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ABSTRACT

INFLUENCES OF SELF-CONSTRUALS AND PERSONALITY STYLES ON INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS

Yu-Yun Liu

July 26, 2016

The literature suggested that personality styles (i.e., sociotropy and autonomy; Beck, 1983) are vulnerability factors that could – in interaction with stress - trigger mental health concerns. Culturally influenced self-construals (Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand, & Yuki, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) also detect how individuals function in a sociocultural context. While the number of international students in the U.S. increased over the past decades, their reported mental health concerns warrant more attention. This study explored relationships among self-construals, personality styles, domain-specific stressful life events, and depressive symptoms among international students in the U.S. Participants were 579 international students (identified as holding F-1/J-1 visas) recruited from universities across the U.S. Participants completed an online survey consisting of items that assess personality styles, self-construals, social anxiety, stressful life events, and depressive symptoms. Results of path analyses, controlling for social anxiety, confirmed the associations between personality styles and self-construals, and further yielded significant associations with depressive symptoms. No significant relationship was found between a tripartite model of self-
construal and the interactions of personality styles and domain-specific stressful life events. However, the interaction of negative achievement life events and autonomy was found to be significantly related to depressive symptoms. Mediation analyses showed that sociotropy mediated the relationship between collective self-construal and depressive symptoms. Implications in regard to working with international students were discussed in light of these findings.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the United States (U.S.) university system, the number of international students has increased over the past few decades (Institute of International Education, 2014a). Culturally diverse student populations bring with them the influence of their social and cultural backgrounds. With the intention of better understanding this unique student population and better promoting their mental health, the focus of this study will be to investigate the impact of cultural influences on international students’ depressive symptoms through their personality styles.

International Students and Their Impact on the U.S.

What defines and distinguishes international students from immigrants or visitors is the visa status. International students are normally issued with a temporary student visa and are required to be enrolled in accredited institutions (Institute of International Education, 2014a). The U.S. has been one of the most popular countries that international students choose as their designated country of study. According to the Institute of International Education (2014b), the number of international students in the U. S. postsecondary school system in the 2013-14 academic year reached a record high of 886,052, with international students making up 4.2% of the U.S. higher education population. Many of those international students are to pursue graduate studies (Allum, 2014; Gonzales, Allum, & Sowell, 2013). In the Fall semester of 2013, international graduate students represent 16.7% of the overall graduate student population which has
increased consistently over the past 10 years (Allum, 2014). In addition, among first-time graduate enrollment, 20.2% of those are international students (Allum, 2014). International students are becoming a critical part in the U.S. higher education.

Given the increasing number of students who travel outside their country of origin for postsecondary education in recent years, universities have highly valued the internationalization of higher education (Guo & Chase, 2011). In addition, several national surveys confirmed the trend of the increasing international student population and revealed the significant impact of these students on U.S. higher education systems (Barger, 2004; Green, 2005; Hayward & Siaya, 2001). In a report addressing internationalization of higher education, Green (2005) analyzed a sample of 8,782 students from eight institutions that scored high in an internationalization index created by the American Council on Education (ACE). Results indicated that more than 85% of the students at these colleges and universities agreed that the presence of international students benefitted their learning experience. In a Cross-Cultural Interaction Model that measured the relationship between cross-cultural interactions and educational experiences, a positive association was found between domestic students’ cross-cultural interactions and educational aspects (Barger, 2004). International students are generally more engaged in educational activities and are more achievement-oriented than their American peers (Volet & Ang, 2012). The greater engagement of international students resulted in better educational outcomes and positive academic and social influences on the domestic students (Zhao, Kuh, &Carini, 2005; Volet & Ang, 2012). Moreover, having opportunities interacting with individuals with different cultural backgrounds helps domestic students become culturally aware and sensitive, which also better prepares them
to live and work in a multicultural society (Barger, 2004; Brustein, 2007; Hayward & Siaya, 2001). Based on these findings, international students bring about a positive impact on U.S. college campuses.

In addition, international students positively influence the U.S. economy while they stay for their career upon completing their studies. While the mobility of the labor force becomes a global phenomenon, many countries have increased their recruitment of international students as skilled migrants (Ziguras & Law, 2006). International graduate students, along with skilled migrants, made significant contributions to U.S. innovation (Chellaraj, Maskus, & Mattoo, 2008). They helped increase the university innovation and patenting, which is viewed as a significant determinant of the U.S. economy. It is clear that including international students in the U.S. higher education system and workforce creates benefits in many aspects. However, if international students fail to adjust to American society, such benefits are at risk (Wang, Lin, Pang, & Shen, 2006). Thus, it is important to consider the well-being of this unique student population and promote their mental health.

**Mental Health of International Students**

Among college students, depressive symptoms are viewed as common manifestations of stress (Arthur, 1998). For example, they are often reported as one of the primary concerns presented at college counseling centers (Nilsson, Berkel, Flores, & Lucas, 2004; Yi, Lin, & Kishimoto, 2003). Further, depressive symptoms can have damaging impact on individuals’ daily life (Ayuso-Mateos, Nuevo, Verdes, Naidoo, & Chatterji, 2010; Klerman, 1989). Results from a longitudinal study indicates that the lifetime prevalence rate for depressive symptoms is 24% and that individuals with
depressive symptoms are at greater risk for a first-onset of major depression during a one-year period than those who are not (Horwath, Johnson, Klerman, & Weissman, 1992).

