his Turkish cultural and religious values than he was while in Turkey. He described that Turkish culture is more relaxed and American culture is more competitive and aggressive. Thus, he also commented that he thought that his doctoral program was about meeting deadlines. When he stopped making progress, he had a negative relationship with his academic advisor, and lost his funding.

**Case V: Hiroshi**

*Hiroshi Personal Demographic Information*

Hiroshi was a single male from Japan (Table 4.1.). He had earned his bachelor degree in Social Welfare from a university in Japan. He had earned a master’s degree in APE from MU. He currently attends a doctoral program and is working on his dissertation in APE within the Department of Kinesiology at MU. The purpose of his study abroad to MU was to attend an Intensive English Program (IEP). He had spent eight months at improving his English proficiency. Then, after he completed the IEP program, he was
interested in beginning a master’s program in APE. He had asked his friend who attended the graduate program in Therapeutic Recreation from Southern Illinois University to introduce him to some graduate programs in APE. He has attended the graduate program in APE at MU since 2001. Currently, Hiroshi is back in Japan while working on his dissertation project, because of financial reasons. He decided not to work as a faculty member at American colleges or universities. Several themes and subthemes emerged from analysis of Hiroshi’s interview transcripts. These themes were: (a) language barriers (b), socioeconomic difficulties, (c) stereotyping international students, (d) frustrated as student, and (e) broader perspective (Table 4.18).
List of Themes and Subthemes from Hiroshi’s Case Study

Hiroshi

Theme 1: Language Barrier
Subtheme:
(a) Tutoring Service
(b) Suffering from Presentation

Theme 2: Socioeconomic Difficulties
Subtheme:
(a) Lost Funding
(b) Unclear Understanding about Funding

Theme 3: Stereotyping International Students
Subtheme:
(a) Faculty Members’ Stereotype

Theme 4: Frustrated as Student
Subtheme:
(a) No American Students in APA Graduate Program
(b) Communication Issue in Seminar
(c) Being Quiet

Theme 5: Broader Perspective

Table. 4.18

Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?
Hiroshi had some difficulties with language barriers particularly of speaking English and writing papers. He did not know what to do in term of enhancing the quality of his writing. One of the program’s faculty members was surprised that he did not use a writing center to proofread his papers at the beginning of his master’s program. Since then, he always used the writing center while in the master’s and doctoral programs. He described differences between masters and doctoral programs at MU in terms of the academic advisor’s expectation of quality of writing in doctoral program was much higher than master’s program. He explained that his language proficiency was improving tremendously through his graduate program.

**Language Barrier:**

I was absolutely struggling for my master’s program. I had to learn more American students and socialize with them or watching TV. Writing, hummm, I wrote a lot, I used English tutoring service, and so every time I had assignments, I took and asked to give me their feedback or correct my mistakes. That is how I improve my English ability. My writing skill is tremendously improving I would say. My writing was horrible at first. I should be dismissed at the first year. My professor read my paper and he asked me that did you use a writing service? And I said no, and he looked at me surprised. I do not use writing tutoring services anymore. I feel very comfortable and my writing. Presentation skills improved tremendously during APE graduate program. I learned the patterns of speaking from professors in APA. I struggled to present. I was so nervous (Hiroshi interview).

This quote reveals that (a) Hiroshi used English tutoring services for improving the quality of his writing, and (b) he struggled not only in writing his papers (e.g., grammatical errors and sentence construction), but he also suffered while presenting in front of students in some classes (e.g., pronunciation problems).
Subtheme: Tutoring Services

Hiroshi used English tutoring services for improving the quality of his writing.

I think network is very important for graduate students. For example, I did not know anything about writing center on campus until my professor suggested me to use. There are many international students who did not know anything about writing center. These international students struggled to write their papers and manuscripts. I have used 6 years of this service, my writing skill significantly improved, but I do not want to tell about writing center to other international students, because it might be possible that the center become busier and may not have adequate time for checking my paper for me (Hiroshi interview).

This quote captures Hiroshi’s perspectives that (a) networking with other doctoral students is very important for improving language proficiency, but (b) Hiroshi did not want to share information about the writing center with other international students, because by doing so the writing center may need to support a large number of students, which meant that it is possible that the quality of feedback he would now receive may not be an efficient.

Subtheme: Suffering from Presentation

Hiroshi struggled not only writing his papers, but he also suffered from presenting in front of students in some classes.

I remembered that I was in second semester of master’s program. There was an assignment to present. There were only five students in the class, my turn came and I presented. I was talking the same things over and over, very poor English. There was 15 minutes presentation, but I did not get through it. There was another Asian international student from Taiwan and I was a master’s student. His English was amazing. I assumed that he almost finished PhD at that time. He had an accent, but his presentation skills were awesome. He was a first mentor for the presentation (Hiroshi interview).
This quote exemplifies that Hiroshi believe that (a) when he presented during the first year of his graduate program, he struggled with pronunciation and time management, and (b) when students practiced presentation often, they will perform better.

**Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Hiroshi lost his funding from MU at the start of this year. He reflected on this as now he had more time to study, but financially it was very tough. He did not know exactly why he lost funding from the university. He discussed this with his academic advisor regarding criteria for qualification of graduate assistantship, but he did not receive adequate clarifications from his academic advisor. The other theme was that Hiroshi called himself a “YES” man. Whatever he was told to do either from academic advisors, or other faculty members of the department, he always said yes to them. He believed that there are a number of faculty members who asked a number of favors of Asian doctoral students, because Asian students did not know how to say NO.

**Socioeconomic Difficulty**

Two doctoral students received funding from the government and then two students were funded, and I lost the funding from this year. I do not know anything about qualification as being a graduate assistant. I have not heard that how MU [Midwestern University] evaluates students’ AI (GA) applicants. My case was that I asked to my advisor that there are some criteria like GPA, teaching evaluation, but they did have anything like that. If you cannot meet GPA, they will not give it to you. I think that advisors’ recommendation and school has money, which should not be problematic (Hiroshi interview).
This quote illustrates that Hiroshi had received funding for three years. However, he lost funding for this year, and moreover, he did not have a good awareness of any specific criteria of funding opportunity for doctoral students at MU.

**Subtheme: Lost funding**

Hiroshi received his funding for three years. However, he lost funding at the start of this year.

Basically, I was funded to do research like a research assistant, but what I did was teaching. That is a little contradiction, but university expected to do research. We usually teach five different activity courses as graduate assistants. I used to teach soccer and swimming, and personal fitness. I took classes at night time. My job was to coordinate APE lab. Thus, my job role was a teaching role not research. I do not know, maybe I could not contribute to research project. That was the reason why I lost funding. When I was a coordinator of APE lab, I was busy. Now I have more time, but I lost funding. It is very tough (Hiroshi interview).

This quote reveals that (a) there is a contradiction from actual job role from university and the requirement as being graduate assistant at MU, and (b) Hiroshi had currently more time for preparing his coursework, but he struggled financially at paying his tuition and his living expenses.

**Subtheme: Unclear Understanding about Funding**

Hiroshi did not have any specific criteria clarifying funding opportunity for doctoral students at MU.

MU did not provide specific criteria of graduate assistant evaluation form to each AI. I did not know why MU did not give it to me. They just said that unfortunately you would not be able to receive your funding for next year. They never provided me any details. They supposed to offer funding opportunity for students at least 4 years (Hiroshi interview).

This quote captures Hiroshi’s belief that (a) he was supposed to receive funding for at least 4 years, and (b) MU faculty did not provide any details of why they stopped funding
to Hiroshi. He was confused as to why he did not satisfy the decision making process in selection of graduate assistant position for doctoral students. Hiroshi stated that some faculty members utilize Asian doctoral students while they attend the doctoral program, because it seemed that they had some degree of stereotype toward Asian doctoral students that these students would not be able to say NO. Thus, faculty members could ask students for favors such as supporting their work.

Stereotyping International Student

We are quite and say yes men. Typically, there are some professors who use students. What I heard from American students was that we [Asian] cannot say no. We can make a copy from article or find some resources. They expected us to say yes. Professors have our stereotypes, so they use us. That is stereotype. That is how people look at us, we cannot say no. They think it is ok to ask us. My roommate from Spain is also yes man. He cannot say no. He told me that he could not say no especially from American professors. I learned that it is hard for Spanish students here on campus as well (Hiroshi interview).

This quote exemplifies that faculty members had stereotypes about Asian doctoral students not willing to say NO. Many faculty members from MU asked him for favors such as copying journals articles or textbooks at the Department of Kinesiology library.

Subtheme: Faculty Members’ Stereotype

Hiroshi felt that faculty members had stereotypes that Asian doctoral students did not know how to say NO.

Non-Asian students and faculty members looked at and judged us. Korea, China, Japan, or other Asian countries. We have similar culture and habits, but we are totally different from each other. Japanese students tended to agree with people who have social power. That is why we are required to agree everything what people who has social power said, but China and Korea are different. However, faculty members did not see that way. As a result, faculty member had some stereotype that Asian international students never said No. It may be my fault that they asked Asian international students’ favors, because I did everything for them. Therefore, they had stereotype of who we are (Hiroshi interview).
This quote illustrates that each Asian country has different cultural and social norms. However, faculty members framed and exposed their stereotypes of Asian international doctoral students. Some students who were from certain Asian countries tended to agree and followed everything people who had social power in the society asked of them, and Hiroshi felt that his behaviors (always becoming a yes man to faculty members) may have negatively influenced other students that all Asian international students were yes men.

Hiroshi pointed out that a weakness of the doctoral program at MU was the situation where all of the current doctoral students in APE were international students. Moreover, Hiroshi did not have any chances to observe other programs within his graduate program experience. He felt that his doctoral APA program was isolated from other universities. When he enrolled in a doctoral seminar with other international students and all students were English as second language speakers, some discussions with these students did not work smoothly. He mentioned that international students had some difficulties in responding to other students’ comments. Thus, he revealed some degree of frustration within the seminar in APE.

**Frustrated as Student**

Weakness is the small program and we cannot see the outside of program and universities. Sometime I feel this environment is very isolated area. This is a small town in Midwest. I get sick and tired of it sometime. I feel frustrated as being a student from this university for a long time. Personally it was too long. This environment did not change much since I got here. We all are international students and there are no American students in this program. I feel this factor becomes a weakness. I think we all had the language barriers at the point, but some people were extremely well done within the discussion, but some others did not.
Sometime, I participated in the discussion, but other students did not respond me back. The other student from Turkey did good job to respond me back. The other student who just graduated did not talk a lot. The other Turkish student never talked. The other students did not speak English well at the time (Hiroshi interview).

This quote reveals that (a) Hiroshi raised concerns of having mostly all doctoral students as international students and how this had become a weakness of the doctoral program at MU, (b) language barriers became a communication issue among doctoral students during seminars, (c) only a few students participated in the seminar discussions, therefore the majority of students only listened during the class lectures.

Subtheme: No American Students in APA Graduate Program

Hiroshi rose the point that having only international doctoral students become a weakness of the APA doctoral program at MU.

We used to have seminar courses in our program. What we did was that we met all together and discuss about a topic, but we all are international students and are using English as second language. Discussion did not go well. I am not sure that how others thought about it, but I usually did. Every time I asked something, I felt that some students’ responses were out of my expectation (Hiroshi interview).

This quote suggests that each doctoral student had different understandings and she or he sometimes did not understand their instructors’ questions during APA seminars. Each student had different learning experiences and cultural norms from their own native countries. As a result, the conversation was completely parallel. Thus, a program typified with only international doctoral students may not enhance students’ learning appropriately.
Subtheme: Communication Issue in Seminar

Hiroshi commented that language barriers became a communication issue among doctoral students during the seminar.

I realized that there were a number of international students who were afraid of making mistake during the seminar discussion. They were not sure that they had adequate language ability of explaining and presenting their thoughts to other students and instructors. Thus, class structure became more directive contexts than indirective or collaborative contexts, because the majority of international doctoral students did not often participate in the class. I know language barriers were issues for all international doctoral students, but we needed to make some improvements for the quality of seminar (Hiroshi interview).

This quote exemplifies that the majority of international doctoral students were afraid of explaining and presenting their thoughts using English as second language to other students and faculty members.

Subtheme: Being Quiet

Hiroshi commented that only a few students participated in the seminar discussions, therefore the majority of students only listened during the class lectures.

Usually APE professors talked and we [all doctoral students] listened. Then I and Tayfun talked, but not others. That was how it went. They asked somebody and students talked. That is not the way it should be. We had to participate proactively. I was frustrated (Hiroshi interview).

This quote illustrates that Hiroshi was frustrated that only a few students participated in the discussions while they attended the doctoral seminar in APA. He believed that the seminar was not very productive for international doctoral students.

Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?
Hiroshi’s perspective indicated that he was glad to have an opportunity to study abroad in USA, because he could observe various students from various backgrounds. He learned many things from books and media. However, it was totally different from his observations. He commented that faculty and fellow peers needed to be more sensitive to diverse groups’ political and religious issues. He did not change his personality from the study abroad experiences, but knowing and learning social, political, and cultural background from other students influence his perspectives. In brief, his perspectives were both positively and negatively impacted through living and studying in the USA.

**Broader Perspective**

Personality did not change. My perspectives become broader. I am glad to be able to study abroad here. Six years ago, I could think that I knew some certain things based on reading and watching media, but here I can observe daily life living and I see a number of international students, so we can get to know what is going on the outside of the country. Palestine, Israel, or Iraq, we can be very sensitive about this topic. Thus, the perception about political and social phenomena from the other countries was getting closed to my psychology which becomes a factor for changing my identity. It is not only about Japanese, but also I began to think about the meaning as being human being in this world.

Hiroshi’s quote reveals that he: (a) was glad to be able to study abroad in USA; (b) knew what happened at outside his country [Japan] from reading and watching media, but it was different to observe daily life living in USA; (c) felt that he needed to be sensitive toward diverse topics [social, political and cultural essence] which owned by international students as well as American students; and (d) began to think about the meaning as being a human in this world.
Summary

Hiroshi was the only participant who had attended master’s and doctoral programs at the same university. He now believed that he should have attended different universities especially for the doctoral program. He did not mean that he was not satisfied with the academic program at MU, but he regretted not maximizing his learning experiences at different universities. He noted that studying at MU for 6 years had made him “sick and tired.” In contrast, he expressed his appreciation to MU, which helped him improve his language proficiency in speaking, writing, and reading since he began his master’s program 2001. But a shocking experience he had during the doctoral program been to lose funding from the university. He requested of his academic advisor for some clarification as to why he lost funding, but he could not assertively ask him about it, because Asian international students cared about the group orientation, so try not to offend anyone around the department. Thus, he struggled as being an Asian student by studying at a PW-IHE. Moreover, a number of faculty members tended to stereotype him by asking favors of him such as copying articles and requesting his help in completing some tasks, because Asian international students did not know how to say NO. Hiroshi pointed out a weakness of the doctoral program as that of doctoral students were all international students, and because each student has different levels of language competences. Therefore, discussions within the doctoral seminar in APE did not go well.

Hiroshi’s perspective was that he was glad to have an opportunity to study abroad in USA, because he could observe various students from various countries. He learned many things from books and media. However, it was totally different from his first hand
observations. He commented that faculty and students need to be sensitive to political and religious issues. He did not change his personality from the study abroad experiences, but knowing and learning social, political, and cultural background from other students was stimulated thinking and influenced his perspectives. Thus, his perspective was positively and negatively impacted through living and studying in USA.

**Case VI: Sin-Hong**

**Sin-Hong’ Personal Demographic Information**

Sin-Hong was a married male from Taiwan (Table 4.1.). He did not bring his wife from Taiwan when he was in the first year of his doctoral program, because he needed to adjust to the American culture at first. He did not want to make her struggle living in Indiana. His 13 month old son was born during his second year of the doctoral program. He received his bachelor and master’s degrees from a university in Taiwan. Before starting the doctoral program at MU, he was a physical education teacher in Taiwan. Then, he began to think about attending doctoral program in APE. He was interested in therapeutic recreation and rehabilitation for individuals with disabilities. Before he applied to the doctoral program at MU, his senior classmate from the same undergraduate program in Taiwan attended a doctoral program in different field at MU. He introduced the doctoral program in APE to Sin-Hong and also provided some guidelines for applying for graduate assistantship. He was accepted into the doctoral program in APE and also received funding from the department over the first three years. He was also required to take pronunciation English as Second Language classes during his first semester of the
doctoral program. Several themes and subthemes emerged from analysis of Sin-Hong’s interview transcripts (Table 4.19). These themes were: (a) expectation from academic advisor (b), socioeconomic difficulties, (c) cultural sensitivity, (d) social distance from White American students, (e) becoming a good researcher, and (f) becoming aggressive and productive.
List of Themes and Subthemes from Sin-Hong’s Case Study

Sin-Hong

Theme 1: Expectation from Academic advisor
Subtheme:
(a) Progress of Research Project
(b) Coursework Requirement

Theme 2: Socioeconomic Difficulties
Subtheme:
(a) Financial Difficulty
(b) Parental Support

Theme 3: Cultural Sensitivity (Keep Sin-Hong’s Taiwanese Name)
Subtheme:
(a) Social Distance (between Taiwanese and Chinese students)
(b) Social Tensions with Chinese International Students
(c) Disrespected by Chinese Neighbor

Theme 4: Social Distance with White American Students
Subtheme:
(a) Language Barrier
(b) Not Understand American Joke

Theme 5: Becoming a Good Researcher
Subtheme:
(a) Evaluation of My Knowledge
(b) Difficulty of Updating Recent Articles

Theme 6: Becoming Aggressive and Productive
Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

Sin-Hong had four different roles as a graduate assistant, doctoral student, father, and husband while studying and living in the USA. He was the only participant who had a wife and a child with him during this study. His experiences differed from the other participants in this study, because he had different types of difficulty while adjusting within the doctoral program culture as well as American culture. Moreover, Sin-Hong was the only advisee under one of two professors in APE within the Department of Kinesiology. The other participants [4 participants from MU] in this study were advised by a different APE professor. He felt some degree of pressure due to high expectations from his academic advisor for the last three years. His academic advisor expected him to become an expert researcher.

Expectation from Academic Advisor

My academic advisor was usually thinking about research and stayed in my desk all the time. I had to see her everyday almost. I had to be that way. I think I am OK with that. When we meet together, we have to discuss our research everyday. She and other professors wanted me to be more progressive for conducting research or searching resources, maybe it is right to say more productive. I am still OK for working with them, but I know their expectations, so I hope doing that more productive reading and doing research everyday. For doctoral students, they will not do for master students, but they require them higher expectations for doctoral students (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote reveals that Sin-Hong’s academic advisor highly expected that Sin-Hong would make progress on his research project daily.
Subtheme: Progress on Research Project

Sin-Hong’s academic advisor highly expected that Sin-Hong would make regular progress on his research project daily.

I had one independent study from year 2003. Right now, I am still incomplete, because research is still in the middle of process, not complete. I am making a lot of progress, but professor put incomplete. She may be able to give me a grade or she may forget to give me a grade. I do not know. Independence study from my academic advisor is very hard. Her standard is very high. Her requirement is very hard, but it is good for doctoral students. I feel that I am not really qualified for her requirement. It is hard (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote exemplifies that Sin-Hong (a) received incomplete grades for independent studies from his academic advisor, and (b) felt that he may not be well qualified as being an advisee of his academic advisor.

Subtheme: Coursework Requirements

Sin-Hong indicated that his overall coursework is determined by his committee members. However, he did not believe that their decisions about his selection of coursework would help him in finding a future job.

The other thing was that I know you collect all participants’ program of study, but as you see, MU course work depends on committee members. My major and minor for all doctoral students are so different. We are taking different coursework even major part. The other professor in APE is more related to assessment. I cannot do pedagogy. If you have a background of pedagogy, it is easy to find a job (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote captures Sin-Hong’s belief that each doctoral student has different course requirements. For Sin-Hong, his academic advisor did not emphasize pedagogy coursework, but he believed that when he would eventually apply for a job, pedagogy courses would be beneficial to have, because other doctoral students who had major or
minor in pedagogy found jobs. Thus, there is a contradiction between his hope and advisor’s emphasis. These factors were most important for Asian international students.

Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

Sin-Hong discussed socioeconomic issues encountered while studying at MU. He was living with his wife and son. He struggled to adjust to the different roles as being graduate assistant, doctoral student, father, and husband. He noted that he struggled to complete all these roles equally. Time management was a major issue during Sin-Hong’s doctoral matriculation. Moreover, socioeconomic difficulties occurred throughout his program. He only received stipend of $1,100 per month (10 months contract) from the department. He provided the detail information on how his family managed their finances.

Socioeconomic Difficulties

I worked in Taiwan for 3 years. I have deposit. MU (Midwestern University) contract is only 10 months. In summer, we do not get any money from university. We have taken care of everything by ourselves. I am living in an apartment. I have to pay $700 monthly. What I can get is about $1100. After that rent, I only have $300-400 left. You know personally is ok, but my family is here, so it is not enough. Again, I think it may be a big problem, but I know I have a little deposit. If I can graduate by 4 years, I am OK. I can borrow some money from my parents (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote illustrates that Sin-Hong (a) had difficulties financially supporting his family, and (b) may need some financial support from his parents.
Subtheme: Financial Difficulty

Sin-Hong had difficulties financially supporting his family.

To relate this socioeconomic issue, time management is another factor. That is one thing. I cannot do well on roles of husband and father here, because of study. That is a problem. Even though I tried my best or better jobs for managing the time to stay with family for working on my dissertation, it is not enough always. There are some conflicts. I do not want to become a problem between my wife and myself. That is a big issue for me. You pointed out good point (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote reveals that Sin-Hong could not afford to continue attending his doctoral program without funding from MU. However, graduate assistantship became time consuming. Therefore, he was frustrated at managing different roles such as being a doctoral student, graduate assistant, husband, and father. He also was concerned that his doctoral study may negatively affect his wife and son.

Subtheme: Parental Support

Sin-Hong may need some financial support from his parents.