International students encounter multiple stressors upon entering the U.S. for higher education, including academic performance, social relationships, financial distress, language proficiency, and adjustment to a different culture (Wei, Heppener, Mallen, Ku, Liao, & Wu, 2007; Fritz, Chim, & DeMarinis, 2008; Sümer, Poyrazli, & Grahame, 2008). Stressors that are associated with acculturation process often put international students at risk for compromised mental health (Constantine, Okazaki, & Utsey, 2004; Rice, Choi, Zhang, Morero, & Anderson, 2012; Wei et al., 2007). When comparing to their pre-arrival and post-arrival status, their psychological health is likely to be diminished after starting their life studying abroad (Ying & Liese, 1991). Stress-induced discomfort is also likely to cause feelings of loneliness, helplessness, and hopelessness, all risk factors for depressive symptoms, while adjusting to a host country (Aubrey, 1991; Mori, 2000). Thus, not surprisingly, the acculturative stressors are often positively associated with depressive symptoms among international students (Wei et al., 2007; Yang & Clum, 1995; Ying & Han, 2006).

In addition to stress-induced depressive symptoms, it is important to understand how other contributing sources like changes in identity impact the development of depressive symptoms among international students (Jung, Hecht, & Wadsworth, 2007). When international students move to their host country and adjust to a new culture, the way they understand and conceptualize themselves becomes divergent. Cultural differences and communication barriers would lead to limited expression of self among
international students, creating identity gaps. The effects of identity gaps could possibly trigger the development of depressive symptoms (Jung et al., 2007).

Little is known regarding the prevalence and impact of depressive symptoms among international students (Sümer et al., 2008). A recent study showed that approximately 44% of international graduate students had encountered at least one emotional-or stress-related problem in the previous semester and experienced difficulty in maintaining their physical and mental health as well as academic performance (Hyun, Quinn, Madon, & Lustig, 2007). The prevalence of stress reported by international students is not significantly different from domestic students (Hyun et al., 2007; Khawaja & Dempsey, 2008; Smith & Khawaja, 2011). A multiwave study also found that international students might not experience a significant increased stress shortly after their arrival of host country (Wang, Heppner, Fu, Zhao, Li, & Chuang, 2012). However, international students often do not recognize mental health related issues like depressive symptoms but report more somatic complains (Aubrey, 1991) and have greater stigma associated with seeking mental health services (Hyun et al, 2007; Nilsson et al., 2004). Moreover, they tend to have less social support and use more maladaptive coping strategies (Khawaja & Dempsey, 2008; Smith & Khawaja, 2011). As social support is also found to mediate depressive symptoms (Sümer et al., 2008; Wang, Cai, Qian, & Peng, 2014), the lack of access to social support is associated with the development of more mental health issues like depressive symptoms.

For individuals with different cultural backgrounds, failure to manage depressive symptoms and excessive stress could lead to negative outcomes like poor academic achievement (Rodriguez, Myers, Morris, & Cardoza, 2000; Wan, Chapman, & Biggs,
1992), diminished mental health (Wan et al., 1992), impairment in functioning (Mori, 2000), less satisfaction with life (Wan et al., 1992) and greater risk for suicide (Wong, 2013). Given the varying contributing sources to the development of depressive symptoms, the notion of depressive symptoms varies from individual to individual and should not be viewed unitarily (Hsu, Hailey, & Range, 1987). To better serve individual needs of international students, one’s cultural background should be considered as well.

Self-Construals

It is important to examine international students’ identity development when studying factors influential to their depressive symptoms, as this could be a contributing factor. In regard to culture and the self, Markus and Kitayama (1991) suggested that individuals form self-images and distinguish themselves from other people; this formation of the self can be conceptualized as different construals of the self and others. In responding to cultural influences, there are two construals of the self: independent and interdependent dimensions. The concept of independent self-construal refers to the autonomous and independent person who separates the self from the social context and asserts one’s needs (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Individual uniqueness and achievement is emphasized and encouraged in a societal context that values independence. In contrast, the idea of interdependent self-construal represents the interdependence among individuals. In other words, individuals with interdependent self-construal are more interested in making connections with others and fitting into groups (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). A societal context that signifies interdependence is one that appreciates interpersonal harmony and pursuing group goals. Individuals establish their self-
definition through one’s social roles. These self-construals can further influence
cognition, emotion, and motivation of individuals.

Other commonly used constructs to separate individuals with different cultural
tendencies are individualism (IND) and collectivism (COL), as proposed by Hofstede
(1980), where individuals displayed different preferences in self-in-group relationships.
Members from individualistic cultures value self-expression and self-determination
toward personal goals whereas members from collectivistic cultures emphasize in-group
harmony and unquestioning loyalty (Hofstede, 1980). The boundaries for IND-COL
recently became blurred with the variation existing within and across nationalities
(Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). For instance, European-Americans were
found to be individualistic, meaning they favored personal independence and valued
peers as less important. In addition, they were not more individualistic than African-
American and Latinos, and not less collectivistic than Japanese or Koreans (Oyserman et
al, 2002). While the terms of IND and COL are often viewed as limited to specific
countries and nations, researchers recognized that the concepts of self-construals focus
more on locus of identity and extend beyond nations (Oyserman et al, 2002; Brewer &
Chen, 2007).

Evidence on how individuals’ self-construals influence the development of
depressive symptoms was found through some studies (Mak, Law, & Teng, 2011;
Okazaki, 1997; Sato & McCann, 1998; Su, Lee, & Oishi, 2013). Depressive symptoms
were negatively correlated with independent self-construal, with correlations ranging
from $r = -.18$ (Su et al., 2013) to $r = -.44$ (Mak et al., 2011). The relationship between
depressive symptoms and interdependent self-construal is less clear. Results indicated a
significant but weakly positive correlation \((r = .20; \text{Okazaki}, 1997)\) or no relationship \((r = .03 & .11; \text{Mak et al., 2011})\). Other studies found no relations between both self-construals and depressive symptoms (independent SC: \(r = -.05\); interdependent SC: \(r = .18\); \text{Shim, Freund, Stopsack, Kämmerer, & Barnow, 2014}; independent SC: \(r = -.06 & .04\); interdependent SC: \(r = .06 & -.05\); \text{Yamaguchi, Kim, & Akutsu, 2014}).

Empirical support suggested some relationships between self-construals and social anxiety (\text{Dinnel, Kleinknecht, & Tanaka-Matsumi, 2002}; \text{Essau, Leung, Koydemir, Sasagawa, O’Callaghan, & Bray, 2012}; \text{Hardin, 2006}; \text{Hong & Woody, 2007}; \text{Okazaki, 1997}; \text{Su et al., 2013}; \text{Xie, Leong, & Feng, 2008}). Independent self-construal is consistently found to be negatively associated with social anxiety, and ranged from \(r = -.34\) (\text{Xie et al., 2008}) to \(r = -.61\) (\text{Essau et al., 2012}). A less consistent relationship existed between interdependent self-construal and social anxiety; significant correlations ranged from \(r = -.14\) (\text{Xie et al., 2008}) to \(r = .24\) (\text{Okazaki, 1997}). Given the suggested association between self-construals and social anxiety, it is important to consider the impact of social anxiety when studying relationships between self-construals and depressive symptoms (\text{Cross, Hardin, & Gerecek-Swing, 2011}). In a sample of White American and Asian American college students, neither independent nor interdependent self-construal was associated with depressive symptoms when controlling for social anxiety (\text{Okazaki, 1997}). Therefore, controlling for social anxiety is a prudent step in researching self-construals and depressive symptoms.

In the past decades, cross-cultural research focused on how individuals define themselves across cultures through Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) two dimensions of self-construals (\text{Mak et al., 2011}; \text{Okazaki, 1997}; \text{Sato & McCann, 1998}; \text{Singelis, 1994};
Su et al., 2013). Some scholars did not agree with the approach of capturing self-representations through only independence and interdependence; using self-other distinction to shape self-view seems somewhat limited (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000; Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand, & Yuki, 1995; Levine et al., 2003). Some have attempted to expand the two-dimension category into three or more dimensions to better understand how self-view is formed (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Cross et al., 2000; Kashima et al., 1995).

Brewer and Gardner (1996) argued that self-representations can be understood through three different levels: personal, relational, and collective. In particular, the relational and collective levels are the social aspect of self, resulted from different focuses on interpersonal relationships and a symbolic group membership (Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Kashima et al., 1995). Similarly, a tripartite model of self-construals, comprising of relational-interdependent, collective-interdependent, and independent type of self-construals, is supported through separating interpersonal relationships across cultural contexts (Cross et al., 2000; Cross et al., 2011). For example, women tend to value close relationships more than men; such an observed gender difference exists even in independence-oriented Western societies. Some individuals define themselves through a larger societal context, emphasizing belongingness and group membership such as a family or an ethnic group. This nuance has driven scholars to consider different dimensions of the concept of interdependence. The focuses on close relationships versus on group-centered memberships are later distinguished and defined as relational-interdependent and collective-interdependent self-construals, respectively (Cross et al., 2000; Cross et al., 2011). Relational-interdependent self-construal is significantly
correlated with relational well-being (e.g., Cross, Gore, & Morris, 2003) and friendship quality (e.g., Morry, Kito, Mann, & Hill, 2013), but not with depressive symptoms (Cross et al., 2003; Çetin, Eroğlu, Peker, Akbaba, & Pepsoy, 2012). However, the research to relational-interdependent self-construals and depressive symptoms is limited in two regards. First, there are only two studies researching the association between relational-interdependent self-construals and depressive symptoms (Cross et al., 2000). Second, both studies used the same measure, the Relational-Interdependent Self-Construal Scale (RISC scale; Cross et al., 2000). The generalizability of their results is somewhat limited. Thus, the relationship of tripartite model of self-construal and the development of depressive symptoms needs more empirical support. Another question has been raised regarding individuals’ response pattern to these styles. Individuals could display traits of both interdependent and independent self-construals (Gardner, Gabriel, & Lee, 1999; Trafimow, Triandis, & Goto, 1991). Gardner et al. (1999) tested the influence of situational prime on the shift of self-construal and found that individuals with independent self-construal did display more characteristics of interdependence when exposed to more interdependent priming material. Therefore, it is possible that exposure to a cultural environment different from the original culture of the individuals will prime them to shift in self-construal. For example, international students will display self-construals that might be different from their original cultural environment.