I may need to ask financial support from parents. I have a little saving when I was a PE instructor at Taiwan. However, it was not enough for supporting my family for 4 years of doctoral study. I needed to borrow some money from my parents. I hated to do that, but that is a way it is (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote captures Sin-Hong’s struggles over several years toward receiving his degree. Sin-Hong struggled supporting his family financially for four years. Therefore, he asked his parents for financial support. On the other hand, Sin-Hong appreciated both faculty members in APE understanding his cultural essence as being international students. For example, these professors suggested to him not to use his English name (Ken) through doctoral program period.
Cultural Sensitivity (Keep Sin-Hong’s Taiwanese Name)

Faculty members in APA do not want me to use English name at all. They prefer to call me my Chinese name. That is why I call myself Sin-Hong. When I came here, I could use English name KEN, but I began this program, I introduced myself and told them that my Chinese name is Sin-Hong and English name is Ken. They said why not you use Chinese name. They did not want me to use English name because I am here. They wanted to maintain our cultural essence in this program. I have to adjust so many things, but they tried to make this environment comfortable, so they tried to understand about us (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote exemplifies that both faculty members in APA at MU suggested that he should use his native name, because it was respectful for letting him use his native name.

Sin-Hong said that it seemed that there was some social tension between Taiwanese and Chinese students on campus. A number of Chinese students at MU did not acknowledge that Taiwan was considered as an independent country. His Chinese friends indicated that there were some Chinese undergraduate students who believe that Taiwan is still a part of China, so they do not feel bad when they offend. Sin-Hong described some of his experiences relative to this issue on campus as well as his family.

Social Distance (between Taiwanese and Chinese Students)

I have some good friends who are from China at MU. One of them talked me like this. She said Sin-Hong if you had a chance to talk some friends or undergraduate students from China, if they told you that Taiwan is a part of Chinese continent, please do not feel bother, mad, and angry about it, because they (undergraduate students) are too young. He knows there are some undergraduate students like that, because of age, personalities, and environment. To be honest, I did not have any chances to know this kind of undergraduate students. I know some undergraduate students from China, but I did not have any problems to communicate them. There is no tension between us, but I heard this kind of problem. I give you another example. My wife was trying to attend a community based English class. It was free and is located in my apartment. One of assistant from China said Taiwan is a part of China. She told my wife that you are a Chinese, not to say you are a Taiwanese.
Usually, I really do not care about that. Taiwanese is Chinese. I do not have any problems with that. Even some people do not want to say themselves Chinese if they come from Taiwan etc. To me is fine. I can not stand if you force me to say that my wife smiled and said to her that I do not care. Some people from China who are living here may be may be people talking this way (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote illustrates that (a) Sin-Hong observed some social tension between Taiwanese and Chinese students, and (b) his wife also received some disrespect because of her nationality by Chinese neighbors.

**Subtheme: Social Tensions with Chinese International Students**

Sin-Hong observed some social tension between Taiwanese and Chinese students.

My Chinese friends told me that there is political issue between China and Taiwan, because our country [Taiwan] indicates democratic rather than communist (China). Thus, this political difference became a social barrier between Chinese and Taiwanese students. I really do not care, but there are a lot of students who do care (Sin-Hong interview).

Sin-Hong felt that political issues between China and Taiwan became a social barrier between Chinese and Taiwanese students.

**Subtheme: Disrespect by Chinese Neighbor**

Sin-Hong’s wife also received some disrespect because of her nationality by Chinese neighbors.

It is very sad to hear that my wife was disrespected by Chinese neighbors. I am ok, but I did not want to put her any external stress. In fact, Chinese students were everywhere and large community. We had to deal with Chinese family frequently when we live in USA. We had to deal with language barriers with Americans and also had social barriers with Chinese students. We have double barriers (Sin-Hong interview).
This quote reveals that Sin-Hong faced double barriers (language and social barriers) within community. Sin-Hong sometimes could not adjust to class environment and felt as an outsider from the class, because some topics or jokes which were brought in the classroom were not familiar to him. He would like to involve himself in the conversation with other American students, but he had no clues as to what they were talking about. He could ask some questions of other students, however, he did not want to disturb their conversations.

**Social Distance with White American Students**

Sometime I am an outsider, because students were talking about sport. They are talking about their lives. I do not want myself. Read and study, sometime I would like to involve more. English may be an issue. The other thing is a joke. I know the reason that I quite did not understand, because of history or culture. I could not tell. I feel outsider, but I did not feel bad about that, because I know the reason. Maybe I will ask to the other students about that. My focus is to study so I am not focusing on that. I know what I have to do (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote captures the social distance experienced by Sin-Hong due to (a) language barriers which were obvious while enrolling in classes, and (b) American students or professors’ making jokes creating distance between insider and outsider status.

**Subtheme: Language Barrier**

Language barrier was obvious while enrolling in classes.

Students were sometime talking slang and very fast. It is hard to understand. Secondly, they are talking about topics which I have no idea. If they talking about sport. I am not a basketball fan. My background is martial arts. I want to know, because of my language or information. It was happening two years ago. Right now, I knew how to deal with that. I contacted some martial arts guy who is American. We can ask each other when I do not understand about American culture. We went out and hang out, right now are ok. If you are talking about the class, sometime I am an outsider (Sin-Hong interview).
This quote exemplifies that (a) he struggled in understanding language which his classmates used, and (b) cultural differences (e.g., discussion on sport) were obvious. As a result, he could not follow some information, which he was not familiar to him.

Subtheme: Not Understand American Jokes

American students and professors’ jokes became a distinguishing factor between insider and outsider status.

When I heard that American students or professors joke around, I felt I was an outsider, because I could not catch up what they were talking about. I tried to understand what they were talking about as much as I could. I learned that it was not only language barriers, but also there if cultural difference. Even I completely understood what they were saying, I still did not understand why was funny (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote illustrates that a combination of language barriers and cultural differences became a factor of Sin-Hong as an outsider while taking some classes.

Sin-Hong believed that becoming a research expert was the most important contributing factor within the doctoral program, but he was very stressful throughout the process. From his perspective, he mainly focused on how to become a good researcher and how to meet his academic advisor’s expectations.

**Becoming a Good Researcher**

I believed that the most important thing of doctoral study was to become a research expert. However, there is knowledge required through this process. I felt pressure daily by my academic advisor. My academic advisor wants me to be able to discuss our major areas which are physical activities for people with disabilities. That is her area and that will be my area. She wants me to be able to know fundamental skills, history, assessment tools including general information. I also have to be able to write review papers using or multiple models from previous literatures and provide my rationale why I was writing that way. She also asks me how to research independently. Not only to read literatures, but also she requires me how to apply toward my future profession. It can be broad, because you have to know everything.
That is the requirement for me to be qualified as a PhD student. Currently, the hardest part of research was to read a number of literatures and governmental documents and keep focusing on recent updated articles (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote reveals that (a) Sin-Hong struggled to meet his academic advisor’s various research requirements throughout his doctoral program, and (b) the most difficult part of being a good researcher was to keep updated recent articles and governmental documents.

*Subtheme: Evaluation of My Knowledge*

Sin-Hong struggled to meet academic advisor’s various research requirements throughout his doctoral program.

I felt that I have to evaluate my knowledge everyday. My academic advisor asked me to collect various information from text books, previous articles, or news papers. She required different types of knowledge relative to APA such as assessment tools, theory, and models. Thus, I am struggling to understand the detailed concepts through my doctoral study. I try my best as much as I could, but it may not be enough (Sin-Hong interview).

This quote captures Sin-Hong’s struggles in understanding various research concepts in APA. More specifically, he was required to conceptualize his research knowledge daily and respond to his academic advisor’s assigned criteria of research on APA. He felt that APA research had tremendous amount of content information. Therefore, he struggled to conduct research projects with his academic advisor.

*Subtheme: Difficulty of Updating Recent Articles*

Sin-Hong felt that the most difficult part as to being a good researcher is to keep updated recent articles and governmental documents.

I have to update recent articles and governmental documents consistently. It was really hard for me. This means that I need to visit an educational library almost daily and try to get recent articles as much as I could. It was like 24 hours work. It is very hard for me. My academic advisor suggested me not to use old articles, so I needed to maintain the updated articles (Sin-Hong interview).
This quote exemplifies that his academic advisor suggested that he needed to visit the library for keeping update on recent articles, and he struggled with time management due to this activity.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Sin-Hong’s perspective was that graduate students in USA were required to be aggressive and productive. He commented that he did not have a close relationship with his academic advisor and was not required such expectations (sharing his reading materials, researching, and participating in discussion in meeting) by his advisor either while attended master’s program at a university in Taiwan. In fact, his master’s program advisor required him only to take care of a laboratory. He felt that it was a dilemma that becoming aggressive was not a part of his personality or culture, becoming productive may be possible as a doctoral student.

**Becoming Aggressive and Productive**

My advisor wanted me to become more aggressive and productive while studied in the doctoral program in USA. When I was a master student in Taiwan, I was in small lab. My advisor asked me that “you were taking care of this lab.” I did not have very close relationship with him. He was a director of the program. Probably, that was a reason I did not have positive social relationship with my advisor in Taiwan. Here, we have lab in the ground floor in Department of Kinesiology. My advisor was usually thinking about research and stay in my desk all the time. I had to see her everyday almost. I had to be that way.
I think I am OK with that. When we meet together, we have to discuss our research everyday. I think is totally different. My advisor wanted me to be more aggressive, maybe it is right to say more productive, but not become aggressive. I still do not how to become aggressive. This might be advisors’ personality, not me. I am still OK for working with her (advisor). I know her expectations, so I hope that I do more productive reading and doing research everyday. (Sin-Hong interview).

Sin-Hong’s quote illustrates that (a) his advisor expected Sin-Hong to become more aggressive and productive as a doctoral student; (b) his former advisor from Taiwan only required him to take care of the lab; and from his perspective (c) he believed that becoming aggressive was not a part of his personality or culture, but becoming productive may be possible.

Summary

From his overall interview responses, Sin-Hong mostly emphasized that time management was very difficult for him in his different roles as being graduate assistant, doctoral student, father, and husband. He discussed that “I could not do well on roles of husband and father here in Indiana, because my doctoral work is time consuming.” He also noted that “Although I tried my best or better jobs for managing the time to stay with family for working on his candidacy exam or dissertation proposal, it is not enough.” He was concerned that he did not want his doctoral work to become an issue within his family. Thus, he had a dilemma between meeting different expectations from academic advisor and his family. Moreover, his graduate assistant appointment was only 10 months, so he did not receive any financial support from department during the summer months. He was not eligible to receive financial loan either from Taiwan or the USA. He was concerned about a number of factors while working on his doctoral degree in APE at MU.
Sin-Hong’s perspective was students were required to be aggressive and productive while living and studying in the doctoral program. However, he felt that it was a dilemma that becoming aggressive was not a part of his personality or culture, but for him becoming productive may be possible as a doctoral student.

**Case Study VII: Yi-San**

*Yi-San Personal Demographic Information*

Yi-San was a single female from Taiwan (Table 4.1.). She currently is in her first year of the doctoral program in APE within the School of PAES at OSU. She had earned a bachelor and master’s degree in biomechanics from a university in Taiwan. She was currently receiving scholarship and financial support from her government in Taiwan. Thus, she was not assigned to any graduate assistantship at CU. However, she did not have any pedagogical experiences relative to APE, so her academic advisor assigned her to a number of practicum experiences during her first year. She struggled academically to adjust to the doctoral program’s culture at CU. She struggled mainly because her background was in biomechanics and not education which was the emphasis of her doctoral program. Moreover, she was not comfortable using English and was required to take one English as Second Language Writing Composition course and she was now studying new academic content (APE pedagogy) area while she was attending this doctoral program. Several themes and subthemes emerged from analysis of Yi-San’s interview transcripts. These themes were: (a) academic experiences, (b) acculturation into doctoral program, (c) isolation, (d) birds of a feather, (e) power and hierarchical relationship, and (f) sustaining cultural values and beliefs (Table 4.20).
List of Themes and Subthemes from Yi-San’s Case Study

Yi-San

*Theme 1: Academic Experiences*
Subtheme:
(a) Different Research Interest
(b) New Experience

*Theme 2: Acculturation into Doctoral Program*
Subtheme:
(a) Difficulty Adjusting American Program Culture
(b) Not Be Able To Participate in Discussion

*Theme 3: Isolation*
Subtheme:
(a) Advisors’ Guidance
(b) Marginalization from Department

*Theme 4: Birds of a Feather*
Subtheme:
(a) Social Tension with Chinese Students
(b) Lack of Social Interaction

*Theme 5: Power and Hierarchical Relationship*

*Theme 6: Sustaining Cultural Values and Beliefs*

Table.4.20

**Research Question 1:** How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?
Yi-San struggled to adjust to the APA doctoral program’s culture at CU. She did not have any educational background relative to APE in pedagogy before she began this program, but she was starting to focus on various research projects which related to APA such as biomechanics in fitness field for children with disabilities. But still, her current doctoral program’s culture and her past experiences (master’s program) did not match. Thus, she had a hard time transitioning from her past experiences into the new doctoral program culture. She also noted that she had some difficulties adjusting to the classroom culture, because class structure was different from the Taiwanese university classroom. For example, in Taiwan, instructors directly provided lectures and the students just listened and discussion never occurred. In contrast, the faculty of the doctoral program at CU encouraged students to participate in the class discussions.

**Academic Experiences**

I had some information about the program here. I really struggled when I came here, because personally I preferred kinesiology field in APA. I would like to conduct some research studies on computer technology for people with disabilities. I could see this program focus on psychological issues, behavioral issues and social issues in APE. I like these topics, but I am not really good at this kind of topics, so I felt uncomfortable, so I need to learn more and adjust myself more. I do not have educational background, and then I need to learn more about American school culture. I need to learn more about the USA school system. I cannot use any past experiences into the program at all (Yi-San interview).

This quote reveals that (a) Yi-San had different types of research interests than what was emphasized in the APE program at CU, and (b) she was not comfortable learning APA pedagogy, because she did not have on educational background in pedagogy.
Subtheme: Different Research Interest

Yi-San had different types of research interests compared to research foci of faculty in her doctoral program.

I have research interests relative to kinesiology in APA. I do not mind to do some research projects relative to pedagogy, but I would like to focus on more kinesiological field rather than APE. My background was from biomechanics, so I would like to connect research ideas I learned from my master’s and doctoral programs. That is the rationale that I chose a cognate - motor development (Yi-San interview).

This quote captures Yi-San’s preference to conduct Kinesiology-related research projects through her doctoral program. However, her doctoral program educational philosophy did not align with her research interests. Thus, she would like to connect her research interests and the educational philosophy of her doctoral program.

Subtheme: New Experience

Yi-San was not comfortable learning APA pedagogy, because she did not have an educational background in pedagogy from her work or academic experiences.

Before I came here, I focused on more about how to help kids with disabilities. For example, I would like to use my background as biomechanics in fitness field of kids with disabilities. I would like to combine my testing and assessment experiences which have been done in Taiwan with this program. Adapted physical activity is a broad term not only focusing on education. Here is more focus on the education, policy something like that. I believe that that is a small portion of adapted physical activity. I think inclusive physical education, attitudes, assessment, are strongly relating to the important in America (Yi-San interview).
This quote exemplifies that Yi-San focused on APA kinesiology field of research interest rather than APE pedagogy, because she had earned her master’s degree with a focus on biomechanics. But, she was now required to obtain new knowledge about pedagogy in APA within her doctoral program.

**Acculturation into Doctoral Program**

I need to adjust a lot of different things, because the time schedule is very different from my past. Each student is required to take 2 or 3 classes per quarter. This is different from my experiences. I took a class only one or two course for one or twice a week when I was a master’s student at Taiwan. Cultural class climate is very different where I am from. In Taiwan, we listened the instructions from teachers or instructors, in other word, we attended the class, but we did not participate in the class. I participated, but it depends on students’ choices, but here this class structure in American colleges and universities focuses on students’ participation. Professors point out or warn if students did not participate, so academic culture is very different (Yi-San interview).

This quote illustrates that (a) Yi-San struggled to adjust to American institutional culture including class scheduling, culture of class involvement, and professors’ expectations; and (b) she could not actively participate in the class discussions.

**Subtheme: Difficulty Adjusting American Program Culture**

Yi-San struggled to adjust to American institutional culture.

This program provides me a lot of course work. It is not my expectation. I am not here just taking a class. Ph.D. students should not only focus on the class, you need to focus on research and teaching. What I want to try to say is that amount of coursework is just too much. I mean 135 hours is too heavy for doctoral students. I would like to develop my program, but it is too heavy workload. In Taiwan, we take only one or two classes and working on dissertation after that (Yi-San interview).

This quote reveals that Yi-San believed that her doctoral program required heavy workload for doctoral students.
Her master’s program required only a few courses. Thus, there is a cultural difference in the amount of courses required between master’s and doctoral programs, and between the culture of American and Taiwan IHE.

**Subtheme: Not felt as if she Participates in Discussion**

Yi-San could not actively participate in the class discussions.

I need to really proactive and speak. I feel like uncomfortable, some people speak something which does not relate to the questions from professors. That made us waste our time, but they identified students that they are good students, because they spoke out (Yi-San interview).

This quote captures Yi-San’s belief that students who participated in class discussions were considered as better students. However, she was acculturated from her experiences in Taiwan where she was not allowed to participate in class discussions, but now she felt pressure to participate.

**Research Question II: How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Yi-San was assigned to practicum experiences where she taught students with disabilities during the year. Her academic advisor recommended and assigned her to this practicum for interacting with students with disabilities within an educational setting. Yi-San appreciated her academic advisor for this opportunity. However, she discussed her dilemma associated with practicum experiences and her feeling isolated from other students. More specifically, she was the only doctoral student who was required to do a practicum experience.
The other doctoral students in the program were assigned to teach undergraduate courses, supervise student teachers, or work in administrative roles in the school or college. Due to this, she felt socially isolated from peers in the program. Moreover, she did not have much time to socialize with the other doctoral students in the program. She expressed feelings that she was totally uncomfortable as being a student in this program.

**Social Isolation**

My advisor gives me good opportunities to know about American culture. This is the best thing happened to me. I can look at American culture and education here. He tried to push me to take some APE courses during first year. I see a benefit, because I did not know anything about the minimum credit hours I had to take per quarter. He gave me some advice which classes are best for you or not. I am taking a lot of practicum experiences. I am the only one taking it, but when I see other students, they are doing different things. I feel like that am I on right track, this made me uncomfortable (Yi-San interview).

This quote exemplifies that (a) Yi-San’s academic advisor considered what is best for preparing her professionally, and (b) she was required to do practicum experiences at local schools. However, she felt isolated from the other doctoral students in the program.

*Subtheme: Advisor’s Guidance*

Yi-San’s academic advisor considered what is best for preparing his advisees professionally.

I need to learn more about the teaching students with disabilities. I do not have any teaching experiences in Taiwan and USA at all, so my academic advisor emphasized me to have this practicum type of teaching experiences. He also pushed me to see the reality of students with disabilities in school system. I have done for a year. I felt that in this program, I feel like that I am not in the middle of circle of doctoral program. I am still inside of this program and group, but I am not in the circle and I am not in the outside as well. I have different requirement from other doctoral students, but I need to take classes with other doctoral students (Yi-San interview). This quote illustrates that Yi-San felt that she appreciated her academic advisor for
offering some opportunity for interacting with students with disabilities within a school system. However, she felt that she was not in the circle of other doctoral students in the doctoral program, because she had different requirements compared with other doctoral students, but she was required to enroll in classes with other doctoral students.

**Subtheme: Social Interactions Limited**

Yi-San was required to do practicum experiences at local schools. In doing so, she felt isolated from other doctoral students within the program.

I have a number of practicum experience hours, but I felt some degrees of social isolation from other doctoral students from department. I had no chance to interact with pedagogy students from our program, so I only deal with students from APE field not pedagogy. For example, Jose, Eun-Su, and Juan, because they were coordinators of a weekend recreation program. I also have some types of opportunities to socializing with master’s students from APE, but not pedagogy. I felt socially isolated or marginalized from them (students from pedagogy field) sometime. I would say, I and Eun-Su got in this program together. We did not know anything about this program, but other students were so busy, they did not have any chances to social interact with others. Thus, I feel really getting close to Eun-Su, because we got in this program at the same time (Yi-San interview).

This quote reveals that Yi-San (a) had a chance to socialize with APA doctoral students in the program, but she did not socialize with other students from the PETE program, and (b) Yi-San had a closed relationship with a student who began to attend the doctoral program at the same time as her, because they helped each other in understanding the details of the doctoral program. As a result, Yi-San and Eun-Su established a good social relationship.

Yi-San explained that her Taiwanese graduate student friends at CU supported and helped with her social and cultural assimilation while living in the USA. She received some advice on adjusting to American culture and lifestyle from her friends who had
more than 10 years living experience in the USA. She also discussed that she did not often have many opportunities to socially interact with American faculty members or other students on campus. Therefore, she learned American culture from media or newspapers. Moreover, she had some difficulty speaking English to Americans. She explained that she was comfortable speaking English only when Americans were very friendly. She described that some Americans were very rude or were not interested in communicating with international students. Thus, her willingness to speak English varied based on the attitudes of those she was speaking with toward international students.

**Birds of a Feather**

Yi-San’s experience was that students from same or similar backgrounds, and cultures or nationalities socialized with one another and became friends, while students from different backgrounds, cultures, and nationalities did not socialize with others. It was like “birds of a feather” fly together.

I always hang out with Taiwanese friends, so I do not have many American friends. I do have some opportunities to observe American culture. I just only watch the TV. My access of social interaction is very limited. It is not like learning American culture. I do not have American friends at all. I did not assimilate well, because what I said I have only Taiwanese and Chinese friends, because we speak the same language. Taiwanese people are really collaborative and care giver. We have social occasions frequently, so they give me a number of opportunities to assimilate here. They share information about how to live in this society such as purchasing a car, fixing a car, how to talk with your friends who are coming from the same nationality. I did not know anything about my friends before I came, so I made friends easy comparing students from different cultural backgrounds. It is hard to make friends in our program, because after classes, there are no social interactions with other students at all, but Taiwanese students are opposite. We have a lot of social opportunities with Taiwanese students after the class here. Many doctoral students in our program only focus on academics, not to make friends. That is how I see things here (Yi-San interview).
This quote illustrates that Yi-San had difficulties finding opportunities to socialize with students from different cultural backgrounds, but Yi-San had only positive social relationships with Taiwanese students. She indicated that doctoral students in the program only focus on academics not having friendship with other doctoral students.

Subtheme: Social Tension with Chinese Students

Yi-San had difficulties in finding opportunities to socializing with students from different cultural backgrounds, but she had only positive social relationships with Taiwanese peers.

There are a number of Chinese students on this campus. I did not want to make some troubles with Chinese students on this campus including our programs. Let me tell you the differences between Taiwanese and Chinese, there are some students who said that oh you are Chinese, no I am not Chinese. I am a Taiwanese. I always correct them. In our program, I never do that, because there is a Chinese student in our program. I tried to avoid the offensive comment toward him, because this doctoral program is very sensitive this kind of issue. We have to be careful about the political term which relates to peoples’ identity. The differences between Taiwan and China are that Taiwan is democratic and independent country, but in China is more social communism, because the government controls everything. For Taiwanese, when we come here, we help each other, but for Chinese students, these political issues barrier social tensions between students from these countries. The way Chinese students think and believe is totally opposite with Taiwanese students, because of political differences, so we do not understand each other well, even we speak same language Mandarin (Yi-San interview).

This quote exemplifies that Yi-San believed that cultural backgrounds differ from the various Asian countries (Chinese and Taiwanese), and she also emphasized that even students who speak the same language had social tension between Chinese and Taiwanese. This theme also emerged from another Taiwanese participant (Si-Hong from MU).
More specifically, Yi-San emphasized that some Chinese students from CU identified her as Chinese. She emphasized that Taiwan is an independent country and is not a part of China.

**Subtheme: Lack of Social Interaction**

Yi-San believed that doctoral students in the program only focused on academics not having friendship with other doctoral students

The relationships with other classmates do not care about much. For me, it was just the class. I attend the class for the academic purpose. I do not have the relationship with other students. I would like to have some opportunities to get to know other students, but all students left right away when the class session completed. Thus, I felt that class environment made me feel for focusing on students’ learning not social interaction. For example, inclusion class was for APE students and pedagogy students. I do not have good relationships with other colleagues in this program. I just say Hi to them. That was all I did in this program. Here is not good environment for me (Yi-San interview).

This quote captures Yi-San’s belief that (a) she did not have positive social relationships with other students within the doctoral program, and (b) after class sessions were completed, all students left the classrooms without interacting with anyone, so typically there was no social interaction that occurred.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

Yi-San indicated that she would like to become an assistant professor in APA at a university in Taiwan. Yi-San was motivated toward academic achievement through her doctoral study. However, she was frustrated in following the required guidelines of the doctoral program in APA. She commented that there was power and hierarchical
relationships between students, and faculty in the doctoral program. These power and
hierarchical relationships negatively impacted her in living and studying at this PW-IHE.

Power and Hierarchical Relationship

I would like to be a faculty member at the university level, because I have support
from the government in Taiwan, so I have a strong desire to have some degree of
academic achievement in this program. I have some frustration during this doctoral
program, everything I have studies did not stimulate my interest and also climate of
this program did not support my professional development. In my past experience, I
had good relationship with my advisor, he was supporting and helping my
professional development. He always opened the door for me. I had a good
experience. But now, I have to follow some guideline of program, research design
which advisor is familiar with. This is a power and hierarchical relationship. It is
frustrating. Doctoral program is to develop our own work. However, this program
provides me a lot of course works. It is not my expectation. I am not here just take
classes. PhD students should not only focus on the class, you need to focus on
research and teaching. What I want to try to say is that amount of coursework is just
too much.

Yi-San’s quote reveals that (a) she was motivated to become a professor at a
university in Taiwan; (b) she had positive experiences while attended her master’s
program in Taiwan; (c) but since she began her doctoral study in APA, she realized that
there were power and hierarchical relationships with students and advisors in the doctoral
program; and (d) because the doctoral program did not offer flexible coursework for
students she was frustrated.

Yi-San commented that she strongly sustained her cultural value and beliefs in living
and studying within the doctoral program in USA. She was uncertainty to follow
whatever the program and her advisor required of her in order to complete the doctoral degree. However, she resisted assimilating into the American cultural values during this study abroad experience. But assimilated in her life style to some degree.

**Sustaining Cultural Values and Beliefs**

I have not changed my beliefs and values actually. It just changed living style, but my value did not change a lot, because Taiwanese culture strongly sustains in my disciplines. I follow whatever the program and advisor requires me to complete this doctoral degree, but here I do not change my values and beliefs in living here. Let me tell you one thing that I am not comfortable to talk about my beliefs and values to other people, I never expose myself. Here, when I observe the social interactions between students, I see their behaviors, opinions, and verbal interactions. I really like it, but sometime, I could only see students’ academics so much, so I did not want to talk about my nationality and culture to the other students in our programs.

Yi-San’s quote reveals that she (a) sustained her own cultural values and beliefs in living and studying at the doctoral program in USA; and (b) refused to talk about her cultural values and beliefs to the other people especially other doctoral students, because in her view the other doctoral students focused on their academics too much. Her living style did not change while in the APA doctoral program.

**Summary**

Yi-San felt some degree of social isolation within the doctoral program at The OSU, because she was only one student who was assigned to a practicum for teaching students with disabilities at public schools, and because she did not have any teaching experiences at the public school level. She appreciated her academic advisor considering what he felt she needed to know in order to become a professional. In her educational background, she had worked on a number of research projects relative to biomechanics, which focused on motor performance of individuals with disabilities. She felt that other doctoral
students were assigned to different tasks regarding teaching undergraduate courses or graduate administrative associates’ job roles. However, she was funded from the government in Taiwan. Thus, she was not required to complete the same graduate assistantship roles as the other doctoral students. This condition caused her to have feelings of social isolation from peers within the doctoral program, resulting in less opportunities for social interactions with other doctoral students. She noted that “doctoral seminars which are held every quarter were the only chance of interaction with other doctoral students in this program.”

Currently she was receiving adequate social support from other Taiwanese graduate students who she became friend on campus. These friends supported and helped her in adjusting to American culture. On the other hand, she had less opportunity or confidence to use English with American students. Therefore, she often learned about American culture through media or newspapers. She also brought an identity issue as being a Taiwanese student on campus. This finding also appeared in Sin-Hong’s (other Taiwanese student from MU) case study. Yi-San explained that there were some Chinese students at CU who pointed out to her that Taiwanese is considered a part of Chinese. Thus, she brought the detail description of social incidents between Taiwanese and Chinese students on campus. Yi-San’s perspective was that she would like to become a faculty member in APA at the university level. Yi-San was motivated toward academic achievement through her doctoral study. However, she was frustrated to follow the guidelines of the doctoral program in APA. Yi-San sustained her own cultural values and beliefs while living and studying at the doctoral program in USA. She commented that
there was power and hierarchical relationships between students, advisors, and the doctoral program. These power and hierarchical relationships negatively impacted her living and studying at this PW-IHE.

**Multiple Case Findings Based on Cross Case Analysis of All Seven Asian International Doctoral Students**

This section addresses the overall description for all seven Asian international doctoral students under each research question. That is, DECP survey responses were analyzed and presented descriptively across cases. Plus, data from the interviews and programs of study for each student were constantly compared (categorized and recategorized, labeled and relabeled) from themes, and recurring themes emerged from across cases associated with the research questions. Table 4.21 presents the major themes and brief narratives of supporting sub themes that emerged from the data. These themes were (a) academic experiences and dilemmas; (b) relationships; (c) barriers; and (d) identity, political, cultural, and diversity awareness.
Theme 1: Academic Experiences and Dilemmas

*Academic experiences while studying at doctoral program in APA*

- **Language Barriers:** Participants had language barriers while studying at doctoral program.
- **Extra Time for Extra Courses:** Participants were required to complete English as Second Language courses before full time enrollment in master or doctoral courses.
- **Academic Challenges:** Participants concerned about maintaining a certain GPA through doctoral program in APA.

Theme 2: Relationships

*Academic experiences and relationships with academic advisors*

- **Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of APA Doctoral Program:** Students satisfied or dissatisfied with their doctoral studies in APA.
- **Satisfied and Dissatisfied Social Relationships with Advisor:** Students satisfied their academic advisors. However, some students had a difficult time developing positive social relationships (stop making progress, receiving low grade, high expectation from academic advisor) with advisor.
- **Academic Advisors’ Attempt to understand Asian International Students’ Issues and Concerns:** Participants recognized that their academic advisors understood or attempted to investigate international students’ issues and concerns of doctoral studies.
- **Advisors’ Respect of Asian International Students’ Cultural Essence:** Participants recognized that their academic advisors respected participants’ cultural essence while studying doctoral program in APA.

*Social relationships with graduate students*

- **Positive Social Relationships with International Doctoral Student:** Participants had excellent social relationships with other students from doctoral program in APA.
- **Negative Social Relationships with White American Graduate Students:** Participants had some difficulties to social interact with American graduate students in APA.

*Power and Hierarchy Relationship*

- **Power and Hierarchy Relationship between Student, Advisor, and Program:** Some participants felt that there were power and hierarchy relationship between students, advisor, and program.

Continued

**Table 4.21. Recurring Themes of Asian International Doctoral Students’ Experiences, Assimilation or Resistance, and Perspectives**
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Theme 3: Barriers

Social Distance and Discrimination
- Social distance from White American Graduate Students: Some participants felt that
  White American graduate students avoided communicating with Asian international
  doctoral students, because White American graduate students assumed that Asian
  international students did not understand English well.

Marginalization
- Social Marginalization from Faculty Members and White American Graduate
  Students: Some participants felt that White American students and faculty members
  laughed, students felt marginalized from the environment. Students had difficulty
  understanding jokes by White students and faculty.

Socioeconomic Considerations
- Rationale for Attending APA Doctoral Program: Some participants chose to attend
  their doctoral programs in APA, because of funding opportunities.
- Financial Struggle While Taking Summer Courses: Some participants who received
  funding from university were covered on only 9-10 month contracts, they struggled to
  manage financially during summers.
- Asian Governmental Financial Support: Some students received financial support from
  their native country’s government.
- Socioeconomic Issues and Concerns: Participants who did not receive funding from
  university had socio economical issues and concerns through their doctoral studies.

Time management difficulty while studying doctoral program
- Time Management Issues and Concerns: Participants who received funding from their
  university had some difficulties in time management.

Competitive Environment
- Competitive Environment of Doctoral Program: Some participants felt that fellow
  doctoral students in general did not pay attention to other students’ thoughts or
  opinions.

Continued
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**Theme 4: Identity, Political, Cultural, and Diversity Awareness**

*Identity Awareness*
- Respect Asian International Students’ Cultural Backgrounds: Participants recognized that their identities were stable through their doctoral programs.

*Social and Academic Identity*
- Academic Identity: Participants could think critically about their personal strength and weakness of their doctoral studies.
- Improvement of Academic Performance: Participants used varied strategies to improve their academic performance.

*Political issues between Asian international students*
- Definition of Term Asian: Students were not congruent in defining the term “Asian”.
- Social Tension within Asian Group: Participants observed some social tension within Asian groups

*Holding Students’ Own Cultural Values and Beliefs*
- Religious Values and Beliefs: Participants’ perspectives indicated that religious values and beliefs helped them to continue their doctoral studies, even as they were marginalized.
- Cultural Values and Beliefs: Participants thought that holding their own cultural values and beliefs by not assimilating adversely influence their academic performance.

*Learning about Diversity*
- Learning about Diversity: Participants felt that communicating and understanding about diversity with students from different backgrounds is important.

**Research Question I: How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

A major recurring theme was academic experiences and dilemmas. These Asian international doctoral students discussed their academic experiences while studying within doctoral programs in APE/ APA at two PW-IHE in the Big Ten Conference. Six
participants (Hang-Meeng, Byung-Soon, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) mentioned that they had language barriers (speaking, writing, and reading) while studying at their universities. Moreover, they were required to complete some English as second language courses during their master’s and/or doctoral programs. In so doing, they were frustrated in completing these courses before they could officially enroll full-time in their academic programs. Only Eun-Su did not experience significant language barriers during her doctoral studies. Nonetheless, she was reluctant to speak publicly in her classes. All seven participants were concerned about maintaining a certain grade point average (GPA) throughout their doctoral studies. Most participants had some difficulties passing required courses in their doctoral programs.

Theme One: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES AND DILEMMAS

Descriptions of Academic Experiences and Dilemmas

The first major theme was academic experiences and dilemmas that included language barriers, extra time for extra courses, and academic challenges. Six participants had academic difficulties such as low academic performance (e.g., passing some difficulties in research courses or APA graduate courses), difficulties in writing papers and assignments, reading assigned textbooks, and presenting class assignments during their doctoral programs. In contrast, however, one female participant had no academic dilemmas, but instead had positive academic experiences, because she had a chance to improve her language proficiency prior to her current doctoral experience while she attended an APA graduate program in Canada. Although two students also graduated
with their master’s program in the USA, they still felt that language difficulties such as writing papers and difficulties passing research courses during their doctoral studies were barriers. Six students felt some degree of frustration between their language proficiency and the high academic standards of performance which was expected and required by their APA doctoral programs at these PW-IHE.

**Academic Experiences While Studying at PW-IHE**

*Language Barriers*

The first subtheme of academic experiences while studying at PW-IHE was language barriers. All seven participants discussed varied language barriers they had encountered while studying in their APA doctoral programs. More specifically, Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong mentioned difficulties they had while speaking or presenting in English, writing papers, and reading their assigned materials (textbooks or journal articles). For example, Hang-Meeng felt that he had severe language barriers when speaking with other students and professors. Similarly, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong struggled to write papers, assignments, and manuscripts. Moreover, Byung-Soon had some difficulties reading her assigned textbooks during her course work. She was frustrated in attempting to complete her assignments. Yi-San did not identify specific components of language difficulties but mentioned language barriers as a struggle. Eun-Su mainly struggled with time management due to multiple tasks and assignments.
Because the doctoral program at CU required students to accomplish multiple different tasks, which required them to present, read their assigned materials, and write papers. Thus, both Eun-Su and Yi-San felt some degree of pressure in time management.

*Extra Time for Extra Courses*

The second subtheme of academic experiences was extra time for extra courses. All seven participants were required to enroll in some English as second language courses when they began either their master’s or doctoral programs. They had to spend extra time improving their language proficiency at first. Then, they began to enroll in their core APA doctoral classes. Some participants were shocked when they were required to complete a few English as second language (ESL) courses, because they assumed that they would be able to graduate in a certain amount of time (on average at MU 4 years – and at CU in 3 years), but enrolling in ESL courses lengthen their time in the programs. Because all international students were required to pass the Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL) for admission into their doctoral programs they had not anticipated taking ESL courses. Thus, they assumed that they would be able to graduate from their doctoral programs by only spending the number of years which was typified of their doctoral programs. Some students claimed that the ESL classes were not counted toward their doctoral program credit hours. All students without graduate assistant positions were required to pay for these classes themselves.

*Academic Challenges*

The third subtheme of academic experiences was academic challenges. Six of the seven participants had some difficulties passing courses through their doctoral programs.
of study. Most of them had issues and concerns in passing research (statistic) courses. MU required doctoral students to complete three different types of statistic courses. Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Byung-Soon described their dilemmas of how much they struggled to pass these courses. They told the researcher that these courses were a part of a series, when you missed or had a hard time to understand a certain concept you will struggle to pass the following courses in the series. It was a cumulative process in this series of courses. If you received a bad grade for the first class of statistic, you may have a hard time to receive good grade for next two following classes. On the other hand, Hang-Meeng and Yi-San had difficulties in passing APA related courses, because they did not have any previous experiences in this content area (Hang-Meeng - Sport Psychology and Yi-San – Biomechanics at the master’s degree end). In fact, Hang-Meeng received a letter of probation from the graduate school at MU, because he received double Cs during a summer session of his first year. In contrast, Hang-Meeng and Yi-San did not struggle passing any of their research courses, because they had learned the detail materials through their master’s programs as well as their working experiences before they began their doctoral programs.

**Research Question II: How do Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

To this research question, the major recurring themes were relationships and barriers. These Asian international doctoral students identified social relationships with academic advisors, social relationships with other students, socioeconomic difficulties while studying within their APA doctoral programs, and time management dilemmas. Relate to
these issues, a couple students were dissatisfied with their academic programs, because they felt that there was a mismatch between their research interests and the educational philosophies of their doctoral programs. All seven participants discussed details of their social relationships with their academic advisors and other students within their programs. They also provided information regarding their financial issues and concerns through their doctoral studies. Three participants who did not receive funding from their university struggled to pay their tuition. In contrast, participants who received funding from their university or governments of their native countries had less difficulty financially but had difficulties in time management and concerns throughout their doctoral studies. All seven participants gained greater awareness of their identity while matriculating within their doctoral programs. These Asian international students had strong beliefs and values of nationalism and were proud of their cultural origins. Thus, mostly they were resistant to assimilating into American tendencies.

Theme Two: RELATIONSHIPS

Descriptions of Relationships

The second major theme was relationships which include social relationships with academic advisors, graduate students, and power and hierarchical relationships. There were two different types of relationships that emerged from this study such as academic relationships with their doctoral programs and academic advisors, and social relationships with graduate students. These relationships strongly influenced participants’ satisfactions or dissatisfactions with a variety of aspects of their doctoral programs. In this study,
academic relationships between participants and academic advisors demonstrated that participants should meet their academic advisors’ expectations and APA doctoral programs’ standards throughout their doctoral studies. For example, five participants (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong) were satisfied with their doctoral programs’ educational philosophies and their academic advisors’ research interests. However, Yi-San was dissatisfied with her doctoral program of study, because there were power and hierarchical relationships between APA programs, academic advisors, and doctoral students. For example, APA doctoral students’ course requirements were determined by their academic advisors’ research interests and paradigms. Sin-Hong was also dissatisfied with his academic advisor, because he had some issues and concerns in reacting to his academic advisor’s expectations. In this study, participants’ social relationships with other graduate students include two different types of components such as negative and positive social relationships. For example, three participants (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) revealed that they had social relationships such as collaborating on research projects with other Asian international doctoral students. Moreover, participants from MU emphasized their positive social relationships with other Asian international doctoral students. Another example found that participants at MU did a road trip to where they attended the AAHPERD 2004 National Convention held in New Orleans, Louisiana. Since then, they had established strong social bonds (acceptance or approval as a member of Asian international student’s group) within their relationships.
Despite the positiveness of social relationships at MU, six participants (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San) had negative social relationships such as ignorance and avoidance from communication with White American graduate students.

**Academic Experiences and Relationships with Academic Advisors**

*Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of APA Doctoral Program*

The first subtheme of social and academic experiences and relationships with academic advisors was satisfaction and dissatisfaction of APA doctoral program. Five out of seven participants were satisfied with their APA doctoral programs and the other two participants were dissatisfied with aspects of their APA doctoral programs. A couple participants felt some degree of frustration that there was a mismatch with their research interests and the doctoral programs’ foci. For example, Yi-San had specific research interests through the doctoral program, but she realized that there was a mismatch with her research interests and her doctoral program’s focus on teaching. Thus, she indicated that her doctoral program experience was unsatisfactory. Hang-Meeng also was dissatisfied with his doctoral studies, because of his language barriers. He had difficulties listening for comprehension during lectures. He often misunderstood the detailed criteria of assigned papers or presentations from his classes. Thus, he had to spend extra time completing his assignments. In contrast, Hiroshi, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Byung-Soon, and Sin-Hong expressed satisfaction with their academic experiences. These five participants had carefully investigated their doctoral programs’ educational philosophies and their academic advisors’ research interests before they applied to the doctoral programs. Byung-Soon, Tayfun, and Hiroshi met their academic advisors and discussed their
research interests and made some agreement on their second year projects and dissertation topics. Thus, the careful reviews of doctoral programs were strongly related to students’ satisfactory levels.

*Satisfied and Dissatisfied Social Relationship with Advisors*

The second subtheme of social relationships with academic advisors was satisfied and dissatisfied with social relationship with advisor. Five of the seven participants felt that they were satisfied to have their current academic advisors. However, two participants had difficulties in developing positive social relationships with their academic advisors and they believed this was because they stopped making progress, received low grades, or had different expectations from their advisors. For example, Tayfun passed his candidacy exam in 2004. However, he suffered from burnout during his doctoral studies. He was supposed to begin his research proposal and conduct his proposal meeting on a certain date in which his academic advisor had suggested. However, he missed the deadline of his proposal submission a couple of times. His academic advisor suggested to him that he should find another academic advisor. He developed a negative relationship with his academic advisor for 9 months, but he decided to make progress on his dissertation research and successfully conducted his proposal meeting on June 8th 2006. Afterward, his relationship with his advisor improved significantly Hang-Meeng also had a difficult time with his academic advisor during his first year of the doctoral program. He struggled to pass two APE courses. He finally received double C grades and received a letter of probation from the graduate school. His academic advisor was upset and did not contact him for two weeks. His advisor expressed uncertainly about Hang-Meeng’s
ability as a doctoral student. Hang-Meeng explained that he could not understand 50% of his academic advisor’s conversation. Their social relationship became increasingly negative for the first two years. Hang-Meeng also lost funding opportunity from the university. His relationship with his academic advisor became more positive during the last two years, because of improvements in his English proficiency. They discussed his second year project and his academic advisor admitted to him that he had research potential. His grades in research courses were all A average. Receiving good grades of research courses was rare for international students because many of these students have difficulty in understanding research terms, but Hang-Meeng’s academic advisor found this as strength and they developed a better relationship.