Given the globalized context in which individuals live, along with the advances in technology and communication, people are more interconnected with one another. How individuals define themselves might be beyond the physical limits of countries and nations and instead may be more complex. To better understand the prevalence of
depressive symptoms in international students as well as to gain information for prevention, it is necessary to assess individuals’ self-construal through a different lens like personality styles, especially without the presumption on the nationality.

**Personality styles as Vulnerabilities to Depressive symptoms**

Noticing that individuals have different emotional reactions to specific stressors, Beck (1983) hypothesized that there are differences in individuals’ cognitive organization. Based on one’s reaction to predominant concerns, he proposed that individuals could be categorized into one of two personality styles: the sociotropic style and the autonomous style.

Individuals with a sociotropic personality style tend to invest themselves in building positive relationships with other people. Interpersonal relatedness with others brings this type of individuals satisfaction. The emphasis on acceptance, support, admiration, and validation leaves sociotropic individuals more vulnerable to social rejection and isolation (Beck, 1983). As Bowlby (1977) stated in his attachment theory, interruption of social bonding is likely to lead to the development of depressive symptoms for individuals at any age. While Beck (1983) did not view social bonding as the only contributing factor to depressive symptoms, he acknowledged that the lack of social bonding accounts at least partially for the development of depressive symptoms.

In contrast, individuals with an autonomous personality style value personal achievement and independence (Beck, 1983). They tend to be interested in preserving and increasing control over one’s life. Thus they are more likely to experience depressive symptoms triggered by failure to attain their goals (Beck, 1983). Internalized
standards and personal achievements tend to elicit the emotional reaction of individuals with autonomous personality style (Blatt, Shahar, & Zuroff, 2001).

Other scholars also proposed two sets of personality styles, similar to Beck’s (1983) personality styles of sociotropy and autonomy, intending to understand individuals’ vulnerability to depressive symptoms. Those terms include but are not limited to: anxious attachment and compulsive self-reliance (Bowlby, 1977) and dependency and self-criticism (Blatt, D’Afflitti, & Quinlan, 1976; Blatt & Zuroff, 1992) and often are used interchangeably (Robins, Ladd, Welkowitz, Blaney, Diaz, & Kutcher, 1994).

The notion of the personality styles of sociotropy and autonomy has received much research attention, especially with their function as vulnerabilities to depressive symptoms (Bieling & Alden, 2001; Hammen, Ellicott, Gitlin, & Jamison, 1989; Iacoviello, Grant, Alloy, & Abramson, 2009; Mongrain & Blackburn, 2005; Nietzel & Harris, 1990). As sociotropy and autonomy are viewed as vulnerabilities (Sutton et al., 2011), stressful life events are necessary to trigger the development of depressive symptoms (Beck, 1983). Multiple studies found a significant interaction between the sociotropic personality style and negative social events to trigger depressive symptoms (Hammen et al., 1989; Mongrain & Blackburn, 2005; Nietzel & Harris, 1990; Robins & Block, 1988). Positive relationships were also found between sociotropy and depressive symptoms (Alford & Gerrity, 1995; Bagby et al., 2001; Bieling & Alden, 2001; Mazure, Raghavan, Maciejewski, Jacobs, & Bruce, 2001; Nelson, Hammen, Daley, Burge, & Davila, 2001; Sato & McCann, 1998; Sutton et al., 2011). Further, in a sample of graduate students who reported at least one depressive episode, Mongrain and Blackburn
(2005) found that sociotropy is significantly and positively associated with previous depressive episodes \( (r = .35) \).

It is generally believed that these distinct personality styles help explain people’s vulnerability to depressive symptoms. However, research has shown inconsistent results regarding autonomy. For example, a few studies found that the association between depressive symptoms and the interaction of high autonomy and failure events was not as strong as the association between depressive symptoms and the interaction of sociotropy and negative social events (Hammen et al., 1989). Other studies did not find significant relationships between depressive symptoms and the interaction of high autonomy and failure events (Iacoviello et al., 2009; Mazure et al., 2001; Robins & Block, 1988). Further studies found no association between autonomy and depressive symptoms without any occurrence of life events (Alford & Gerrity, 1995; Nelson et al., 2001). Nevertheless, some studies found a significantly positive association between autonomy and the recurrence of depressive symptoms (Bagby et al., 2001; Bieling & Alden, 2001; Mongrain & Blackburn, 2005; Sato & McCann, 1998; Sutton et al., 2011) and others found significant associations between the interaction of achievement-related events and subscales of autonomy (e.g., Iacoviello et al., 2009: goal attainment and sensitivity to others’ control; Mazure et al., 2001; Nelson et al., 2001: need for control) and severity of depressive symptoms.

Abela, McIntyre-Smith, and Dechef (2003) theorized that one reason for the inconsistent findings could be that participants interpreted the meaning of stressful life events differently from the researchers. For example, individuals with an autonomous personality style might have viewed stressful life events interpreted by researchers as
interpersonal events as achievement-related, which led to misinterpretation of the interaction between personality characters and stressors.

In addition, similar to individuals’ response to self-construals, individuals could display both traits of sociotropy and autonomy. Though conceptually the intercorrelation between the two personality styles should be low, Abela et al. (2003) pointed out a significant intercorrelation is often observed. Since individuals with both personality styles are likely to develop depressive symptoms when encountering either social or achievement related life events, this might lead to incongruent findings on the impact of autonomy on depressive symptoms. Overall, previous studies found mixed results regarding the impact of personality styles on the onset of depressive symptoms. There is more support for the interaction of sociotropy and negative social events on depressive symptoms (Alford & Gerrity, 1995; Hammen et al., 1989; Nietzel & Harris, 1990) while less evidence has been found to support the pathway of autonomy and failure events to depressive symptoms (Iacoviello et al., 2009).

**Relationships between Personality Styles and Self-Construals**

Individuals with high sociotropic personality style respond predominantly to social concerns while those with high interdependent self-construal value interpersonal relationships as well as group harmony (Beck, 1983; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Research showed an overlap of the concepts of sociotropy and interdependent self-construal (Gorski & Young, 2002; Sato & McCann, 1998). However, the notions represented by autonomy and independent self-construal are not as similar; Sato and McCann (1998) suggested that autonomy reflects a mode of functioning that may cause individuals to develop depressive symptoms while independent self-construal is an
adaptive mode of functioning influenced by societal context. There is no clear pattern between autonomy and independent self-construal as tested in previous studies (Gorski & Young, 2002; Sato & McCann, 1998).

To date, little research has examined relationships between personality styles and self-construals (Gorski & Young, 2002; Mak, 2001; Sato & McCann, 1998). However, the existing evidence leads to the conclusion that the association between sociotropic personality style and interdependent self-construal is stronger \( r = .46, p < .001, \) Gorski & Young, 2002; \( r = .86, p < .01, \) Mak, 2001; \( r = .46, p < .05, \) Sato & McCann, 1998) than the association between autonomous personality style and independent self-construal \( r = .23, p > .05, \) Gorski & Young, 2002; \( r = -.24, p < .01, \) Mak, 2001; \( r = -.08, p < .05, \) Sato & McCann, 1998).

The cultural-specific vulnerability-stress model proposed by Mak (2001) suggested that distress patterns could be separated based on individuals’ cultural backgrounds, namely the way individuals identify and distinguish themselves from a larger social group. Individuals with certain types of self-construals are likely to develop either sociotropic or autonomous personality style, which might trigger depressive symptoms as stressful life events occur (Mak, 2001; Sato & McCann, 1998). Results of previous studies indicate that interdependent self-construal was related positively to sociotropy whereas independent self-construal was related weakly to autonomy (Gorski & Young, 2002; Mak, 2001; Sato & McCann, 1998). In Mak’s (2001) study, direct relationships were found between sociotropy and anxiety and between autonomy and depressive symptoms. There was no significant moderating relationship found between life events and depressive symptoms. Mak et al. (2011) modified the model and
proposed a different model which addressed only the effects of self-construals and sociotropy on anxiety and depressive symptoms, but the result yielded no better model fit than the one tested by Mak (2001).

**Purpose of this Study**

Previous literature has supported the influences of an individual’s cultural self-construal (Mak et al., 2011; Okazaki, 1997; Sato & McCann, 1998; Su et al., 2013) and one’s personality style (Beck, 1983; Hammen et al., 1989; Mongrain & Blackburn, 2005) on the development of depressive symptoms separately. Some studies further supported the impacts of one’s cultural self-construal on one’s personality style and therefore one might develop depressive symptoms differently as encountering certain life events (Gorski & Young, 2002; Mak et al., 2011; Sato & McCann, 1998). Therefore, the interaction between personality styles and life events will be tested for moderating effects in this study. Furthermore, the number of studies on effects of both self-construals and personality styles on the development of depressive symptoms is limited. Even within the existing literature, some publications reported different analyses but used the same sample (e.g. Mak, 2001 and Mak et al., 2011). This inflates the number of independent samples appear higher than they actually are. The purpose of the study is to research the associations between self-construals, personality style, and depressive symptoms in international students. This study aims at adding more empirical evidence to the relationships between personality style and self-construals and proving implications for promoting mental health of international students.
Hypotheses

In this current study, it was proposed that the effects of self-construals on personality styles would influence the development of depressive symptoms for international students when encountering stressful life events. More specifically, it was predicted that cultural self-construals would predict certain personality styles within the international student population. Relational self-construal and collective self-construal would be positively associated with sociotropic personality style but not with autonomous personality style. Also, independent self-construal would be positively associated with autonomous personality style but not with sociotropic personality style.