Sin-Hong also struggled to develop a positive relationship with his academic advisor, because he had issues and concerns in responding to her expectations. His academic advisor tended to pressure him frequently regarding research projects, graduate assistant roles, and course work grades. In this study, he declined to fill out Section A.10 and A.11 component (relationship with academic advisor) from the modified survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation (Golde & Dore, 2004). He was not sure that he had a positive relationship with his academic advisor. Personally, he respected her as a scholar and lecturer, but there was no social bond with his academic advisor.

The other five participants (Byung-Soon, Hiroshi, Eun-Su, and Yi-San) had positive relationships with their academic advisors. Hiroshi and Byung-Soon explained that it took them a long time to understand their academic advisors. In fact, Hiroshi had 7 years to establish a relationship and Byung-Soon had 4 years with their academic advisors.
They also mentioned that participants and advisors were learning consistently and changed ways of thinking over this period of time. Therefore, it was difficult to develop positive relationships with academic advisors. It took a long time. In other cases, Eun-Su and Yi-San had just completed their first year of the doctoral program. They believed that they had positive relationships with their academic advisors, because they realized that their advisors always were thinking about what is best for them. They really appreciated their academic advisors’ efforts and time for guidance.

Academic Advisors’ Attempt to Understand Issues and Concerns

The third subtheme of social relationships with academic advisors was academic advisors’ attempts to understand Asian international students’ issues and concerns. All seven participants asserted that their academic advisors attempted and sought to understand their issues and concerns as international doctoral students. Sin-Hong, Hang-Meeng, and Hiroshi explained that their academic advisors suggested to them to have some opportunities for engaging in English conversations with partners on campus or recommended that they should participate in a martial art club (Judo), of which one of advisors was lecturing at a local community center near the campus town. Thus, they appreciated their academic advisors help to maximize their various experiences and assimilate into the doctoral program culture. Eun-Su from CU also expressed that her academic advisor was not only caring about his advisees, but also concerned about other doctoral students in the program as well. Yi-San also admitted that her academic advisor tried to help her with needed learning experiences such as offering practicum experiences teaching students with disabilities. She also described that her academic advisor knew
what students needed to know when they graduated from this doctoral program in APE. Thus, their academic advisors expressed various types of approaches for understanding issues and concerns of their advisees.

Advisor’s Respect of Asian International Students’ Cultural Characteristic

The fourth subtheme of social relationships with academic advisors was advisors’ respect of Asian international students’ cultural characteristics. Students recognized that their academic advisors respected students’ cultural characteristics while studying within doctoral programs in APA at these two PW-IHE. All seven participants felt that their academic advisors considered their cultural identity and norms. For example, Sin-Hong expressed that his academic advisor and other professors in APA program suggested to him to use his Taiwanese name while studying at this PW-IHE. He appreciated their suggestions and realized that they respected students’ cultural origins. Moreover, Hiroshi described that his academic advisor well understood the cultural characteristic of Japanese spirit, probably, because his advisor was a Japanese martial art expert. Hiroshi developed and maintained positive social relationship with his academic advisor over seven years. He stated that he would select his academic advisor again if he was to reapply to a doctoral program in APA. Eun-Su and Yi-San also noted that their academic advisors respected students’ cultural backgrounds throughout their doctoral programs. In fact, Eun-Su received her funding from the Office of the Assistant Dean for Equity and Diversity from the College of Education at CU. She appreciated that her academic advisor attempted to understand students’ native cultures including languages, religions, and ethnicities. Yi-San also expressed that her program was a diverse group of students.
Therefore, all faculty members including her academic advisor became sensitive about how to respect individual differences. Tayfun also explained that “we do care about individuals [specifically talking about individuals with disabilities] who have less opportunity to access our communities.” Tayfun also said “We hoped to see our world which accepts and respects individual differences across communities. That is what APA is all about!”

**Social Relationships with Graduate Students**

*Positive Social Relationships with International Doctoral Students*

The first subtheme of social relationships with graduate students was positive social relationships with international doctoral students. All seven participants felt that they had positive social relationships with other Asian international doctoral students in their APA programs. None of participants provided negative comments against any other international doctoral students in their interviews. Tayfun expressed that positive social relationships were the most important for all doctoral students. In fact, all students from MU did a road trip where they attended a national convention together. Since then, they had established strong social bonds within their relationships. Eun-Su and Yi-San from CU also discussed how they had positive social relationships with other doctoral students in the APA program, in part because the population of doctoral students in APA was so small. However, Eun-Su and Yi-San felt that the most dominant group in the Sport and Exercise Education program was PETE not APA faculty and students. Thus, they discussed issues and concerns around social relationships with other doctoral students in PETE. For example, their program required all APE/PETE doctoral students to complete
a doctoral seminar every quarter. They felt that the seminar focused mostly on PETE content and for less on APA related content. Moreover, Eun-Su and Yi-San felt some degree of social isolation from doctoral students in the PETE program.

Negative Social Relationships with White American Graduate Students

The second subtheme of social relationships with graduate students was negative social relationships with White American graduate students. Six participants had some difficulties socially interacting with White American doctoral students within their doctoral programs. For example, four participants from MU felt that American students only cared about international students who spoke English well [Hang-Meeng’s comment], they did not know how to socially interact with international students [Tayfun’s comment], When I called my American friend, he said “What do you want?” I am not begging something to him [Sin-Hong’s comment], or when I was a coordinator of APE lab, one undergraduate student was supposed to get permission for missing a class for the following week from me, but he asked American master’s student to get the permission instead [Hiroshi’s comment]. Thus, these participants felt some degree of isolation, marginalization, or segregation from their American peers. They understood that American students and international students had different cultures, but American students did not realize how international students felt about living in America. Moreover, Yi-San also discussed how she was not comfortable talking to American students including those in her program, because they believed that USA is the best country in the world. As a result, she did not socially interact with American doctoral students in her program. Eun-Su also commented that “When I was only one international student in an
American group, I would close my mouth whole time. Group members [American students] looked at me that I speak different. I am not comfortable to speak out in public. You [the researcher] asked me to attend a focus group interview in this study, if there were American students in the focus group interview, I am not attending.” Thus, these participants explained their different types of negative social relationships with American students. They discussed that their language proficiency (speaking English as second language) contributed to a hierarchical relationship with American students. Therefore, all seven participants felt some degree of being as outsider while studying at PW-IHE.

**Power and Hierarchy Relationship**

*Power and Hierarchy Relationship between Student, Advisor, and Program*

The subtheme of power and hierarchy relationship between student, advisor, and program captures how a participant described her doctoral program in APA needed to have flexible coursework requirements for doctoral students. In her case, Yi-San felt that her coursework needed to be more flexible and selective for doctoral students than only taking many doctoral core-required courses. Moreover, there were no hierarchical or power relationships with their former advisors while they attended their master’s programs in their native countries. Thus, the course requirements from advisor and programs were cultural changes for these Asian international doctoral students. For example, Yi-San indicated that doctoral coursework requirements were too much. Faculty should be more flexible such as allow doctoral students to select courses by themselves. She pointed out that research interests and paradigms should not be necessarily limited to advisors’ familiarity or research focus, because research project accomplishment is not
only for advisors, but also for students as well. She argued that students struggled when there were some conflicts of research interests and research paradigms between advisors and students. She indicated that she followed exactly doctoral programs’ coursework requirements and guidance by her advisor. However, she suffered from this power and hierarchical relationship between student, advisor, and doctoral program.

**Theme Three: BARRIERS**

*Descriptions of Barriers*

The third major theme was barriers which include discrimination, marginalization, socioeconomic considerations, time management difficulty while studying doctoral program, and competitive environment. In this study, there were two different major categories of barriers, these were: participants’ financial barriers and communication barriers with faculty members and White American graduate students. Financial barriers, for example, exemplified that participants (Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong) who had received funding (graduate assistantship) from their university or native country (Yi-San), and other participants (Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi) who did not receive funding had different types of barriers while attending doctoral programs. Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong were assigned to their graduate assistantships (approximately 20 hours per week). Thus, they had time management issues and concerns such as completing multiple tasks (graduate assistant jobs and accomplishing coursework) while studying in their doctoral programs. In contrast, Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi had socioeconomic issues and concerns such as paying their tuitions, health insurances, living expenses, and textbooks through their doctoral studies. The other type of barriers was communication
barriers. For example, a couple participants, Hang-Meeng and Sin-Hong explained that faculty members and White American graduate students avoided communicating with Asian international students. This they believed was because they had some degree of stereotype that Asian international students did not speak or understand English, including American jokes. Moreover, Eun-Su also revealed that fellow doctoral students did not care to understand other graduate students’ thoughts and opinions, because PW-IHE is a competitive environment.

**Social Distance and Discrimination**

*Social Distance from White American Graduate Students*

The subtheme of social distance was typified as social distance and even discrimination by White American graduate students toward Asian international students. These participants felt that some White American graduate students avoided communicating with Asian international doctoral students, because perhaps White American graduate students assumed that Asian international students did not understand English well. For example, Hang Meeng described that he had minimal greetings, which were void of real conversations, with White American graduate students while attending the doctoral program such as “How are you?, and I am fine” and followed by moments of silence. He commented that “White American graduate students assumed that I did not understand what they said, but it was not true. I understood what they talked about, but I could not respond well.” Although, he knew that he could not actively engage in the conversations with White American graduate students, he wanted to have some conversations with his White American peers. Tayfun also commented that there was
certain social distance between Asian international doctoral students and White American graduate students. This social distance was because White American students did not care about what Asian international doctoral students were doing, and because Asian international doctoral students were the majority group in the graduate APA program at MU. Thus, Asian international doctoral students felt a sense of social discrimination while attending the doctoral program in APA.

Marginalization

Social Marginalization by Faculty Members and White American Graduate Students

A recurrent theme of was social marginalization by faculty members and White American graduate students. Participants felt that when White American students or faculty members laughed, they felt marginalized within these situations. For example, Hang Meeng described that when he was a first and second year doctoral student, a few White American graduate students looked at him and laughed. He had serious language barrier at that time, so he had difficulty in understanding their conversation and did not understand what their laughter was about. He felt that White American graduate students laughed, because they made fun of him. He assumed that White American graduate students definitely thought that he was a wired alien. When Hang-Meeng and his White American graduate student peers were in the same environment (e.g., lab at the Department of Kinesiology), White American graduate students never invited him to join in their conversations. Thus, he felt marginalized in this situation. Sin-Hong also felt marginalized when he did not understand jokes by American students or faculty members while he attended classes.
More specifically, marginalization was experienced as some students had difficulty in understanding jokes. For example, Sin-Hong felt marginalized when he had difficulty understanding jokes by students or faculty members while he attended a class. He commented that students and faculty members brought their own cultural topics and often the international doctoral students were unable to understand. He commented that “I felt as an outsider from the environment.” He wanted to ask someone what the jokes meant, but it was not appropriate asking someone while they laughed. He felt that he should pay more attention to American culture such as sport, music, and media. However, he did not have much time for learning about these things (sport, music, and media), because he had to devote tremendous amounts of time to his doctoral study and his family (his wife and son). Thus, Asian international doctoral students felt marginalized when they had difficulty understanding jokes by American students and faculty members.

**Socioeconomic Considerations**

*Rationale of Attending APA Doctoral Program*

The first subtheme of socioeconomic considerations was rationale in the decision to attend APA doctoral program. Five participants’ rationale for attending their particular doctoral programs was to receive funding from their universities to ensure they could progress in the program. Several participants met their academic advisors at an AAHPERD National Convention or visited their departments to make sure that there was funding available for them as doctoral students. The average age of the participants in this study was 33 years old. These students believed that they needed to become independent. Thus, they preferred not to receive any financial support from their parents.
Moreover, international students typically are not eligible to receive any financial support (e.g., loans) from the US federal government, so some participants had estimated and saved the total amount of living costs for three to four years for sustaining themselves in the doctoral programs before they applied.

*Financial Struggle While Taking Summer Session Courses*

The second subtheme of socioeconomic considerations was financial struggle while taking summer session courses. Participants who received funding from their respective university were covered only on a 9 – 10 month contract, they also struggled financially to manage during summer months. Only three participants (Sin-Hong, Eun-Su and Byung-Soon) in this study received funding from their universities for 9-10 months per academic year. Sin-Hong explained his situation that he had a difficult time supporting his family financially. He currently lived in a campus apartment (rental was $700 per month). But, he only received funding ($1,000 - $1,100) monthly for 10 month contract. Therefore, he needed to spend some money from his savings account from Taiwan during the summer. He also needed to support his wife and son who was 13 month old at the same time. His wife was not eligible to have a job in the USA, because her visa status was F-2 which indicated she was on a husband dependent visa (students’ spouse visa). Thus, only his income which came from the university was there means of financial survival. During this study, he was preparing for his candidacy exams. He was required to complete a number of reading materials and as a result he needed to purchase several books and needed to copy some journal articles. Sin-Hong could not afford these extra expenses. He mentioned that he had to ask his parents for financial support.
Byung-Soon mentioned that she was required to take some summer session courses (e.g., special education courses) during her first and second years. She struggled to pass these courses, because she could not afford to purchase her resource text books or computer software. The coursework became more intense and required her tremendous amount of reading of assignments and papers. Thus, she felt that the most difficult period of her doctoral program was the summer months. Eun-Su commented that she needed to enroll in at least 7 credit hours for summer session courses during her first year. Thus, she may need to ask her parents for financial support in purchasing her textbooks or course packets during the summer.

Asian Governmental Financial Support

The third recurrent subtheme of socioeconomic considerations was Asian governmental financial support. A couple participants received financial support from their native country’s government. More specifically, Tayfun and Yi-San were receiving financial support from their native country’s governments of Turkey and Taiwan, respectively. Tayfun was receiving an extension of financial support (total $2000) from his government. He was pressured financially to earn his doctoral degree by December 2006, because his funding would end at that time. If he missed graduating this year, the Turkish government would begin to ask him to return his previous funding. Because of the governmental support, after graduating Tayfun was required to return to Turkey to teach at a university. Yi-San was also supported financially by her government in Taiwan. She was also required to return after graduating to Taiwan to teach at university. These students had some degree of pressure from their native countries. They were required to
complete their doctoral degrees successfully and then return home to contribute to universities of their native countries. They felt some degree of stress as a consequence of receiving funding from their countries.

Students’ Socioeconomic Issues and Concerns

The fourth subtheme of socioeconomic considerations was students’ socioeconomic issues and concerns. Participants who did not receive funding from either their native governments or from their current university had socioeconomic issues and concerns throughout their doctoral studies. Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi did not receive funding from their governments or universities. These participants experienced some degree of frustration throughout their doctoral studies. More specifically, Hang-Meeng did not receive funding from his university since he began his doctoral program. He spent four years of his academic program, but he was not allowed to begin his candidacy exam at this time. He will spend another two to three years completing his doctoral degree. He noted that he had no idea as to when his doctoral studies will end.

Hiroshi also explained his frustration that he decided to return to Japan for conducting his dissertation, because of socioeconomic difficulties. After he lost his funding from his university, he was required to pay his own tuition since 2005. He struggled to manage financially. Therefore, after he passed his candidacy exam, he decided to return to Japan for conducting his dissertation on Japanese physical education teachers who work at special education schools. The rationale for returning to Japan was that he would be able to make some money and work on his dissertation at the same time. Tayfun had to rely on his parents to pay his rent, because he needed to pay his tuition $5,000 last semester.
He was also married and needed more money to support his wife. Socioeconomic stresses motivated Tayfun to try to complete his doctoral degree by December 2006. If he missed the deadline for submission his dissertation by the end of 2006, he will be asked to re-pay all financial support from Turkish government.

**Time Management Difficulties**

*Time Management Issues and Concerns*

The subtheme of time management difficulties captures several participants’ issues and concerns around management of multiple tasks with limited time available to do so. Sin-Hong, Byung-Soon, and Eun-Su who received funding from their universities had difficulties in time management through their doctoral programs. These students had three different roles such as conducting research projects, teaching undergraduate courses, or working in administrative roles, while enrolling in 3-5 courses per semester or quarter. Thus, Sin-Hong and Byung-Soon spent a tremendous amount of time preparing for teaching of undergraduate courses (e.g., developing syllabus and grading quizzes etc). Byung-Soon explained her time management issues and concerns at trying to handle these multiple tasks with her academic advisor. His advice was that she should prioritize research projects rather than teaching and coursework. However, she felt pressure from her student evaluations, because she may lose her funding for the following years, if her students evaluations were poor. Thus, she struggled to manage her time across all her assigned tasks. Sin-Hong had different types of time management issues and concerns than those experienced by Byung-Soon, because Sin-Hong had multiple roles as a graduate assistant, student, husband, and father. He felt a tremendous amount of pressure
at maintaining his graduate assistant position for supporting his family. Eun-Su had some difficulties of time management through her doctoral study. Her concern was that she was required to complete multiple tasks (graduate assistantship, research projects, and coursework) all within 10 weeks which was the academic system at CU. She explained that she could not sleep many nights because of working to complete her assigned tasks. Thus, these three students discussed their different types of experiences and issues related to time management.

**Competitive Environment**

*Competitive Environment of Doctoral Program*

The subtheme of competitive environment was that some students in the doctoral programs were competitive with one another. Some participants felt that some doctoral students were competitive and did not pay attention to other doctoral students’ research ideas or perspectives. For example, Eun-Su described that many doctoral students in general had some listening problems during other doctoral students’ presentations, and tended to not participate in discussions while attending classes. Eun – Su pointed out that there were many doctoral students from CU who were using the experimental research paradigm. However, her research interests were situated in the qualitative research paradigm. Thus, her research interest was different from other students who used the experimental research paradigm. She had some difficulties communicating with other doctoral students in explaining to them her research paradigm, because other doctoral students who used experimental research paradigm did not listen or pay attention to her study. In fact, they believed their research projects were the best of any in the doctoral
program. Eun-Su felt that some doctoral students were not motivated to learn from other doctoral students’ knowledge. She struggled at studying with other doctoral students while attending classes or doctoral seminars.

**Research Question III: How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?**

The major recurring theme was identity, political, cultural, and diversity awareness. These seven Asian international doctoral students varied in their perspectives about their doctoral studies, and discussed social and political tension within Asian international student groups, as well as mentioned enhanced identity awareness while studying within their APA doctoral programs at these PW-IHE. All seven students mentioned that their cultural and religious beliefs and values and sense of nationalism helped them to continue their doctoral studies even though they were marginalized by the dominant White American graduate program culture.

**Theme four: IDENTITY, POLITICAL, CULTURAL, AND DIVERSITY AWARENESS**

*Descriptions of Identity, Political, Cultural, and Diversity Awareness*

The fourth major theme was identity, cultural, and diversity awareness which captures the participants’ identity awareness, academic identity, political issues between Asian international students, holding students’ own cultural values and beliefs, and learning about diversity. In this study, the participants respected their own cultural backgrounds
and nationalism including their cultural, political, social, and religious values and beliefs throughout their doctoral programs. For example, Hang-Meeng and Tayfun thought that holding their own religious values helped to continue their doctoral studies. Although, Hang-Meeng decided to change his church from a Korean one to an American one for improving his language proficiency and enhancing his social life, he was conscientious of Korean identity relative to his religious beliefs. In contrast, Sin-Hong and Yi-San discussed political issues between Asian international students. Political issues within Asian groups (e.g., between Taiwanese and Chinese international students) had social tension even though they spoke the same language. Thus, Hiroshi suggested that learning about diversity such as historical, cultural, political, and social contexts with students from different backgrounds is beneficial for all international students. This theme supports the assertion that participants’ identity was defined in their nationalism, but they were not in agreement on what it meant to be “Asian.”

Identity Awareness

*Respect Asian International Students’ Cultural Backgrounds*

The subtheme of identity awareness captures the essence of giving respect Asian international students’ cultural backgrounds. All seven participants experienced an enhanced sense of awareness of their cultural identity while in their doctoral programs. Most of participants stated that the major factor enhancing their cultural identities was that all faculty members in APA programs showed respect for students’ cultural backgrounds as well as languages, religions, races, and nationalism. In fact, their departments allowed students to conduct some research projects which relate to education
from their native countries. For example, Byung-Soon conducted her dissertation topic which focused on emotionality of students with behavioral disorders within public schools in South Korea. Hiroshi focused on self-efficacy of Japanese physical education teachers within special education schools. These students were proud of being either Korean or Japanese. All students felt that it was ok as being who they were. Thus, all of the participants experienced an enhanced identity awareness while in their doctoral programs.

**Social and Academic Identity**

*Academic Identity*

The first subtheme of social and academic identity epitomizes how these participants developed their academic identities through their various issues and concerns. All seven participants could reflect on various issues and concerns that required them to define their academic identities. For example, several of them had issues and concerns at conducting research projects through their doctoral studies. They also had a hard time passing statistic and/or research courses. They felt that if they did not understand the concept of research methods, there was no way to meet their doctoral program’s requirements, because their university was considered as Division I Carnegie Research Institution (BIG TEN conference). They could also identify their academic weaknesses related to their level of language proficiency such as using appropriate words for writing a manuscript, for presenting national conferences, or for understanding and comprehending content while reading a number of research articles and other reading materials. Some students mentioned that doctoral study was a cumulative process.
They attempted to identify their concerns and issues daily. It was with daily self assessments that they developed a greater awareness of their social and academic identity. 

*Improvement of Academic Performance*

Another subtheme was improvement of academic performance. Related to the previous subtheme, all seven participants found some strategies to solve their issues and concerns which were mostly related to passing their doctoral program required courses. For example, Hang-Meeng suffered from language difficulties which caused his low grade point average (GPA) in the doctoral program. However, he had a strong background in research methods. Therefore, he showed his strength in research, which improved his relationships with his academic advisor. In fact, his ability in research impressed all faculty members as well as other students, because other students had a hard time passing statistic courses. He mentioned that when he demonstrated his academic strength to faculty members and other students in his program, he was able to establish positive social relationships with them as well as improve his GPA. Hiroshi experienced difficulties in writing term papers and manuscripts throughout his graduate program. He asked a tutor to proofread his work at the writing center each and every time before he submitted his written assignments. He mentioned that it took more time to go through this double process. Hiroshi said “I wrote my paper and revise or rewrite again, but it was very helpful for enhancing his quality of writing.” Tayfun also struggled to pass statistic courses. So he decided to use some visualization aids to better understand the concepts common to statistics. Sin-Hong used an English conversation partner for
improving his English pronunciation. These participants attempted to solve their issues and concerns with different strategies with other Asian international doctoral students.