Further, it was proposed that the main effects of personality styles and the interaction of personality styles and domain-specific life events but not the main effects of domain-specific life events would be associated with international students’ depressive symptoms. The interaction of sociotropic personality style and interpersonal-related events and interaction of autonomous personality style and achievement events would be associated with depressive symptoms. While previous studies found a weak (Bagby et al., 2001; Bieling & Alden, 2001) or even a lack of (Alford & Gerrity, 1995; Robins & Block, 1988; Segal, Shaw, Vella, & Katz, 1992) a relationship between autonomous personality style and depressive symptoms, Iacoviello and his colleagues (2009) found significant interaction effects between autonomic personality style and life events. Based on Beck’s (1983) theory and results from Sato and McCann (1998), it was hypothesized that the association from autonomous personality style and achievement-related events to depressive symptoms would be significant.
It was also predicted that the main effects of personality styles and the interaction of personality styles and occurrence of domain-specific life events would mediate the associations between self-construals with depressive symptoms. That is, the association between relational self-construal and depressive symptoms and the association between collective self-construal and depressive symptoms would be mediated by sociotropy and the interaction of sociotropy and stressful interpersonal life events, respectively. Similarly, the association between independent self-construal and depressive symptoms would be mediated by autonomy and the interaction of autonomy and negative achievement life events.

Finally, social anxiety was added as a control variable (see Figure 1); it might account for some variance explained in the model, but it would not change the association among independent variables to dependent variable of depressive symptoms.
Figure 1. Hypothesized model
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

Six hundred individuals who were enrolled in U.S. institutions for postsecondary education (with F-1/J-1 visas) during academic year 2015-2016 completed all survey questions, and 579 respondents passed the validity test and were included in the final analysis (96.5%). Participants were recruited through International Scholars and Students Offices (or parallel official offices) as well as through Facebook, and student organization webpages.

This final sample includes international students currently holding F-1 or J-1 student visa in the United States (Mage = 26.24 years, SD = 4.52, female: 58.2%). In terms of intended degree, 11.9% of participants identified as seeking a bachelor degree, 34% seeking a master’s degree, 51.8% seeking a doctoral degree, and 2.3% seeking a certificate or do not seek a degree. As for financial sources, 36.4% of participants are supported by their family, 9.5% by their own government, 41.1% by their home university, 6.4% by themselves, and 6.6% by other sources such as a combination of family, school, and loans. In regard to marital status, 19.2% of participants identified as being in a committed relationship, 15.4% are married, 64.6% are single, and 0.3% are divorced. The median of length of stay for the current sample was 24 months, with a
minimum of 0.5 month and a maximum of 204 months. Table 1 presents country of origin of the final sample. Top five countries of origin for the current sample are China, India, Taiwan, South Korea, and Brazil, and they represented 65.8% of the total sample.

The proposed model included 22 estimated parameters. Based on Kline’s (2011) suggested 20 to 1 ratio of participants to estimated parameters, the minimum number of participants required for this study is 440. The final sample of 600 exceeded the minimum requirement and therefore generated enough power for statistical analyses.

Measures

Demographics. Participants were asked to provide information about their nationality, age, gender, marital status, subject of study, length of stay in the U.S., and source of financial support.

Sociotropy and autonomy. The Personal Style Inventory-II (PSI-II; Robins et al., 1994) contains 48 items measuring two dimensions of sociotropy and autonomy. Items are responded on a six-point rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Each dimension contains three subscales: sociotropy includes “Concern About What Others Think”, “Dependence”, and “Pleasing Others” while autonomy includes “Self-criticism”, “Need for Control”, and “Defensive Separation.” Items on the sociotropy scale include, “I am very sensitive to criticism by others”, “I find it difficult to be separated from people I love”, and “I often put other people’s needs before my own.” Items on the autonomy scale contain, “It bothers me when I feel that I am only average and ordinary”, “I am easily bothered by other people making demands of me”, and “I tend to keep other people at a distance.” The reliability scores ranged from $\alpha = .84$ to $\alpha = .90$ for the PSI dimension of sociotropy and ranged from $\alpha = .82$ to $\alpha = .86$ for the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>18.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1 (continued)

Demographics: Country of Origin ($N = 579$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurdistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macau</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Africa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1 (continued)

*Demographics: Country of Origin (N = 579)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dimension of autonomy (Bagby et al., 2001; Sato, 2003; Sutton et al., 2011; Wong & Mak, 2013). Cronbach’s αs for this current sample was .89 and .83 for sociotropy and autonomy, respectively, consistent with the previous research results.

**Self-construals.** The Relational, Individual, and Collective Self-Aspects (RIC) Scale (Kashima & Hardie, 2000) is a self-report measure using 10 sets of three items to assess three different aspects of self-construal. Items are rated on a seven-point rating scale, ranged from 1 (not like me) to 7 (very much like me). A total self-aspect score is calculated by summing all 10 ratings for each dimension; a higher score in each self-aspect indicates a salient identity. Sample items set include: “I think it is most important in life to: have personal integrity/ be true to myself (I); have good personal relationships with people who are important to me (R); work for causes to improve the well-being of my group (C).” Studies yielded reliable internal consistency for each subscale; the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the R subscale ranged from α = .75 to α = .85, for the I subscale ranged from α = .71 to α = .82, and for the C subscale ranged from α = .77 to α = .83 (Hardie, Critchley, & Morris, 2006; Kashima & Hardie, 2000). For this current study, Cronbach’s αs were .74, .75, and .81 for subscales R, I, and C, respectively, similar to what was reported in the previous studies.

**Life events.** The occurrence of stressed life events is measured by a 31-item scale of Index of Life Stress (ILS; Yang & Clum, 1995). The ILS is a self-report survey of individuals’ patterns of life stress in domains of: (1) concern about finance and desire to stay in the U.S., (2) language difficulty, (3) interpersonal stress, (4) stress from new culture and desire to return to one’s home country, and (5) academic pressure. Items include “My English embarrasses me when I talk to people”, “I can feel racial
discrimination toward me from other students”, and “I worry about my academic performance.” The items are rated on a four-point scale from 1 (never) to 4 (always). A higher score indicates higher life stress. In Yang and Clum’s (1995) study on Asian international students, a one-month test-retest reliability of $r = .87$ was reported.

**Depressive symptoms.** The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977) is a 20-item self-report survey of depressive symptoms for the general population. The CES-D uses a four-point rating scale ranging from 0 (never or rarely) to 3 (most or all the time) asking participants to describe the frequency of experiencing a given depressive symptom (e.g., “I felt depressed”, “I did not feel like eating”, “I thought my life had been a failure”). The total CES-D score is calculated by reversing items 4, 8, 12, and 16 and summing all 20 items. Total scores can range from 0 to 60 and a higher score indicates a high level of depressive symptoms. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ in previous studies were .89 for Chinese international students (Wei et al., 2007), .90 for Taiwanese international students (Ying & Han, 2006), and .91 for African, Asian, and Latino international students (Constantine et al., 2004). Cronbach’s $\alpha$ for the international students in this study was .91, which is comparable to previous findings.

**Social anxiety.** The Social Phobia and Anxiety Inventory-23 (SPAI-23; Roberson-Nay, Strong, Nay, Beidel, & Turner, 2007) is a 23-item abbreviated measure of the 45-item Social Phobia and Anxiety Inventory (Turner, Beidel, Dancu, & Stanley, 1989). The two subscales of the SPAI-23 have a strong correlation with those from the original SPAI ($r = .97$ and $.90$ for the Social Phobia subscale and the Agoraphobia subscale, respectively). Items are rated on a five-point scale, ranged from 0 (never) to 4 (always). Items include “I feel anxious when I am in a social situation and I am expected to engage
“in some activity” (for social phobia) and “Being in large open spaces makes me feel anxious” (for agoraphobia). Two subscales (16-item Social Phobia subscale and 7-item Agoraphobia subscale) are calculated separately by summing all the ratings. A difference score is computed through subtracting the Agoraphobia score from the Social Phobia score. The internal consistencies were consistently high in previous studies; for the Social Phobia subscale, \( \alpha \) ranged from .93 to .95 and for the Agoraphobia subscale, \( \alpha \) ranged from .85 to .88 (Roberson-Nay et al., 2007; Schry et al., 2012). In this current study, \( \alpha \) were .94 and .85 for Social Phobia and Agoraphobia subscales, respectively, which is consistent with previous research.

**Procedure**

Approval from Institutional Review Board was obtained prior to participant recruitment. Five offices of International Student and Scholar Services from institutions that host international students advertised for study recruitment through email listserv and social medias (such as Facebook page or blog). Further, international student organizations and faculty members from 14 universities that were identified as leading institutions hosting international students (Institute of International Education, 2014b) helped distribute recruitment messages through listservs, emails, and social medias. In addition, the survey link was also distributed through listservs of the American Psychological Association Divisions 17 (Counseling Psychology) and 52 (International Psychology). Finally, 170 training directors of psychology pre-doctoral internship sites were contacted to help distribute the survey to eligible trainees. However, it is unclear how many of them actually distributed the survey.
Participants received an online survey link containing a preamble page and a set of questionnaires. Respondents who chose “I agree. I understand the information above, I am age 18 or over, and I am holding a student visa (F-1/J-1) in the U.S. Take me to the survey!” were directed to the survey questions. Respondents who chose “No, I don’t agree! I don’t want to take the survey, I am under the age of 18, and/or I am not holding a student visa (F-1/J-1) in the U.S.” were thanked for their time and the survey discontinued.

The online survey by Qualtrics included a demographic questionnaire, PSI-II (Robins et al., 1994), RIC scale (Kashima & Hardie, 2000), ILS (Yang & Clum, 1995), SPAI-23 (Roberson-Nay et al., 2007), and CES-D (Radloff, 1977). The researcher arranged questionnaires in four different orders, with the CES-D always positioned as the last questionnaire. After completing the survey, participants were given a chance to join a drawing for a $50 gift card.

**Data Analysis**

Two validity questions instructing respondents to select a certain response (e.g. *Agree* and *Sometimes*) were embedded in the survey to identify participants who gave random responses. Only those who passed both validity questions were included in the final sample. Initial data cleaning, internal consistencies of all scales, and sum scores of all constructs were calculated using SPSS 22.