**Political Issues between Asian International Students**

*Definition of Term “Asian”*

The first subtheme of political issues between Asian international students concerned incongruence in defining the term Asian. These seven participants were not congruent in their definitions of what is meant to be an Asian. They recognized that each Asian country has different types of characteristics such as languages, politics, and cultures. They stated that the term Asia was used for geographical reasons. None of the participants could define social and cultural characteristics associated with the term Asian. Sin-Hong pointed out that some American faculty and students had some stereotypes indicating that Asian students work hard and are intelligent. These stereotypic views added pressure on these Asian international students while studying within their doctoral programs, because they were concerned about the possibility of disappointing their professors.

*Social Tensions within Asian Groups*

Another subtheme of political issues between Asian international students was social tensions within Asian groups. Some participants felt that political issues which caused social tensions between Asian groups while studying at PW-IHE. For example, some felt that there were social tensions between Korean and Japanese international doctoral students. Their rationale was that Korean students had a tendency of becoming short tempered or aggressive. In contrast, Japanese students did not have much emotional
expressions at any time. It seemed that they were “stone cold” type of persons. They obviously discerned the differences between themselves and other Asian doctoral students. They felt these groups made the environment uncomfortable. Sin-Hong and Yi-San also mentioned that there were significant social tensions between Taiwanese and Chinese students at their universities. For example, a number of Chinese students believed that Taiwan was a part of China. These students believed that these two countries had different political philosophies (China is social communism and Taiwan is democratic). Therefore, Taiwan should be recognized as an independent country. Sin-Hong and Yi-San held their strong identity as being Taiwanese while studying within their respective doctoral programs.

Religious and Cultural Values and Beliefs

Religious Values and Beliefs

The first subtheme of religious value and beliefs captures the importance of how the participants’ religious values and beliefs helped them to continue their doctoral studies, even when they were marginalized by others. Moreover, Hang Meeng indicated that his former advisor from his master’s program in Korea recommended selecting doctoral field of study which relate to his religious beliefs. Although he (a) had various struggles with language barriers, (b) experienced marginalization within the doctoral program culture, and (c) academic issues, his religious beliefs and values helped him while he continued to matriculate in his doctoral program. He believed that APA field of study was strongly associated with his personality which was to help individuals with disabilities lead better lives in their communities through physical activity participation. Tayfun also stated that
his Muslim values and beliefs were strong influences while he attended the doctoral program. He believed that holding his Muslim religious values and beliefs was important for him as an international doctoral student, because as an international doctoral student his cultural values and beliefs motivated him to continue within the doctoral program, even as he struggled at living and studying at a PW-IHE in the USA. But, Sin-Hong was concerned that by international students holding onto their own cultural values and beliefs would adversely influence their academic experience.

Cultural Values and Beliefs

The second subtheme, cultural values and beliefs captures the paradox of how the participants felt that although they needed to maintain their own cultural values and beliefs as motivates for them to continue their doctoral studies, they also believed that holding their own cultural values and beliefs adversely affected their academic performances. For example to be successful, Sin-Hong discussed that he was required to become a more aggressive and productive doctoral student according to his advisor while attending the doctoral program, which he viewed was a cultural norm at a PW-IHE. However, Sin-Hong’s Taiwanese cultural values and beliefs were to cooperate, respect, and collaborate with others and to not be aggressive. Therefore, he had no idea how to become an aggressive doctoral student. He commented that it was possible to become a productive doctoral student. He may be able to become more productive by spending more time updating articles, reading texts, and sharing resources with his advisor. He felt that there were certain things Taiwanese doctoral students could, and could not achieve. This component was strongly associated with his own cultural values and beliefs.
He tried to assimilate toward American cultural values and beliefs, but the degree of assimilation (low level – high level) also became an issue for these Asian international doctoral students.

**Learning about Diversity**

This theme was learning about diversity with students from different backgrounds. The participants felt that communicating and understanding more about diversity with students from different backgrounds was an important aspect of the experience as international students’ studying abroad. For example, Hiroshi indicated that he was glad to have an opportunity to study abroad in the USA, because he could observe various students from various backgrounds. He felt that while studying abroad it was important to understand other students’ experiences, maximize his knowledge about different cultures, and appreciate this learning opportunity by communicating with other students and faculty from diverse cultural backgrounds. He added that he could learn many things from books and media. However, it was a totally different experience interacting with different people, languages, and cultures. He commented that he did not change his cultural identity while studying abroad, but by knowing and learning more about the social, political, and cultural backgrounds of other students enhanced his understanding of diversity.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND, CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. This chapter presents a discussion of the major themes that emerged in this study and addresses each of the research questions, articulates implications, offer recommendations, and conclusions.

Discussion

The assimilation of the seven Asian international APA doctoral students at PW-IHE within Big Ten Conference was described from their perspectives based on their experiences. These Asian international doctoral students had (a) varying academic experiences and dilemmas, (b) both positive and negative relationships and at times felt isolated and marginalized, (c) encountered different barriers, and (d) developed a greater awareness of self – identity, political tensions, culture, and diversity. Stated differently, four major themes emerged in this study. These themes were (a) academic experiences and dilemmas, (b) relationships, (c) barriers, and (d) identity, political, cultural, and diversity awareness.
Theme One: ACADEMIC EXPERIENCES AND DILEMMAS

Descriptions and Discussion of Academic Experiences and Dilemmas

The first major theme was academic experiences and dilemmas that include language barriers, extra time for extra courses, and academic challenges. Six participants had academic difficulties such as low academic performance (e.g., difficulties in research courses or APA graduate courses), difficulties in writing papers and assignments, reading assigned textbooks, and orally presenting class assignments during their doctoral programs. In contrast one female participant had no major academic dilemmas, but instead had mostly positive academic experiences, plausibly, because she had a chance to improve her language proficiency prior to her current doctoral program while she attended an APA graduate program in Canada. Although two students also graduated with their master’s degree in the USA, they still felt that language difficulties such as writing papers and difficulties passing research courses during their doctoral studies were barriers. Six students felt some degree of frustration between their levels of language proficiency and the high academic standards of performance which were expected and required by their APA doctoral programs at these PW-IHE.

Language Barriers

These students had various language barriers such as writing papers, reading textbooks or assigned materials, and orally presenting their class assignments through bilingual experiences, which underwent a shift from their own native language to the English language. These various language barriers made students loose confidence that they may not be able to complete their APA doctoral studies successfully, because their
lack of English proficiency was influenced and interpreted by their knowledge of their own native language and culture (Minami & Ovando, 2004). This finding is consistent with Lin and Yin’s (1997) finding that Asian international students have difficulty adjusting to the academic cultures (e.g., various accents of instructors along with their different teaching styles) of PW-IHE. Moreover, Asian international students have difficulty understanding class lectures (Wan, 2001), which cause them to feel reluctant to participate in class discussions (Lin & Yi, 1997). The Euro-American approach at PW-IHE reflects an unique cultural perspective from these students’ previous academic experiences. In assimilation theory, international students’ assimilation toward the dominant academic patterns of their APA doctoral program within PW-IHE extend beyond the mere acquisition of English language to graduate program norms which created dilemmas for these students in meeting program expectations. In this study, students were willing to transform or assimilate their language toward their APA doctoral programs cultures, even at the expense of compromising their own language values from their native countries to be successful in their doctoral studies. For example, one student explained that he changed his place of worship from a Korean church to American church, because he felt that his English language proficiency might be enhanced and improved by doing so. Thus, these students somehow found various strategies to meet the APA doctoral programs’ requirements.
Extra Time for Extra Courses

This is about more courses, requiring more time in the programs. More specifically, these students were required to complete English as a second language (ESL) courses before they could enroll in master’s or doctoral level courses. When students have course requirements, these “extra” courses create additional stress, because these additional ESL courses may delay the students’ completion of the APA doctoral programs. Although all international students in this study were required to pass the required Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL) for admission into their doctoral programs, they still were required to enroll in ESL courses before officially starting their doctoral studies since many of them still had poor English language proficiency which for them caused a major stressor and created significant problems when they were trying to function and succeed at these PW-IHE (Lin & Yi, 1997). These students were surprised and even started, because these extra courses extended their time pursuing their doctoral degrees. Yet, these Asian international APA doctoral students needed to shape their language styles to better reflect the divergent dominant academic culture at these PW-IHE. To this, Scheieffelin and Ochs (1996) describe two claims of learning style of international students who use English as second language. To paraphrase, these claims were: “(a) the process of acquiring language [presenting, writing, reading, and understanding] is deeply affected by the process of becoming a competent member of APA doctoral programs, and (b) the process of becoming a competent member of APA doctoral program is realized to a large extent through language, by acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in and across academically defined situations; that is,
through exchanges of language in particular academic situations” (Scheieffelin & Ochs, 1996, p. 252). In the current cases, findings indicate that these Asian international doctoral students had language shift experiences such as displaying a native language to English. This process not only brings the language back, but also it forwards it into new academic contexts at PW-IHE (McCarty & Watahomigie, 1999).

**Academic Challenge**

In the current cases, the students were concerned about maintaining a certain GPA during their APA doctoral studies, as their various language barriers made it more difficult to maintain a certain GPA of at least 3.0, which was required by their graduate schools. When international students receive a letter of academic deficiency, they have a possibility to lose their legal immigration status (non immigrant student visa) as being a graduate student within their higher education programs (Lin & Yi, 1997). This finding is consistent with Suzuki’s (1989) finding that Asian international students who recently immigrated to the USA encounter academic difficulties in learning English as well as to maintaining the minimum GPA. For example, a student in this multiple - case study explained that he had difficulty maintaining his GPA during his first year of the doctoral program, received a probation letter from the graduate school admission office, and subsequently lost his funding. Gordon (1964) asserted that recently admitted international students’ strong retention to their country’s language showed lower level of academic engagement. As such, some international students received lower grades during their first academic year. The struggle with language proficiency appears to impact many recently admitted students with regard to GPA and coursework; however, some students
do show noticeable improvements in their English language proficiency. Lin and Yi (1997) stated that Asian international doctoral students need to meet two stages for successful doctoral studies: (a) understanding class content in English such as reading text books and listening to class lectures by professors, and (b) responding in writing on papers, presenting whether in written or verbal form their class assignments, and performing on tests. When students cannot meet these components, they are more likely to have academic difficulties.

*Analytical Generalizations of these Findings to Assimilation Theory*

In assimilation theory, the Asian international students of this study were required to learn the new ways of American learning approaches and cultures. They did so while using English as a second language in meeting PW-IHE cultural expectations within their APA doctoral programs and of their academic advisors (Gordon, 1964). In this regard, assimilation theory formulates that language acculturation is typified whenever students with English as second language speak like Americans, write like Americans, and read like Americans without holding their own cultural and social identity (Gordon, 1964). Although, these APA doctoral students found it impossible to ascertain the American language thoroughly, they tended to acculturate their language toward the APA doctoral program culture and expectations, because this was necessary to complete their doctoral studies successfully. However, these students had various degrees of language acculturation into their APA doctoral programs. This finding explains two different notions of students’ language acculturation through their doctoral studies. First students with severe limits in their English proficiency purposefully attempted to acculturate their
language more toward English to meet the expectations of their doctoral programs at their respective PW-IHE. In this multiple case study, one student commented that he wanted to become an American, because he did not want language issues and concerns while he attended an APA doctoral program at a PW-IHE. Second, students with better language proficiency attempted to adjust her or his language to the APA doctoral program using a few language support services (e.g., writing centers, ESL courses). In assimilation theory, it is not surprising that these students were required to acculturate their language more toward English to survive and function successfully in their APA doctoral programs.

**Theme Two: RELATIONSHIPS**

*Descriptions and Discussion of Relationships*

The second major theme was relationships which include social relationships with academic advisors, fellow graduate students, and power and hierarchical relationships. There were two different types of relationships that these participants emphasized, and these were academic relationships within their doctoral programs such as those with academic advisors, and social relationships with fellow graduate students. These relationships strongly influenced participants’ satisfaction or dissatisfaction with a variety of aspects of their doctoral programs. In this study, academic relationships between participants and academic advisors emphasize the importance of meeting their academic advisors’ expectations and APA doctoral programs’ standards throughout the participants’ doctoral studies. For example, five participants, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, and Sin-Hong were satisfied with their doctoral programs’ educational
philosophies and their academic advisors’ research interests. However, Yi-San was dissatisfied with her doctoral program, because she perceived power and hierarchical relationships between the APA doctoral program, her academic advisor, and some fellow doctoral students. From Yi-San’s perspective APA doctoral course requirements were determined by their academic advisors’ research interests and paradigms. Sin-Hong was also dissatisfied with his academic advisor, because he had some issues and concerns in reacting to his academic advisor’s expectations.

In this study, participants’ social relationships with other graduate students include two different types of components which were negative and positive social relationships. For example, three participants, Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi revealed that they had positive social relationships such as collaborating on research projects with other Asian international doctoral students. Moreover, participants from MU discussed their positive social relationships with other Asian international doctoral students, which were enhanced during a road trip to attend a conference. Since then, they had established strong social bonds (acceptance or approval as a member of Asian international student group) within their relationships. Despite the positiveness of social relationships at MU, six participants, Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San had negative social relationships such as ignorance and avoidance of communication with them by White American graduate students. This is discussed in the section titled “Social Relationships with Graduate Students.”
Academic Relationship with Academic Advisor

Identified were the types of relationships between participants and academic advisors in this study, it is clear that this academic relationships with their academic advisors predominated rather than social relationships with them. Their academic relationships with their academic advisors helped these Asian international APA doctoral students succeed in their doctoral programs. As evident in the current case studies, academic relationships foster one-on-one relationships between more experienced academic advisors and less experienced students. In these relationships, academic advisors provide guidance and encouragement aimed at developing the competence and character of doctoral students (Hamilton & Darling, 1989; Rhodes, 2002). In contrast, social relationships serve to maintain and enhance self-esteem as well as provide acceptance and approval (Will, 1985). Mostly, these Asian international APA doctoral students had one-to-one mentoring relationships rather than social relationships with their respective academic advisors. This finding is consistent with Heikano and Shute’s (1986) descriptions that two of the most fundamental objectives in advising Asian international students are to help them adjust to the demands of their respective academic programs and achieve academic success. In this multiple-case study, these students felt accepted within their APA doctoral programs when their academic advisors were satisfied with the quality of the students work.

There were three different types of negative academic relationships that emerged from these cases as well, these were: (a) difficulties meeting academic advisors’ expectations while attending APA doctoral programs within PW-IHE, (b) different philosophies or
academic interests with her or his academic advisor, and (c) stopped making progress on her or his doctoral research. These Asian international APA doctoral students felt that if they could not overcome negative academic relationships with their academic advisors, they may loose their current academic advisors’ trust. As a result, they may be delayed in completing their APA doctoral programs. This finding supports Lee and Carrasquiro’s (2006) finding that when Asian international students have negative academic relationships with their academic advisors, poor communication is the first hindrance of negative academic relationships between them and their academic advisors. More specifically, academic advisors seemed not to bother with their students’ pronounciation, but more with the lack of students’ oral interaction and communication, and (b) low quality of work is the second hindrance of negative academic relationships between Asian international students and academic advisors. For example, academic advisors understand that when students write their papers in English, their mistakes are mainly caused by the great differences in the structure of English and Asian languages. Although academic advisors repeatedly provide useful feedback for their Asian international students, they often cannot see their students’ writing improvements. Portes and Rumbaut (1996) described that when institutional (e.g., APA doctoral program) completeness influences the outcome at an individual level such as between academic advisors and students, these students and academic advisors would develop positive academic relationships as well as positive social relationships.
Social Relationships with Graduate Students

Across cases, the participants had established positive social relationships with other Asian international students that served to maintain and enhance their self-esteem as well as provide acceptance and approval (Will, 1985). For these participants, peer relationships served as emotional sustainment to support the development of psychosocial relationships with other Asian international doctoral students while they were attending their respective APA doctoral programs (Selman, Levitt, & Schultz, 1997). This finding is consistent with Lewis et al’s (2004) finding that when there is a community of minority students at PW-IHE, they can serve to support one another by fostering elements of a cohort. In the current cases these students faced common academic issues and concerns, and language barriers as well as their own unique problems (Lin & Yi, 1997). They encountered similar problems that confront anybody living in a foreign culture, such as racial discrimination, language problems, difficulties in adjusting to academic schedule or campus climate, and financial stressors (Lin & Yi, 1997). Due to a need for support and encouragement, these types of conditions can lead to the development of positive social relationships with other Asian international doctoral students in APA programs. Moreover, Asian cultures tend to place a high value on team effort and collectivity (Lin & Yi, 1997). Thus, these APA doctoral students had established positive social and peer relationships with other Asian international doctoral students.

In contrast, they had some difficulties socializing and building relationships with White American graduate students in their APA graduate programs. These social relationships with White American graduate students made these students feel
uncomfortable communicating with fellow White American graduate students, because they did not share their academic experiences as well as their living experiences with White American graduate students. On this point, Wan (2001) found that Asian international students feel that White American graduate students are often unfriendly, marginalizing, or discriminating against them. Plausibly, this is because they look at Asian international students differently. In the current cases, the students’ social distance in their relationships with White American graduate students and even though class assemblies, for example, brought Asian international students close in contact with White American graduate students’ groups at their PW-IHE, they still encountered social distance. In the present cases, where student’s social distance away from White American graduate students was high, because they rarely communicated with White American graduate students except only subtle and friendly facade greetings. Thus, these Asian international students perceive that White American graduate students treated them as belonging to a separate group. Lin and Yi (1997) asserted that White American culture emphasizes individualism. In these cases, the Asian international students established positive social peer relationships with fellow Asian graduate students, but they had wide social distance in their relationships with White American graduate students.

Power and Hierarchical Relationship

In another finding, one student felt two different types of power relationships: (a) structural power relationship whereby the student was required to complete all doctoral required coursework, and (b) hierarchical power relationship with her academic advisor, which the student needed to align her research focus with her academic advisor’s
research interests and paradigm (Freire, 1970). This student was uncomfortable and uncertain in this situation, but she yielded to assimilate to power and hierarchical structure to be successful. The terms “hierarchy and power” used by Giroux (1985) refer to when “dominant individuals or groups quietly ignore the complexity [e.g., academic issues or concerns] of minority individuals” (p.242). For example, APA doctoral programs in this study equally provide their mission statements and academic expectations to all doctoral students. However, this student felt that her APA doctoral program did not respect students’ academic backgrounds, because her program did not allow students to select or design their program of study. This student was assigned to adjust to APA doctoral power structure as well as with her academic advisor. This finding is consistent with Freire’s (1970) description of banking in education in that students are the depositories of knowledge and teachers are the depositor of their academic experiences. As an example, one participant was assigned to meet two different criteria of her doctoral studies such as (a) required core courses by APA doctoral programs, and (b) recommended coursework by her academic advisor who provides guidance to her effectively for future dissertation or other research projects. This finding lends partial support to assimilation theory (Gordon, 1964); that is, this student respected her own educational background but intended to hold her research interests while aligning (assimilating) with the focus of the APA doctoral program goals and objectives.

Analytical Generalization of these Findings to Assimilation Theory

In social assimilation theory, when social assimilation implicates relationships between students (i.e., in this case, Asian international doctoral students), academic
advisors, and White American graduate students, the students involved assimilation changes occur to enable them to function successfully in the mainstream at their PW-IHE. From this point, findings captured in these case studies suggest that the students did not assimilate significantly to any relationships with their academic advisors or fellow White American graduate students. Instead, there was three different phenomena which suggest student resistance to assimilation. First, mostly their academic advisors respected them while they held on to their own cultural values and beliefs while developing academic relationships with them. Second, these students had social distance with White American graduate students throughout their doctoral studies, plausibly because of language barriers leading to marginalization and discrimination and cultural differences between American (individualism) and Asian cultures (cooperation). Third, there was some resistance to adjusting or assimilating into at least one participant’s APA doctoral programs power and hierarchical relationships. In contrast, these students functioned in positive social relationships within their Asian international doctoral student groups, because they had similar cultural beliefs and values. However, these students did not exhibit overt initiating actions to develop intergroup relationships with White American graduate students. Thus, this finding does not fully support social assimilation theory.

**Theme Three: BARRIERS**

*Descriptions and Discussion of Barriers*

The third major theme was barriers which include (1) language barriers, (2) discrimination, (3) marginalization, (4) socioeconomic difficulties, (5) time management difficulties, and (6) competitive environments. In this study, these different barriers made
these Asian international APA doctoral students have a hard time adjusting to their APA doctoral programs. Several participants (Hang-Meeng, Eun-Su, Tayfun, Hiroshi, Sin-Hong and Yi-San) had social distance with White American graduate students and faculty members at their PW-IHE. More specifically, they felt discrimination and marginalization from White American groups, because they could not (a) speak English like White American graduate students, or (b) understand White American culture such as sport, music, and history. Eun-Su also believed that her APA program had a competitive environment. Financial barriers distinguished those participants, Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, Sin-Hong, and Yi-San who received funding (graduate assistantship) from their university or native country, and those participants, Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi who did not receive funding as having different types of barriers while attending the doctoral programs. Byung-Soon, Eun-Su, and Sin-Hong were assigned to graduate assistantships for approximately 20 hours per week. This work and time commitment resulted in time management issues and concerns such as completing multiple tasks related to their graduate assistant roles, and coursework while studying in their doctoral programs. In contrast, Hang-Meeng, Tayfun, and Hiroshi had socioeconomic issues and concerns such as difficulties in paying their tuition, health insurance, living expenses, and purchasing textbooks through their doctoral studies.

Social Distance and Discrimination

These students felt socially distant and some degree of discrimination from White American graduate students who usually avoided and ignored communicating with them. These barriers made these students feel not welcomed by White American groups within
these PW-IHE. Moreover, they were afraid of communicating with White American
graduate students, because these students never attempted to integrate Asian international
doctoral students into their student groups. Hence, an intergroup barrier became obvious
from data gathered in this study. Discrimination as defined by Dovidio and Gaertner
(1986) is the behavioral component of attitudes or stereotypes. It consists of selecting
unjustifiable behavior toward members of a target group. In these cases, this occurred
when White American students had negative attitudes or stereotypic beliefs about Asian
international students. Further the current findings were consistent with Poyrazli et al.’s
(2002) finding that international students have communication barriers associated with
the establishment of social relationships with White American graduate students.
However, there was no student who understood and could fully explain why they had
experienced discrimination such as avoidance and ignorance to communicate with them
by some White American graduate students at these PW-IHE during their doctoral studies.
But, these students believed that White American graduate students had some stereotypic
beliefs about Asian international students (Wan, 2001). Poyrazli et al.’s (2002) findings
also showed that international students who have low language proficiency tend to have
communication barriers, as a result students are not able to develop meaningful
relationships. When communication barriers between two intergroups (e.g., Asian and
White American groups) are high with no social interaction with each other, international
students perceive White American graduate students as promoting social isolation and
causing discrimination in PW-IHE (Gordon, 1964).
Marginalization

These students felt marginalized within their environments when they did not understand why White American graduate students or faculty members laughed. More specifically, they had difficulty in understanding American jokes spoken by White American graduate students. This barrier made these Asian international APA doctoral students uncomfortable in such situations, because they felt that they were uninvited guests with both White American faculty members and graduate students who rarely included them into their conversations. Thus, these students had invisibilizing cultural backgrounds which simply minimize their unique experiences, backgrounds, and perspectives during their doctoral studies (LaFrance, 1992). Invisibilizing cultural backgrounds occurs whenever individuals outside the dominant structure cannot see or understand dominant groups’ social interests (LaFrance, 1992). These Asian international APA doctoral students were unable to understand the dominant culture at their PW-IHE. The current findings are consistent with Turner and Thomson’s (1993) findings which showed that minority graduate students also report marginalization experiences as well as difficulties understanding PW-IHE academic culture. Moreover, they lacked mentoring experiences from faculty members as well as collegiality with other doctoral students to help them better understand American cultural points-of-view. Across cases, Asian international students had two different types of invisibilizing cultural backgrounds. These were: (a) they had difficulties understanding American culture during their APA doctoral studies, and (b) they did not have high English comprehension for understanding White American graduate students, and faculty members.
In accord with assimilation theory, when White American graduate students or faculty members and Asian international students within PW-IHE have unequal status, problems such as social barriers between Asian international students and American graduate students or faculty may be accentuated. These students do not intend to solve their invisibiling knowledge experiences with White American graduate students or faculty members, because Asian culture emphasizes that asking questions is considered distractive behavior while White American graduate students and faculty members socially interact (Lin & Yi, 1997).

Socioeconomic Consideration

Several students, particularly those who did receive funding from their universities, revealed that socio-economical opportunities provided them with part of their motivation for their doctoral studies (Gordon, 1964). Socioeconomic considerations helped them continue their doctoral studies, as they do not want to ask for help from their parents to pay their tuition and living expenses. This finding is consistent with previous findings that financial aid is an important criterion in the college choice process (Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1989; Hossler & Gallagher, 1987; Hossler, Schmit, & Vesper, 1999; McDonough, 1997).

Moreover, St. John (1999), and St. John and Noell (1989) found that educational opportunity for doctoral program choice can be achieved by offering financial aid, scholarships, or stipends to mitigate the costs of the particular institutions that international students want to attend most, because Asian international students must assume a full time student status while they are enrolled in school. More specifically,
international students are legally prevented from assuming a part-time status or dropping out. Therefore, they are required to pay out-state tuition to the university every semester or quarter (Yin & Lin, 1997). In the current cases, the students who did not receive or eventually lost funding from their university claimed that loss of financial support was an unfair financial barrier for them (McPherson & Schapiro, 1998). Moreover, their APA doctoral programs did not provide any qualification criteria for funding support to all graduate students. However, findings across cases identified two different student assumptions regarding qualification criteria of their funding which was that when students cannot receive funding, it is because (a) a student has low academic performance such as low GPA or low English language proficiency, and (b) a student receives a low teaching evaluation by undergraduate students in her or his graduate teaching assistantship.

Time Management Difficulty

Students who received funding either from their departments, colleges, or their native countries had concerns about balancing research and teaching, and their responsibilities as graduate students. This barrier caused these Asian international APA doctoral students struggle to maintain their GPA, secure good evaluation results from their teaching assistantships, and meet the research expectations of their academic advisors. This was because they believed that if any of these tasks were unsatisfactory, they may be disqualified doctoral students and eventually dismissed from their programs.

There are two different types of barriers associated with time management issues and concerns. First, these students had difficulties in preparing culturally relevant teaching
materials for their White American undergraduate students which met the undergraduate students’ academic interests. In fact, they would spend tremendous amounts of time preparing and organizing undergraduate courses. This finding is consistent with Lin and Yi’s (1997) findings that Asian international graduate teaching associates feel alienated because they do not understand undergraduate norms or the undergraduate culture, because these Asian international students had graduated from a university in their native countries with very different cultures. Second, a couple academic advisors in this study had different prioritized expectations for their students. More specifically, these advisors expected that their students should be knowledgeable in conducting research projects more so than teaching undergraduate courses and passing the required APA doctoral classes. However, these students were afraid of losing their financial support in the event they would receive negative student evaluations from their classes associated with their GTA positions. Thus, the juggling of roles and conflicts between students and their academic advisors that arise from the myriad of hats donned by students in doctoral programs in APA may be inevitable (Kuther, 2003). These students stated that graduate teaching associates as well as academic advisors must learn to manage the various roles. They also expressed concern that departments need to clarify for Asian international students how to independently handle the delicate balance between scholarship, teaching, and outside responsibilities (Kuther, 2003).

**Competitive Environment**

A few participants felt that doctoral students in general do not pay attention to other graduate students’ thoughts and opinions. More specifically, these students struggled
between the balance of acculturation and maintaining their own culture. This barrier made these students uncomfortable, because they felt that they were forced to become competitive doctoral students by their PW-IHE in order to be successful in their doctoral studies. This finding is consistent with Lin and Yi’s (1997) finding which suggests that Asian international students feel uncomfortable with the individualism and the competitive environment associated with the American academic culture. This is because Asian culture emphasizes collectiveness as opposed to competition and individualisms (Triandis et al., 1988; Wan, 2001). These participants had in their cross cultural shifts experiences between collectivism and individualism associated with their doctoral programs. Cross cultural shift experiences refer to a shift in emphasis toward meaning of human activity and the symbolic structure that give such activity significance from one culture to another culture (Portes & Rambaut, 2001). Portes and Rambaut (2001) revealed that cultural shift may become a bicultural existence barrier which international students are expected to engage in different kinds of environment (e.g., APA doctoral program at PW-IHE). Thus, these participants identified that fellow graduate students’ individualism within doctoral programs transform to the competitive environment at these PW-IHE.

Analytical Generalization of these Findings to Assimilation Theory

In accord with assimilation theory, these Asian international APA doctoral students experienced a cross cultural phenomenon of both their own culture and another culture (American culture). Looking at the phenomenon from both sides generated a deeper understanding and explanation of their experiences. These students explained these phenomena as barriers associated with adjusting, but not fully assimilating and in some
cases resisting assimilation into the APA programs’ cultures at these PW-IHE. Assimilation is the decline at the endpoint the disappearance of a racial/ethnic distinction and cultural and social differences between intergroup relationships (Gordon, 1964). These participants experienced cultural differences for which they considered as obstacles to them completing their doctoral studies successfully.

**Theme Four: Identity, Political, Cultural, and Diversity Awareness**

*Descriptions and Discussion of Identity, Political, Cultural, and Diversity Awareness*

The fourth major theme was identity, political, cultural, and diversity awareness which captures the participants’ enhanced personal identity awareness, social and academic identity, and sociopolitical issues with other Asian international students, holding students’ own cultural values and beliefs, and learning about diversity.

In this study, most participants spoke of their respect for their own cultural backgrounds and had a strong sense of nationalism including their cultural, political, social, and religious values and beliefs throughout their doctoral programs. For example, Hang-Meeng and Tayfun thought that holding their own religious values helped them to continue their doctoral studies. Although, Hang-Meeng decided to change his church from a Korean to an American church for improving his language proficiency and enhancing his social life, he was conscientious of Korean identity relative to his religious beliefs. But there were social, cultural, and political tensions for some students. For example, Sin-Hong and Yi-San discussed socio-cultural and political issues between Asian international students. Socio-cultural and political issues within Asian groups (e.g., between Taiwanese and Chinese international students) was caused for social tension
even though they spoke the same language. For Hiroshi, learning about diversity such as historical, cultural, political, and social contexts with students from different backgrounds was beneficial. For these participants, they held a strong sense of nationalism, but they were incongruent in terms of what they felt it meant to be Asian.

*Identity Awareness*

Some students recognized that their identities were stable through their doctoral programs. “Personal identity refers to self conceptions in terms of unique and individualistic characteristics” (Abrams, Ando, & Hinkle, 1998, p.1028). This awareness enabled these Asian international APA doctoral students to maintain their social and national identities in order to complete their doctoral studies. Gonzalez et al. (2001) found that Latina and Latino doctoral students experienced “enduring identity changes” from their own ethnic identity to American identity. However, the current participants resisted changing from their own personal and social identity to American identity throughout their APA doctoral programs. More specifically, these students distinguished their own identity from the PW-IHE environment in the sense that they maintained some elements of their ethnic or national heritage. To the degree to which Asian ethnicities or nationalism were maintained or varied was dependent on the students’ circumstances such as the degree to which ethnic customs were practiced at home; attendance at ethnic high school or undergraduate program experiences (Fukuoka, 2006). Moreover, in these cases the students also had a strong sense of their national identity. Consequently, they did not seek to assimilate into the dominant culture of their doctoral programs at these PW-IHE, but they attempted to adjust to their APA doctoral programs while holding onto
their own personal and social identities. This identity awareness promoted unity among Asian international students at their respective universities. As a result of their enhanced identity awareness, they were strongly critical of PW-IHE culture and felt no enduring attachment to it.

Social and Academic Identity

These students reflected on their social and academic strengths and weaknesses associated with their doctoral programs and used various strategies to improve their academic performance. Social identity derived from ethnic group membership for these students (Abrams et al., 1998). This awareness motivated these students to help each other in academic matters leading to success in their APA doctoral programs. Academic identity refers to a combination between students’ processes and evaluations of self academic relevant information as they construct their self – identity (Berzonsky, 1998). These students emphasized three different academic strengths and weaknesses associated with their doctoral studies, these were: (a) some students have research strengths (e.g., statistical applications) associated with their research projects, (b) they had strength in collaboration with other Asian doctoral students to help improve their academic weaknesses, and (c) they had weaknesses associated with English language mostly in reading text books, writing papers, and presenting in-class assignments. These students used two different strategies, which were acceptance and judgment to improve their academic performance. This finding is consistent with Wan’s (2001) findings that there are two different levels of acceptance between Asian international students such as (a) “just friends” and (b) “good friends.”
The term “just friends” refers to activity companions but “friends” who do not share intimate information (e.g., academic issues and concerns) with each other. The term “good friends” are those who share an intimate and spiritual connection. In assimilation theory, when social distance between intragroup relationships is low, there is a feeling of common identity, closeness, and shared experiences. In the current cases, the students evaluated and criticized other Asian international students’ academic assignments with each other, which means that they were close enough to judge each other and they believed each other important enough to judge. Thus, these students used two different strategies such as acceptance and judgment for enhancing their academic performance via each other.

Political Issues between Asian International Students

The socio-cultural and political tension between Asian international students strongly influenced their sense of national identity during their doctoral studies. This awareness made some Asian international APA doctoral students and their families feel maligned from their own socio-cultural and political values and beliefs by other Asian international student groups. They felt that political issues between Asian international students were distracting to their living experiences. Therefore, they were concerned that these issues would adversely affect their families. Gordon’s (2000) definition of identity refers to “the condition of being a specified person or thing.” Similarly, Giddens (1991) also described identity as the ongoing sense the self has of who it is, as conditioned through its ongoing interaction with others. Identity is how self conceives of itself, and label itself. Reflective of these definitions by Gordon (2000) and Giddens (1999), students across current cases
defined their identity as “Asian” geographically. But, they were not in agreement in defining themselves demographically, because of political, social, and cultural conflicts within various Asian countries. These students represented some contradictions between Asian ethnicity and nationalism (Japanese, South Korean, Taiwanese, and Turkish). Two Taiwanese students, for example, explained their identity choice as either being Taiwanese or Chinese. They discussed the issue of Taiwanese international students’ social relationships with Chinese students. The Taiwanese students were verbally harassed with unethical and discriminative comments by Chinese international students. This finding is consistent with Lin’s (2003) findings that bi-national conflict identity of Taiwanese international students result from political tensions between Taiwan and China which negatively influence students’ perceptions. Some Chinese international students with a strong Chinese identity are accused of lack of love and loyalty to Taiwan. On the other hand, Taiwanese international students with a strong Taiwanese identity are charged with ignoring her or his cultural heritage (Lin, 2003). Thus in these cases, the students emphasized that political issues often adversely influence their intragroup social relationships of Asian international students at these PW-IHE.

*Holding Students’ Own Cultural Values and Beliefs*

Feeling marginalized as “outsider,” these students held their own cultural and religious values and beliefs while attending APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE. Asian international APA doctoral students’ own cultural values and beliefs obligated them to graduate from their APA doctoral programs at these PW-IHE, because they were expected to become a leader of APA in higher education by their native countries. This
finding is consistent with Gonzalez et al.’s (2001) findings that minority students have some degree of “outsider experiences” in doctoral programs at PW-IHE. More specifically, minority students often sense a lack of belonging and acceptance in PW-IHE (Gonzalez et al., 2001). In the current cases, the students explained that their religious values and beliefs helped them to continue within their doctoral studies programs even though they were marginalized or had an “outsider” status. Gordon (1964) noted assimilation theorists often use the term “selective assimilation” to describe ethnic cultural and religious values, beliefs, and practices which support the tendencies of minority students such as Asian international doctoral students participation in mainstream PW-IHE. In selective assimilation, students retain certain cultural and religious values, beliefs, and practices at the same time that they engage in selected mainstream practices of their host society. Gordon’s (1967) description helps to explain why these Asian international students resist assimilating beyond language and academic requirements, in these PW-IHE environments. Even though their cultural values and beliefs might adversely influence their academic performance, they maintained their own cultural values and beliefs because of their sense of hope associated with their cultural and religious values from their own countries and this helped them to survive their doctoral studies at these PW-IHE. Thus, these students minimized “cultural shifts” in their experiences throughout their doctoral studies. Beyond this, the students’ sense of hope helped them continue to survive within their doctoral programs.
**Learning about Diversity**

These students felt that communicating and understanding more about diversity with students from different backgrounds was important. This awareness made these Asian international students believe that their experiences studying abroad were their chance to better appreciate their own identities as well as respect other students’ cultural values and beliefs through their doctoral studies. During this opportunity, they established friendships and exchange partnerships such as conducting some projects together and establishing exchange programs after they complete their doctoral studies. This finding is consistent with Milem and Hakuta’s (2000) assertion that students who are exposed to diverse ideas and people were more motivated and more engaged in higher level thinking of new ideas, new knowledge, and peer interactions were most important. In the current cases, the participants mostly had social relationships and peer friendships with other Asian international students, but only friendly interactions with other students as part of their experiences. This finding lends support to Gordon’s (1967) description that social assimilation is the process by which students or academic advisors of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying PW-IHE, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a common existence. The students in this multiple-case study, believed that understanding different social, cultural, and political contexts of students from different backgrounds helped them to benefit even more from their own cultural solidarity throughout their APA doctoral programs at these PW-IHE. They mostly engaged in intragroup relationships with other Asian international students within PW-IHE.
Thus, these students by and large failed to have intergroup relationships with other students from different ethnic backgrounds, particularly White American graduate students.

Analytical Generalization of these Findings of Assimilation Theory

According to Gordon (1964), identity assimilation is developing a sense of respect among and between both White American and Asian groups requiring the extinctions of any form of ethnic and national identity. Likewise, findings in the current cases indicate that these students were aware of their identity, their own cultural values and beliefs, and the importance of diversity awareness throughout their doctoral studies. Nonetheless, these students resisted assimilating their identity to the White dominant culture at these PW-IHE, because their cultural and religious values and beliefs sustained them to continue their doctoral studies. Although they believed that diversity awareness is important for their intergroup relationships, losing their own personal and cultural identity (i.e., becoming Americanized) was considered a dangerous behavior like painting other colors over their own colors. These students revealed that “birds of a feather flock together,” which means they actively sought to support other Asian international students for their emotional stability while attending their APA doctoral programs. The phrase “birds of a feather flock together” – suggest that people who are a lot alike tend to gather together and become friends (Wikipedia dictionary, 2006). These students were aware of the importance of their own identities, cultures, and diversities throughout their doctoral studies. Therefore, they resisted assimilating or losing their own cultural and ethnic identities to the dominant culture at these PW-IHE.
Answers to Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. This section explicitly answers the three major research questions in this study.

Research Question 1

How do Asian international APA doctoral students experience American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

Findings from the current cases suggest that Asian international APA doctoral students’ experiences are strongly influenced by American graduate education norms at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. In these cases, Asian international doctoral students had various language barriers such as reading text books, writing papers, and presenting their class assignments in front of their classmates throughout their doctoral studies. These language barriers adversely influenced their academic experiences. More specifically, these students had three different dimensions (i.e., cognitive, behavioral, and relational) of their academic experiences (Suarez – Orozco, Suares- Orozco, & Douset, 2004) associated with their language barriers. Those dimensions were that they had: (a) difficulties mastering new academic materials (cognitive dimension), with one exception, because of their low language proficiency and their low explanation skills using English as a second language; (b) difficulties engaging in the behaviors necessary to do well in academic activities such as participation in class discussions and completing their assignments (behavioral dimension); and (c) difficulties finding supportive relationships
with White American classmates (relational dimension), although they had positive and supportive relationships with other Asia international doctoral students. Despite language barriers and lack of support from White peers, these students believed that collaborating with other Asian international doctoral students to support their academic progress lead to their success within their doctoral programs.

**Research Question 2**

How and to what degree do Asian international APA doctoral student assimilate into American graduate education at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

The major findings in the study suggest that Asian international APA doctoral students assimilate their language and academic behaviors into American graduate education. However, they mostly resisted assimilating their beliefs, values, and behaviors beyond language and academic development. However, one student overtly attempted to assimilate beyond language into his APA doctoral program at his PW-IHE. The other students resisted cultural assimilation into their respective PW-IHE, But, they did attempt to adjust to the environment, because they could not solve their adjustment issues and concerns such as language and cultural differences without assimilating to their academic environment. Moreover, these students strongly cultivated their national identities as well as cultural and religious values and beliefs while matriculating at these PW-IHE. That is, these students attempted to became suitable, adjustable, and fitable members of their APA doctoral programs at their respective PW-IHE while maintaining their cultural identities. However, one student attempted to overtly assimilate beyond his language. This student mentioned that he wanted to become an American student rather than a
Korean international student, because he believed that improving his language proficiency and social interaction was necessary to complete his doctoral program successfully. Thus, he changed his place of worship from a Korean church where was Christianity way practiced to an American church where Catholicism was practiced, at the risk losing his traditional Korean religious values and beliefs.

Research Question 3

How are Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives on graduate education impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference?

The major findings in this study reveal that Asian international APA doctoral students felt as if they were outsiders throughout their doctoral studies at these PW-IHE. More specifically, they perceive themselves as not belonging or accepted in these PW-IHE (Gonzalez et al., 2001), because they had a combination of language barriers and cultural shift experiences between Asian and American cultures. A few students believed that the culture at PW-IHE is very competitive. American students were very independent, individually oriented, and competitive. But, these seven Asian international students felt uncomfortable with individualism and competitiveness associated with American culture, because their native cultures emphasize the importance of harmony, respect, and collectivity of group dynamics (Abrams et al., 1998; Triandis et al., 1988). Thus, these students struggled to adjust to American culture at PW-IHE. Therefore, they maintained their own cultural and religious values and beliefs which cultivated in their own native countries while attending their APA doctoral programs.
Overall Analytical Generalizations

Of importance, the major themes from the current case studies of Asian international doctoral students matriculating at PW-IHE are analytically generalizable (Yin, 2003) in across with assimilation theory (Gordon, 1964). In this multiple case study, assimilation theory was used to situate Asian international doctoral students potential for changing their cultural patterns, beliefs, and behaviors (i.e., assimilate) as they matriculated within APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE in the Big Ten Conference. Gordon (1964) described assimilation theory as consisting of acculturation. In these cases, acculturation would be reflected in the degree to which Asian international doctoral students adopt the dominant cultural patterns of their APA doctoral programs at their respective PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. Gordon (1964) stated that cultural patterns extend beyond the acquisition of the English language to dress and outward emotional expressions, and to personal values. In this study, there was no effort by all seven participants to adopt the dominant cultural patterns except language and academic performance at these PW-IHE. Participants held respect for their own cultures and maintained their identities, religions, and nationalism while they attended the APA doctoral programs at the respective PW-IHE. Moreover, findings indicated that although the participants had positive social relationships with other Asian international students, there was negative social distance between them and their White American graduate student peers at these PW-IHE. However, all seven participants learned to proficiently communicate in the English language since it was necessary to do so to be academically successful in doctoral programs in the USA.
Assimilation theory consists of social assimilation (Park, 1930), acculturation, and identity assimilation (Gordon, 1964). Social assimilation refers to a process or processes by which people of diverse racial origins and different cultural heritages, occupying a common territory, achieve a cultural solidarity sufficient at least to sustain a national existence. These students’ interactions with USA White American students, in comparison to other Asian international APA doctoral students, were less personal and more difficult, and there were limited cross-cultural communications with respect to this distinction among USA White American and Asians. In fact, these students felt some degree of discrimination and marginalization toward them from USA White American graduate student groups at their respective PW-IHE. In contrast, these students developed positive social and peer relationships with other Asian international APA doctoral students within these PW-IHE, because they had similar cultural values and beliefs. Thus, they choose to interact with other Asian international doctoral students (intragroup relationships), while they resisted assimilating within intergroup relationships with USA White American graduate students.

In assimilation theory, acculturation is defined as the level to which individuals incorporate language, values, and practices of a new culture (Monzo & Rueda, 2006). In all, findings across the current cases indicate that these students linguistically and academically adjusted and acculturated to their APA doctoral programs at these PW-IHE. More specifically, these students attempted to meet their APA doctoral programs’ academic expectations by continuously improving their language proficiency with various strategies such as using multiple language support services on campus. Thus, they
attempted to adjust to APA doctoral programs, but again resisted assimilating beyond language and academic aspects. For example, one student actively sought to acculturate toward the dominant culture, because he believed that it was necessary to complete his doctoral program successfully. This student’s acculturation pattern extended beyond the acquisition of English language to understanding American cultural values and beliefs by changing his church from a Korean to an American church. Moreover, this student spoke of wanting to become an American, because he believed that if he could become an American, he may not have any language barriers in reading text books, writing papers, and presenting class assignments.

Identity assimilation has taken on importance in the contemporary discussions of assimilation with respect to both Asian international doctoral students and USA White American graduate students and faculty members at PW-IHE (Gordon, 1964). Findings from the present cases support the assertion that these Asian international doctoral students were aware of their identities, cultural beliefs and values, and the importance of diversity during their doctoral studies. Stated differently, these students resisted assimilating their identity to the dominant culture, because their cultural and religious values and beliefs sustained them to continue their doctoral studies at their respective PW-IHE. Although they believed that diversity awareness is important for their intergroup relationships, not losing their own identity (becoming Americanized) was important to avoid the dangerous behavior like “painting other colors over their own colors.” These students’ interactions were as “birds of a feather flocking together” because for them this was providing emotional support for one another (Asian
international students) while attending the APA doctoral programs at their respective PW-IHE. The phrase “birds of a feather flock together” – suggesting that people who are a lot alike tend to gather together and become friends fits this finding. These students were aware of the importance of their own identity, political, cultural, and diversity awareness throughout their doctoral studies. Therefore, they resisted assimilating their own identity to the dominant culture at PW-IHE.

**Implications**

Implications relevant to findings from this explanatory multiple-case study are presented in this section. Specifically, this section discusses four major implications associated with the research questions and major thematic findings. First, across cases it was uncovered that Asian international APA doctoral students had varying experiences while matriculating in American graduate programs at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. Most of these students struggled with language barriers, academic challenges, and time demands. Moreover, the students had both positive and negative experiences and relationships with their academic advisors. These findings raise the question: What can be done to help Asian international doctoral students succeed academically in graduate programs at PW-IHE?

Second, across cases, these Asian international APA doctoral students did assimilate in their language and academic expectations in order to succeed in American graduate programs at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. But, they mostly resisted assimilating their personal and social identities, nationalism, beliefs, religious practices, and cultural values. Of concern, these Asian international students experienced varying
degrees of social isolation, marginalization, and even discrimination in their interactions with some White American students. However, they sought support from other Asian international students at their respective institutions. These findings raise two questions. First, what can be done to help Asian international APA doctoral students establish positive and meaningful relationships with faculty, advisors, and American peers? Second, how can Asian international doctoral students overcome various language, academic, social, cultural, and financial barriers?

Third, findings across cases show that Asian international APA doctoral students’ perspectives were both favorably and adversely impacted while attending graduate school at PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference. These students felt as if they were outsiders while matriculating in their doctoral programs at their respective PW-IHE. They had a sense of not belonging because their White peers at times showed a lack of acceptance of them, plus there were language barriers and cultural differences between their Asian cultures and the competitive American culture at the PW-IHE where they attended. These findings prompt the question: What should APA programs at PW-IHE do to support all students, including Asian international doctoral students come to a greater awareness of their personal and cultural identities and to appreciate and value the diverse identities of others? Each of the preceding questions is described in greater detail below with implication and recommendations.
What Can be Done to Help Asian International Doctoral Students Succeed Academically?

Findings in these case studies suggest that Asian international APA doctoral students believe that Asian cultural, academic, and linguistic characteristics may have adversely affected their academic performance. For example, they may be required to take more ESL courses to officially enroll in APA doctoral courses, may have difficulties maintaining a certain GPA, and may lose their funding from their institutions. Scholars assert that an intimate link between language and culture plays a role in communication and learning style (Oak, 2003; Regan, 1998; Robinson, 2003; Suh, 1999). Language reflects the culture of society as well as the social interactions within the society and the outside world. Cultural influences on Asian educational values and learning style are highly idealized and follow hierarchical rules. For instance, Asian international students are not taught to engage in reciprocal dialogue with their academic advisors or other faculty members (Martin, 2003). Thus, a lack of understanding of cultural differences (e.g., values and beliefs) can lead to miscommunication and confusion (Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006). To solve this issue, six recommendations were suggested by Charles and Stewart (1991), and Lee and Carrasquillo (2006).

First, there is a call for in-service staff development for academic advisors and other faculty members at PW-IHE in the area of multicultural education. More specifically, since an American way of thinking, teaching, and learning differs than that in various Asian countries, faculty members can better provide an appropriate learning environment both in and out of the classroom when they are familiar with the background of their
Asian international students. Plausibly as when American faculty members better understand Asian international doctoral students’ culture, language, and typical learning styles, they may be better able to understand their behaviors and avoid misunderstandings and misinterpretations. In addition, mutual understanding of students’ cultural, language, and learning style differences can help create a more positive learning atmosphere for Asian international doctoral students who leave their homelands and come to study in the USA with a completely different culture and language (Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006).

Second, Asian international doctoral students should receive from their doctoral program or department, an orientation, accompanied with written literature on what to expect in PW-IHE doctoral programs in APA in terms of cultural, learning, and linguistic expectations (Lee & Carrasquillo, 2006), because many international students often have academic performance anxiety, and pressure from academic demands (Lin & Yi, 1997).

Third, advisors should make ensure that Asian international doctoral students take an English support course if it is offered at their university, and encourage them to take at least one English proficiency course even if it is optional. Althen (1983) stated that “students whose English proficiency seem adequate for a regular academic program often need an English support course or courses in order to function more efficiently in the classroom” (p.163).

Fourth, advisors need to assess Asian international doctoral students’ articulation and comprehension skills during advisor-student conferences, because of the differences between Asian and English languages. The way English is taught in Asian countries contributes to the limited proficiency of Asian international students in articulation and
comprehension of English (Wan, 2001). Thus, advisors need to evaluate how much these Asian international students can represent their ideas and understand the conversations with them. Articulation skills may be easier to assess than comprehension skills. However, nonverbal cues may also be indicators of extent of the student’s comprehension. It should be pointed out that asking closed-ended questions such as “do you understand?” may not be the best way to determine whether the student understands or not. In many Asian cultures, for example, in order to “save face” or be polite, the individual may nod his or her head or smile in approval even if that person may not have completely understood (Eisen, 1986).

Fifth, advisors should immediately refer students to the English as a second language (ESL) program or the English or writing department if they require additional assistance in improving their English skills (Charles & Stewart, 1991). For example, English departments often conduct research on international students’ language proficiency in transferring from Asian language ideographic system to English alphabetic system for writing, reading, and speaking. Thus, English departments may be able to respond efficiently to Asian international students’ language barriers (Charles & Stewart, 1991).

Sixth, advisors in consultation with their Asian international advisee(s) should design a lighter course load if their students’ schedules demand a great deal of reading and note taking. This is especially important if the student’s level of English proficiency is significantly low enough to hinder his or her learning. In the event that designing a lighter course load may mean dropping a student from full-time to part-time status, the academic
advisor should inform the international student services office of this decision. This should be done to ensure that the student is in good standing with Immigration Service Regulations (Charles & Stewart, 1991).

What Can be Done in Helping Asian International APA Doctoral Students Establish Positive and Meaningful Relationships with Faculty, Advisors, and American Peers?

In these case studies, findings suggest that the amount of social distance between the Asian international APA doctoral students and their White American peers was significant. However, these Asian international students expected and desired greater contact with White American graduate students. But, their lack of interaction was associated with White American students’ negative beliefs about Asian international students social and academic capabilities. These students perceive that White American graduate students were uninterested in initiating contact with them. Thus, APA doctoral programs must use various strategies to promote intercultural activities for enhancing positive social relationships between Asian international students and White American graduate students.

According to Ward (2001), there are three different implications necessary to develop positive and meaning relationships between Asian international students and White American graduate students. First, Asian international students and White American graduate students should meet with regularity outside the classroom environments for one to one collaborations (e.g., working together on research projects or presentations of class assignments). These types of activities would help to enhance their academic performance, it may also increase intercultural interactions and cultural awareness.
between them. Second, Asian international students and American graduate students need to increase their willingness to work with members of other groups. Intercultural cooperative group learning helps to improve students’ academic performance and to foster intercultural friendships at PW-IHE (Ward, 2001). Third, Asian international students and White American graduate students should engage in activities within their residences. This opportunity may increase intercultural knowledge, more intercultural interactions, and a greater number of intercultural friendships.

To enhance positive academic relationships between a diverse cohort of students, faculty, and their advisors, Gonzalez et al. (2001) describe two important implications. First, faculty members and advisors need to open up to various ways of supporting and nurturing students’ diverse views and identities. More specifically, faculty members and advisors should encourage student in conducting valid research topics that associate with students’ ethnicities and politics. Second, faculty members and academic advisors also should regularly communicate with student support services at their PW-IHE to facilitate the development of Asian international student organizations which might help them create safe environments where these students can engage in dialogue about their doctoral experiences.

*How Can Asian International Doctoral Students or overcome Various Language, Academic, and Financial Barriers?*

In the current cases, the students who did not receive any funding contend that financial considerations may have an impact on students’ activities within PW-IHE. This finding highlights a better need to understand how Asian international doctoral students
who come from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds fit into the opportunity structure (Walpore, 2003). There were four implications recommended by Walpore and Gonzalez et al. (2001) to help students overcome such barriers. One recommendation is that doctoral programs and faculty members need to recognize the unique challenges that a diverse group of students face in attending PW-IHE, particularly in relation to balancing socioeconomic challenges, academic challenges, and various other demands and activities (Walpore, 2003). Faculty members and academic advisors also can help try to find jobs for students and encourage them get involved and stay involved with faculty and student groups within their doctoral programs.

Nettle (1993) indicated that personal finance may contribute to lower grade point averages and cause less interaction of Asian international students with faculty members including their academic advisors. Having a graduate assistantship or fellowship puts students in direct working relationship with faculty members and gives faculty members and students common work interests, thus allowing them to develop a working relationship. Fellowships and assistantships can also lead to the development of personal relationships between faculty and students. Third, Asian international students need to find part-time jobs associated with the APA profession. Astin (1993) described positive affects on international students who had worked part-time on campus. Research on how much and where students are working and the effect of that work on their involvement in outside department activities also could be important for students (Walpore, 2003). Additionally, such experiences provide more detail information on their educational and career choices for students without funding (Berger, Milem, & Paulsen, 1998; Domhoff,
1983; Hoffnung & Sack, 1981; McDonough, Antonio, & Horvat, 1996). For example, these Asian international students were required to complete their cognate area of study (e.g., therapeutic recreation or special education) during their doctoral studies. These students could have contacted the human resource office to ask for help to find some part-time jobs which relate to their cognate area of study. Lastly, with regard to future doctoral students, choosing the best institution may have a lot to do with the support they receive and the interconnection of their identities, the attractiveness of a financial aid, the prestige of an institution, and the presence of a distinguished professor. For example, future Asian international doctoral students may (a) need to understand their research interests, (b) find a distinguish scholar who can relate to their research interests, (c) ask about what types of support services are available to help them to maintain their own cultural and religious values and beliefs (e.g., multicultural education center, or Asian international student services), and (d) ask about financial supports such as GTA positions.

*What Should APA Programs at PW-IHE do to Support All Students Come to a Greater Awareness of their Personal and Cultural Identities and to Appreciate and Value the Diverse Identities of Others?*

APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE need to offer ways to facilitate Asian international students’ adjustment to their new environment which should include culturally sensitive proactive programming. According to Lin and Yi (1997), there are three different implications necessary to respond to students’ academic, cultural, and social issues and concerns associated with their doctoral studies. These implications are (a) pre-arrival
adjustment, (b) initial adjustment, and (c) on-going adjustment. Pre-arrival adjustment is to prepare the necessary information before students’ arrival to reduce their anxiety and possible cultural shock upon arrival. APA doctoral programs need to offer information about the adjustment process, the US educational system, financial requirements, and housing information should be sent out to all prospective Asian international students prior to their arrival on campus. Alumni or students home visits are encouraged to hold a workshop for prospective students (Lin & Yi, 1997). Second, initial adjustment (approximately students’ arrival) is to continue orientating Asian international students and reduce their cultural shock. Activities such as picking up them at the airport, assisting students with moving in and finding housing, helping them orient to the community (e.g., food shopping, transportation system) and holding a welcoming gathering to network with other new arrivals could help in reducing the stress from the transition for these students (Lin & Yi, 1997).

APA doctoral programs need to emphasize to students the need to attend orientation programs for information on American culture, language, and university adjustment (Lin & Yi, 1997). For example, they need to inform them on matters regarding cultures and traditions of APA doctoral programs, financial planning and resources, counseling services, writing centers, multicultural education centers, graduate teaching associate development centers, and library guidance. Further, assisting them with finding networking opportunities, mentors, and conversation partners could help Asian international students with their transition. The third component, ongoing adjustment, is to help international students avoid bi-cultural conflicts to achieve a balance between
participating in the new APA doctoral program culture and maintaining their own cultural and religious identities (Lin & Yi, 1997). Furthermore, APA doctoral programs need to emphasize the importance of Asian international students belonging to social networks. It is important to network with other students from their own native countries or same ethnic backgrounds since they will likely provide a setting where cultural values can be expressed more freely. It is also important to network with other graduate students. This multi-cultural networking between Asian international students and other graduate students can facilitate academic aspirations of the students. Asian international students may need to have a network of friends and acquaintances for companionship for recreational activity again with other graduate students.

APA doctoral programs should encourage these students to attend specialized programs that have opportunities for Asian international students to practice their English while exchanging cultural information with other graduate students (Lin & Yi, 1997). APA doctoral programs need to emphasize these opportunities to Asian international students at PW-IHE.

**Recommendations and Future Research**

Findings in this study uncover a number of issues derived from individual cases and cross-case analysis on the assimilation of Asian international doctoral students in APA programs within the Big Ten conference. The following section presents recommendations and suggestions for future research.
Recommendations

1. Lucas, Henze, and Donato (1990) identified three factors as related to successful outcome with students who used English as a second language. Doctoral programs in APA need to emphasize: (a) advisor’s development explicitly designed to help faculty members serve Asian international doctoral students more effectively, (b) counseling programs, and academic programs for reading, writing, and presenting, (c) academic advisors and advisees’ academic relationship seminars, cultural adjustment seminars, and diversity education courses to provide special attention to Asian international doctoral students throughout faculty [who understand those students linguistically as well as culturally], and (d) faculty members who share a strong commitment such as communicating effectively with other faculty members who have Asian international doctoral students to empower Asian international doctoral students through doctoral education.

2. There are some Asian international doctoral students in APA programs within the Big Ten Conference who do poorly and are seen as misfits and atypical of their educational experiences (Lee, 1996). Doctoral programs need to require Asian international doctoral students in APA to use university support services such as English language tutoring, assistance in reading, presenting and writing, college or university career counseling, and orientation to an educational system (Park & Chi, 1999).
Moreover, Asian international doctoral students who were assigned to their
graduate assistantships also need to use faculty and teaching assistant
development centers (Lin & Yi, 1997).

3. Doctoral programs need to consider the psychological affects of academic
programs on Asian international doctoral students. Allen (1992) recommended
four different components of Asian international doctoral students’ success in
regard to social and psychological factors in higher education which were that:
doctoral programs need to consider (a) supportive relationships (e.g., conducting
weekly or monthly discussions of students’ academic issues and concerns) with
advisors and advisees; (b) social outlets and friends (e.g., conducting physical
activity events for all graduate students and faculty members); (c) Asian
international doctoral students’ self-confidence and self-esteem (e.g.,
recommending them for their participation to present their research projects at
some international and national conventions); and (d) psychological comfort for a
greater sense of belonging (e.g., conducting multicultural seminars).

4. In assimilation theory, the ideal is to create doctoral programs where students and
faculty of every cultural, racial, or national background feel welcome and are
encouraged to reach their highest potential. Doctoral programs in APA need to
consider how best to create positive conditions in academic environments for
Asian international doctoral students. Allport (1956) discussed conditions
necessary to promote positive attitudes and interactions across intergroups
relationships, these were: (a) an equal status environment for diverse peers, such
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as in classrooms and in co-curricular activities; (b) a social climate that supports interracial associations (e.g., Offices of Equity and Diversity), especially modeled by authority figures such as faculty, college administrators, and graduate assistants; (c) contact among diverse groups such as international doctoral students and American doctoral students, and faculty members that lead to in-depth knowledge and understandings of each other similarities and differences; and (d) opportunities for collaborating on research projects, for example between groups such as international doctoral students and American doctoral students, and faculty members to work collaboratively to achieve common goals (Allport, 1954).

5. Ladson-Billings (1994) suggested that teachers need to become culturally sensitive. For example, academic advisors should learn brief greetings in students’ native languages or students’ historical, political, and cultural contexts which would allow Asian international doctoral students to choose both academic success and maintain their own cultural identities.

6. Asian international students’ culture is often ignored, because American faculty members are unable to see elements of Asian international students’ cultures in their own lives (Peng, 2001). Thus, Talbert – Johnson and Tillman (1999) asserted that problems related to ethnicity at PW-IHE may minimize when the number of international faculty who attend to equity issues in higher education increase. Thus, doctoral programs in APA should have more Asian international faculty.
7. Doctoral programs in APA need to understand that more diversity among life experiences and knowledge perspectives of Asian international doctoral students can create an enriched intellectual climate and enhances the education of all doctoral students and faculty members (Villege & Lucas, 2002). Doctoral programs in APA need to require students to enroll in at least one diversity course. This opportunity may help students become more culturally sensitive. Moreover, these graduates may be able to present on their doctoral academic experiences and life experiences relative to diversity issues and concerns to American faculty members within their PW-IHE.

8. Faculty members need to conduct group advising sessions which would provide opportunities for Asian international students to interact with other international students to share ideas, feelings and concerns. They may be able to share common information with a number of international students in APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE. Doctoral programs in APA can offer this opportunity for international students at orientation with the input and participation of other Asian international students, because second or third year international doctoral students’ experiences may help to develop first year doctoral students’ rapport.

Suggestions for Future Research

1. Findings of this explanatory (holistic) multiple case study design are based on data provided by only seven Asian international doctoral students within the Big Ten conference; therefore, it is recommended that this study be replicated in different academic conferences with different graduate programs in APA and
across various geographical regions. This case study method could be used so that findings and data interpretations could be compared and contrasted. Analytical generalizations situated in assimilation theory (Gordon, 1964) from several studies would confirm or contrast what we now know about assimilation of Asian international doctoral students in APA. It would be also informative to replicate this study at various institutions beyond the Big Ten Conference.

2. In this explanatory (holistic) multiple case study, all participants were Asian international students who attended doctoral programs within the Big Ten Conference, thus future related research should investigate students from diverse ethnic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds with varying levels of experience to describe and explain American or international graduate students’ assimilation. For example, African American and Latino graduate students may have different types of assimilation from those of Asian international doctoral students in APA.

3. Research using mixed methods (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) should be conducted to examine the extent of assimilating by Asian international doctoral students in APA, because different research designs may be able to describe and explain their meaningful experiences from the designs.

4. There is limited research on Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation in PW-IHE. Therefore, many institutions and faculty members have failed to recognize and examine the cultural conflicts students must cope with in the acculturation (cultural assimilation) and educational achievement process.
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Future research needs to examine institutions and faculty members’ stereotypes of Asian international doctoral students in higher education including APA.

5. This study indicated that participants who struggled socioeconomically (e.g., did not receive funding from their university) had less social interaction with other White American doctoral students and faculty members (Walpore, 2003). Future research may be able to address this issue, and also study whether or not the acquisition of participants’ social mobility has an effect beyond doctoral programs in APA.

6. Several Asian international doctoral students in this study reported social isolation, a lack of social experiences with faculty members including their advisors, and a lack of collegiality with other doctoral students. Future research is needed to examine socialization process of Asian international doctoral students within their academic careers (Nettle, 1993).

7. Findings in this explanatory (holistic) multiple case study indicate that most of the Asian international doctoral students in APA had difficulties in language acquisition throughout their doctoral studies. Thus, future research need to examine the details of how language shapes and is shaped by diverse cultural experiences through graduates doctoral programs at PW-IHE.

Conclusions

Findings from this study lead to the conclusion that these Asian international doctoral students had various experiences and perspectives within their APA doctoral programs at
two PW-IHE in the Midwestern USA. Several conclusions are reached based on findings from the current multiple-case study and the extent literature. These conclusions are enumerated below.

1. The Asian international doctoral students had various types of academic experiences associated with their language barriers. The Asian international doctoral students described language as a primary barrier which became a key factor of their academic experiences whether they would or would not be able to complete their doctoral studies successfully. These students required courage, determination, and persistent to succeed (Wan, 2001). There are many cultural elements that these students need to adjust to, get used to, learn or unlearn while they attend their APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE. Farrell and Jones (1988) described language, behaviors, and values of international students as likely to be substantially different from White American students. These Asian international students with low language proficiency or competencies experienced various degrees of marginalization and even discrimination within their doctoral programs. Therefore, APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE need to help students by providing a safe and supportive environment. Faculty members should proactively encourage White American graduate students to establish friendships with them so they will get to know the PW-IHE culture sooner and better.

2. The advisor and advisee academic relationship is crucial to the successful completion of Asian international students’ doctoral studies. These doctoral students believed that the advisor and advisee relationship brings much of what they needed to know about being faculty members at the university level. Along these lines, Whitt (1991)
stated that doctoral students are expected to have prior socialization in research and teaching, appropriate values, expectations, work habits, and a research orientation. These seven Asian international students believed that lack of research knowledge and skills by students themselves were insufficient to make a successful researcher. Therefore, academic advisors must ensure a supportive environment and serve as role models as this is critically important for advisees’ professional development (Whitt, 1991). In addition to providing needed financial assistance such as in graduate fellowships and assistantships are also important for Asian international doctoral students. Moreover, because there often are limited interactions between students and academic advisors, more effort should exerted to interact more regulating.

3. The Asian international doctoral students need to develop positive intergroup relationships in APA. These Asian international doctoral students were influenced by the reflection of themselves mirrored by White American graduate students (Winnicott, 1958). These students indicated some degree of “double consciousness” which is a sense of looking at one’s self through the eye of others, of measuring “one’s soul by the tape of the world” (Du Bois, 1986), and is an ideal in one “crowd body,” “whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder” (Du Bois, 1986). Thus, when White American graduate students recognize that Asian international doctoral students have low language proficiency or low communication skills, their outcome of intergroup relationships between Asian international students and White American graduate students become negative (Du Bois, 1986). As a result, these Asian international students perceived that their White American peers
excluded them from their social groups within the respective APA programs. Therefore, the Asian international students felt social isolation from White American graduate students. Bikle, Hakuta, and Billings (2004) also discussed how White American graduate students tended to favor other White American students over Asian international doctoral students. Amerin and Pena (2001) described that students tended to self segregate on the basis of language competencies whenever students were not grouped by their academic programs. In that view, these students had intergroup relationship issues related to communicating with White American graduate students who use English as first language. White American graduate students need to be made aware and become more sensitive to the specific needs of Asian international doctoral students that they bring into APA graduate programs at PW-IHE (Lewis et al., 2004).

4. **Cultural sensitivity is a crucial element in developing students’ feelings as the insider.** Cultural sensitivity is a fundamental element in advising and interacting with Asian international doctoral students. In the current study, the students demonstrated cultural differences in terms of their concept of time, their use of space, or their value orientations. Academic advisors and White American graduate students must have an attitude of caring (Barger & Mayo-Chamberlin, 1983) and have an interest in these students as individuals and as capable students (Charles & Stewart, 1991). Cultural sensitivity takes time and effort to develop. It involves an opening of one’s mind to different worldviews, as well as seeking deeper understandings of one’s own worldview. These Asian international students were well aware of the meanings of
nonverbal or verbal cues that convey intolerance and discomfort. We must remember that the presence of Asian international students in APA doctoral programs at PW-IHE represents a commitment that students achieve academically and respond accordingly in support of them.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

DOCTORAL EDUCATION AND CAREER PREPARATION

(GOLDE & DORE, 2004)
SECTION A: EXPERIENCES AS A GRADUATE STUDENT

To start with, we would like to learn about where you are in your doctoral program and about your dissertation research and advisor.

A1. What is your field of study? Select the one field that is closest to yours (check your cognate or minor).

_____ Physical Education _____ Motor Development
_____ APE          _____ Education
_____ Sport Management _____ Research Method
_____ Sport Humanity  _____ Health
_____ Sport Psychology _____ Athletic Training
_____ Exercise Science   _____ Other:

A2. When did you begin your current doctoral program? (If you are in a program where you first did a master’s and then continued in the Ph.D. program at the same institution list the start of the master’s years.)

Month ___________ 19 ___

A3. What has your pattern of enrollment been?

a. During academic years I have primarily enrolled (select one):

_____ Part-time
_____ Full-time

b. During summers I have primarily spent my time (select one):

_____ Enrolled
_____ Not enrolled, primarily doing work related to my doctoral program
_____ Not enrolled, primarily doing work not related to my doctoral program

c. I have taken at least one term off (excluding summer) during this doctoral program (select one):

_____ Yes
_____ No

A4. Tell us the name of your program and department: ________________________________
A5. A doctoral program has many requirements that students must fulfill. Typical requirements are listed here. Indicate if it is not a requirement of your program, if this requirement remains to be completed, or if you have completed this requirement. Circle the number that best applies. If you completed it, but it is not a requirement, circle 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Not a requirement in my program</th>
<th>Remains to be completed</th>
<th>I have completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Classes and coursework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Master’s degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Comprehensive exam in the middle of the program (also known as</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualifiers, comps, cumulative exams)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Written proposal of planned dissertation work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Oral defense of planned dissertation work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Required teaching or teaching assistant position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Advancement to candidacy (also known as achieving dissertator status)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Oral defense of completed dissertation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These next questions are about your advisor. Advisor means the one faculty member you have as your academic advisor, dissertation chair, or research supervisor whom you consider your primary formal advisor. If you have co-advisors, answer questions in reference to the one person with whom you work most closely.

A.6

Do you currently have an advisor?

_____ Yes

_____ No ➔ IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION B1.

A.7

Did you have an advisor immediately upon beginning the doctoral program? If your program started with a master’s degree, consider that the beginning of your doctoral program.

_____ Yes

_____ No
A.8

Tell us about your relationship with your advisor. Rate the extent to which each statement describes your relationship. Circle the number that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of my advisor, I would say:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I currently have the advisor I want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I am satisfied with the process by which I came to have my current advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The manner in which I came to work with my advisor is typical in this department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am satisfied with the amount and quality of time spent with my advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.9

Students and advisors match up in a variety of ways. Bearing in mind that the exact process you used may not be listed, select the one statement that best describes the way you matched up with your advisor.

_____ I came to this program planning to work with my advisor.

_____ I selected my advisor after I started the program.

_____ I switched to my advisor after I started the program; although I was initially with another advisor with whom I expected to complete my degree.

_____ I switched to my advisor after I started the program; most students are expected to make such a switch.

_____ I was assigned to my advisor. → IF ASSIGNED, SKIP TO QUESTION A13.
Students choose to work with a particular faculty member as their advisor for a variety of reasons. Rate the extent to which each statement describes why you chose your advisor. *Circle the number that best applies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I selected my advisor because she or he:</th>
<th>Not at all a reason</th>
<th>Minor reason</th>
<th>Major reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Is doing interesting research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Has a reputation for getting students through the process in a timely manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Had money to support me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Has intellectual interests that match mine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Will make sure I do a rigorous dissertation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Was recommended to me by other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Has a reputation for being a good researcher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Has a reputation for being a good teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Has a reputation for being a good advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Is knowledgeable in the techniques and methods I will employ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Was willing to take me on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Fosters a working environment I like in his/her research group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Can write a good recommendation letter that will carry my career a long way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Other. Specify:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many students consider other faculty members to be their mentors. For each of these statements, indicate the extent that it describes the behavior of your faculty mentor(s) who are not your advisor. Circle the number in the second column that best applies. If there is no other faculty member whom you consider a mentor leave A14 blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My advisor and other mentor(s):</th>
<th>Advisor</th>
<th>Mentor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Are available to me when I need help with my research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Are available to me when I need to talk about my program and my progress in the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Treat my ideas with respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Give me regular and constructive feedback on my research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teach me the details of good research practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Provide me with information about ongoing research relevant to my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Teach me survival skills for this field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Help me secure funding for my graduate studies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Help me develop professional relationships with others in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Assist me in writing presentations or publications.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Teach me to write grant and contract proposals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Advocate for me with others when necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Provide emotional support when I need it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Are sensitive to my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Take an interest in my personal life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Have my best interests at heart.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Care about me as a whole person—not just as a scholar.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisor and other mentor(s):</td>
<td>ADVISOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Provide direct assessments of my progress.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Would support me in any career path I might choose.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. See me as a source of labor to advance his/her research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Expect me to work so many hours that it is difficult for me to have a life outside of school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Give me regular and constructive feedback on my progress toward degree completion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Provide information about career paths open to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Solicit my input on matters of teaching and research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION B. DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DOCTORAL PROGRAM AND DEPARTMENT**

In this section we are interested in learning about the details of your doctoral program and your perceptions of your experiences. *Doctoral program* means your current program and department at your current university.

B1. One aspect of a doctoral program is the structure of the program. Indicate the extent to which each statement describes the structure of your program. *Circle the number that best applies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of my doctoral program, I would say:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. My coursework has laid a good foundation for doing independent research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I understand the requirements in my program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Some of the exams and other hurdles (qualifiers, prelims, orals, etc.) seem arbitrary and unhelpful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My coursework has given me a broad foundation of knowledge, including related fields and subspecialties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My doctoral program is highly flexible, and I can tailor it to my needs and interests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I am annually reviewed to assess my progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B2. Another aspect of a doctoral program is the ways the students in the program act. For each of these statements, indicate the extent to which it describes students in your program. *Circle the number that best applies.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of students in my program, I would say:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. There is a sense of solidarity among the students who enter the program at the same time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Many students complain of feeling exploited by the faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students have an active role in program decisions that affect them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Students freely share information with each other about opportunities and how to get through the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students have little contact with each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Students must compete with each other for faculty time and attention.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Experienced students mentor newer students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I am part of a supportive student community in my program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I am part of a supportive student community outside my program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B3. Another aspect of a doctoral program is the ways the faculty members in the program act. For each of these statements, indicate the extent to which it describes faculty in your program. Circle the number that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Of faculty in my program, I would say:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Faculty in the program have the best interests of students at heart.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Faculty value individual research over collaborative research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Faculty make sure that students feel like members of the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Faculty care about students in the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Some faculty here make sexist, racist, or homophobic remarks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Faculty appear to give most of the attention and resources to a select group of students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Faculty collaborate with students on publications.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Faculty treat students with respect.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Faculty are willing to bend the rules for some students, but not others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Faculty carefully guard results and new ideas from others in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Faculty seem more concerned with furthering their own careers than with the well-being of the program as a whole.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Faculty really care about their teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Faculty really care about their research.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Faculty really care about advising students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Faculty are explicit in their expectations of students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Faculty carefully supervise teaching assistants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Faculty carefully supervise research assistants.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Faculty regularly socialize with students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Faculty are generous with their time, and help students to grow as scholars, researchers and writers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Faculty have high ethical standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. There are tensions among program faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Faculty are accessible to students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Faculty seem to believe that students are here to help faculty fulfill their research and teaching obligations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following is a list of issues and concerns that often face doctoral students.

Since you started your program, have you developed clear understandings regarding these items? In the first column, circle the number that best applies. If not applicable to you, leave blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue or concern</th>
<th>I HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all Clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Commitments regarding the funding of your graduate studies.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Length of time you would be a student.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Criteria for determining that you were ready to graduate.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Amount of time to be spent with your advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Fulfilling teaching assistant obligations: number of courses, number of hours spent, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Customary practices regarding publication: when and how to submit, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Customary practices about determining authorship of research papers: order of authors, who is included, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Customary practices for the appropriate use of research funds.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Customary practices for generating, handling, and using research data responsibly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Customary practices for reviewing and refereeing academic papers fairly.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Customary practices involving biosafety, human subjects, animal care, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Customary practices regarding appropriate sexual and romantic relationships with undergraduates.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Commitments regarding the funding of your dissertation research project.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Customary practices for using copyrighted material or material written by others.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Customary practices for grading student work.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Customary practices for avoiding conflict of interest: industry funding, consulting, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Customary practices regarding patent policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.5
Following is a list of resources and programs that some campuses have for doctoral students.

For each resource or program listed below, tell us if it is available to doctoral students like you. **Circle the number in the first column that best applies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource or program:</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. An orientation for new graduate students in the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A university-wide orientation for graduate students.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A graduate student handbook for the program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A graduate student handbook for the University.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. A graduate student center (i.e., center with resources, hang out space).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. A written policy on research misconduct.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. A person or office to help students explore options for action when they perceive abuse or misconduct in their program.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. A teaching development center.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. A teaching assistant training course, lasting at least one term.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. A mentor for your professional development who is not your advisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. A seminar or course designed to develop you as a prospective faculty member.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. A career planning workshop on the academic job search.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B.6

For each opportunity listed below, tell us if it is available to doctoral students like you. 
Circle the number in the first column that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity:</th>
<th>AVAILABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Workshop/seminar on teaching in your discipline.</td>
<td>No 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. An organized trip to another campus to learn about being a faculty member in another setting.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. A workshop on career opportunities outside of academia.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Progressively more responsible roles in teaching.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Progressively more responsible roles in research.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Opportunity to participate in campus or department governance (e.g., serve on committees).</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Internship (e.g., in industry).</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Opportunity to work on another campus (e.g., teaching a course).</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Opportunity to make a presentation at a regional or national meeting.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Workshop/seminar on faculty roles and responsibilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Workshop/seminar on research ethics.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Workshop/seminar on history, mission and purpose of higher education.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Workshop/seminar on organization and administration of colleges and universities.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.7

If you could go back in time and start your doctoral program over, knowing what you know now, which decisions would you change? Circle the number that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If I did it over, I would:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Select a different field or sub-field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Select a different advisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Select a different university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Select a different dissertation topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Change my decision about taking time off before entering my doctoral program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Change my decision about taking time off during my doctoral program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Not go to graduate school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Take more courses outside of department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which courses? ______________________________________________________
1. Can you describe your overall experiences when you first stepped onto the university campus that you currently attend?

2. Have you adjusted or adapted to this new environment? In what ways have you adjusted?

3. How well have you adjusted or adapted to your APE doctoral program?

4. How well have you adjusted or adapted to your current university campus?

5. How have you adjusted or adapted American society in general? How well have you adjusted or adapted?

6. What have you done to make these adjustments?

7. Do you feel as if you have “assimilated” into the culture and normal practices of people around you or become like the people around you at this predominantly White university?

8. In what ways have you assimilated or become more like your White peers or others within your APE doctoral program?

9. In what ways have you adjusted or adapted to the campus environment and the community environment?

10. What are your perspectives, as an Asian international doctoral student, on adjusting, assimilating, or adapting to graduate study within APE doctoral programs in America?

11. Can you describe your adjustment, assimilation, or adaptation experiences in your academic program in relationship to other students in your classes or your department?
12. Can you describe your feelings about this academic environment and your experiences as an Asian international student?

13. Can you describe your experiences with faculty and staff in the university as a whole and also in your academic department in particular?

14. What about your experiences with your academic advisor and other committee members?

15. Does your academic advisor understand your issues and concerns as an international doctoral student?

16. Does your academic advisor seek to understand your issues and concerns as an international doctoral student?

17. At what point did you as Asian doctoral students begin to feel like an insider (accepted within the dominant culture) or are you still an outsider (remain outside the dominant culture) in your doctoral program?

18. What are the contributing factors that produce an insider and outsider experience for you?

19. What dimensions of your identity have change as a result of studying APE at this predominantly White university?

20. What critical incidents or interactions during your doctoral study have caused changes in your identity?

21. What are the consequences of identity changes you have experienced?

22. How have you acquired and sustained a sense of hope during your doctoral study?
APPENDIX C

PEER DEBRIFING TRAINING PROTOCOL

(James-Brown, 1995)
PEER DEBRIFING TRAINING PROTOCOL

Step1. First step focuses on reviewing transcripts of interviews with the study’s primary respondents in order to decipher the themes the researcher earlier identified as emerging within and across interviews.

Procedure

1. We will break up into interracial pairings for review and discussion, convening later as a group of four.
2. The researchers’ original list of themes will be compared with those emanating from the discussion.
3. After convening as a group of four, all peer debriefers will bring about the elimination of some themes, the surfacing others, and the modification of several themes.

Step2. Second step will highlight the researchers’ awareness of how cultural experiences of the researcher can influence the analytical process.

Procedure

1. We will break up into pairs except this time the two Asian peer debriefers (The researcher and an Asian peer debriefer) will form one group and White American and Latino peer debriefers will form other.
2. Each group will discuss the data (interview transcripts, demographic questionnaire and program of study) and the researchers’ draft analysis.
3. We will join together later to discuss our conclusion.
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BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

THE OFFICE OF RESPONSIBLE RESEARCH PRACTICE
June 16, 2006

Protocol Number: 2006B0166
Protocol Title: ASIAN INTERNATIONAL DOCTORAL STUDENTS' ASSIMILATION INTO ADAPTED PHYSICAL ACTIVITY GRADUATE PROGRAMS WHILE ATTENDING PREDOMINANTLY WHITE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WITHIN THE BIG TEN CONFERENCE, Samuel R. Hodge, Takahiro Sato, PAES.

Type of Review: New--expedited
IRB Staff Contact: Cheri Petey
(614) 292-0526
Petey.6@osu.edu

Dear Dr. Hodge,

The Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB APPROVED the above referenced protocol BY EXPEDITED REVIEW. The Board was able to provide expedited approval under 43 CFR 46.110(b)(1) because the research presents minimal risk to subjects and qualifies under the expedited review category(s) listed below.

Date of IRB Approval: June 16, 2006
Date of IRB Expiration: June 09, 2007
Expedited Review Category: Category # 7

If applicable, informed consent (and HIPAA research authorization) must be obtained from subjects or their legally authorized representatives and documented prior to research involvement. The IRB-approved consent form and process must be used. Changes in the research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, enrollment numbers, etc.) or informed consent process must be approved by the IRB before they are implemented (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects).

This approval is valid for one year from the date of IRB review when approval is granted or modifications are required. The approval will no longer be in effect on the date listed above as the IRB expiration date. A Continuing Review application must be approved within this interval to avoid expiration of IRB approval and cessation of all research activities. A final report must be provided to the IRB and all records relating to the research (including signed consent forms) must be retained and available for audit for at least 3 years after the research has ended.

It is the responsibility of the investigator to promptly report to the IRB any serious, unexpected and related adverse events or potential unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This approval is issued under The Ohio State University’s OHRP Federalwide Assurance #00006378.

All forms and procedures can be found on the ORR website – www.orr.osu.edu. Please feel free to contact the IRB staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

Thomas Nygren, PhD, Chair
Behavioral and Social Sciences Institutional Review Board

Expeditied Approval
Version 04/20/06
APPENDIX E

The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research

(SURVEY & INTERVIEW)
The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research (Survey)

Study Title: Asian International Doctoral Students’ Assimilation into Adapted Physical Activity Graduate Programs While Attending Predominantly White Institutions of Higher Education within the Big Ten Conference

Researcher: Samuel R. Hodge Ph. D. & Takahiro Sato M.S.

Sponsor: N/A

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose:
The purpose of the proposed study is to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference.

Procedures/Tasks:
After receiving university IRB and APA doctoral programs’ approvals to conduct the study, the participants will be asked to sign and date consent forms indicating their willingness to participate. Each individual doctoral student will be contacted by telephone to be made aware that the researcher will visit them at their APA graduate programs. Before visiting each research site, a demographic questionnaire “Survey on Doctoral Education and Career Preparation” (Golde & Dore, 2004) (Appendix A) and a consent form (agreement of participation form of survey) will be mailed to each participants’ address.
Duration:

The completion of survey, which typically take between 60-90 minutes, will be conducted at their homes before the researcher visit their research sites. You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

Risks and Benefits:

Risks: It is possible that some participants may be uncomfortable for answering some survey questions. To control for this we will notify that all participants will be able to decline the participation of this project anytime and will have a right to deny answering some survey questions.

Benefits: The Asian international doctoral students participating in this study are in engaging in professional development consistent with their own APA program’s goals.

Confidentiality:

Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Incentives:

N/A

Participant Rights:

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal
legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subject research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:
For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact the investigator at (614) 292-8364 or you can contact the co-investigator via email at: sato.37@osu.edu or TAKA0325@aol.com.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Signing the consent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of subject</th>
<th>Signature of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>Signature of person obtaining consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The Ohio State University Consent to Participate in Research
(Research interview)

Study Title: Asian International Doctoral Students’ Assimilation into Adapted Physical Activity Graduate Programs While Attending Predominantly White Institutions of Higher Education within the Big Ten Conference

Researcher: Samuel R. Hodge Ph. D. & Takahiro Sato M.S.

Sponsor: N/A

This is a consent form for research participation.

It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose:

The purpose of the proposed study is to describe and explain Asian international doctoral students’ assimilation into APA graduate programs while attending PW-IHE within the Big Ten Conference.

Procedures/Tasks:

Open-ended focused interviews, which typically take between 60-90 minutes, will be conducted. A combining of the interview questionnaires developed by Lewis et al. (2004) and Gonzalez et al. (2001) will be used in this study (Appendix B).

Before conducting the interview, all participants will be asked to sign the consent form (agreement of participation form of interview). All interview responses from the students will be audio taped. To have the interviews conducted, each participant will choose a confidential and quiet place in the department office building. Follow-up questions or clarifications of participants’ comments will be asked by telephone (Shuy, 2002) and e-mail contacts (Meho, in-press). Once completed, the researcher will transcribe the interviews and return all transcribed data to all participants for member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002) via e-mail (Meho, inpress).
This process will need to ensure that the transcribed data accurately represents the participants’ perspectives and experiences in studying at PW-IHE.

**Duration:**
One focused open ended interviews, which typically take between 60-90 minutes, will be conducted.
You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.

**Risks and Benefits:**
Risks: It is possible that some participants may be uncomfortable for answering some interview questions. To control for this we will notify that all participants will be able to decline the participation of this project anytime and will have a right to deny answering some interview questions before beginning the interview.

Benefits: The Asian international doctoral students participating in this study are in engaging in professional development consistent with their own APA program’s goals.

**Confidentiality:**
Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

**Incentives:**
N/A

**Participant Rights:**
You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.
An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subject research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

**Contacts and Questions:**
For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study you may contact ____________________.

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

**Signing the consent form**

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

______________________________  ______________________________
printed name of subject                    signature of subject

**Investigator/Research Staff**

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

______________________________  ______________________________
Printed name of person obtaining consent  Signature of person obtaining consent