Path analyses were conducted using Amos 22 to investigate the cross-sectional associations between self-construals, personality styles, interaction of life events and personality styles, and depressive symptoms, after controlling for social anxiety. The structural model using maximum likelihood estimation was tested.
Goodness of model fit was first tested with value of chi-square ($\chi^2$), a traditional measure for overall model fit. Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin, and Summers (1977) suggested a method of relative/normed chi-square ($\chi^2/df$) to minimize the impact of sample size. A ratio ranged from 2.0 to 5.0 is considered as acceptable (Wheaton et al., 1977). Other goodness of fit measures used were the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI; Tucker & Lewis, 1973), Comparative Fit Index (CFI; Bentler, 1990), and root mean squared of the residuals (RMSEA; Steiger & Lind, 1980). A value of $\geq .95$ is considered a good model fit and a value of $\geq .90$ indicates an acceptable model fit for CFI and TLI (Hu & Bentler, 1999). A RMSEA value of $< .05$ is viewed as a good model fit and a value of $< .08$ is considered as acceptable (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

When model fit indices suggested the hypothesized model describes the empirical data poorly, the model was modified to improve the model fit (Kenny, 2011; Kline, 2011). Model modification, also called re-specification, is often done based on theoretical rationale or empirical tests (Kenny, 2011). In this current study, the researcher proceeded with re-specification based on the empirical data. The first step of re-specification was to identify and add all possible associations between variables (see Figure 2). The overall model fit for the model with all paths was evaluated in the second step, and then estimates of regression weights were used for modification suggestion. Hosmer and Lemeshow (1989) and Burkholder and Harlow (2003) suggested to use a $p$ value of .20 ($z = 1.28$) as cutoff. Meaning a regression with a $–p$ value of .20 or higher was set to zero. During re-specification, only one modification was made at one time. Following each modification, the estimate of overall model fit was then re-calculated. Such modification process was repeated until the model-data fit reached a good fit and an
Figure 2. Model with All Paths
optimal model was generated. Chi-square difference test was conducted to assess whether the re-specified model was statistically different from the previous model. The difference between CFI values (ΔCFI) for the previous model and the re-specified model was calculated. When ΔCFI of two models is > .002, the model with a higher CFI fits the data significantly better. However, if ΔCFI is ≤ .002, both models fit equally well from a statistical point of view and the more parsimonious model (with more degrees of freedom) should be accepted (Meade, Johnson, & Braddy, 2008).

Mediation analyses of personality styles and the interactions of personality styles and domain-specific life events on the associations between self-construals and depressive symptoms were conducted using Amos 22. A bias-corrected bootstrapping approach was used to improve the accuracy of confidence limits for the indirect effect, and 95% confidence intervals were calculated (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Shrout & Bolger, 2002). According to Preacher and Hayes (2008), multiple mediation effects exist when the indirect effect is significant. To further test for individual mediation effects for each mediator (sociotropy and the interaction of sociotropy and negative interpersonal life events), RMediation (Tofighi & MacKinnon, 2011) was used to calculate this individual mediation effects.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

Descriptive and Missing Data

Table 2 presents mean and standard deviation of all variables measured in the present study and Table 3 presents the bivariate correlations among those variables. The overall percentage of missing data was 0.31%. The randomness of missing data was evaluated using Little’s Missing Completely at Random Test (MCAR; Little, 1988). Results of Little’s MCAR test, $\chi^2(16382)=16335.64, p = .600$, indicated that data were missing at completely random rates and there were no identifiable patterns for the missing data. Expectancy Maximization algorithm (EM; Dempster, Laird, & Rubin, 1977) was then conducted to impute missing values.

Path Analyses

The hypothesized model (model controlling for social anxiety; Figure 1) included variables of relational self-construal, collective self-construal, independent self-construal, social anxiety, sociotropy, autonomy, interaction of sociotropy and interpersonal life events, interaction of autonomy and achievement life events, and depressive symptoms. Results showed that the hypothesized model was not consistent with the empirical data. The model fit indices, $\chi^2(22) = 920.13, p<.001, \chi^2/df = 41.82, TLI = -.351, CFI = .175, RMSEA = .266$, indicated a poor model fit.

Due to the poor model fit, the hypothesized model was modified (Kenny, 2011). All possible associations between variables, including covariances between relational
Table 2  
*Descriptive Data (N = 579)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational Self-Construal</td>
<td>57.98</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Construal</td>
<td>52.67</td>
<td>8.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-Construal</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotropy</td>
<td>95.49</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>89.02</td>
<td>13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Life Events</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Life Events</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Sociotropy and</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Life Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Autonomy and</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Life Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Correlations among Variables (N = 579)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relational Self-Construal</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collective Self-Construal</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Independent Self-Construal</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social Anxiety</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sociotropy</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interpersonal Life Events</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Achievement Life Events</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interaction of Sociotropy &amp; Interpersonal Life Events</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interaction of Autonomy &amp; Achievement Life Events</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. ** p<.01, * p<.05*
self-construal, collective self-construal, and independent self-construal, covariances between sociotropy, autonomy, and their interaction with life events, correlations between social anxiety and sociotropy, autonomy, and their interaction with life events were added (see Figure 2). The path analysis for the model with all associations still yielded a poor to acceptable model fit, $\chi^2 (3) = 38.28, p< .001, \chi^2/df = 12.76$, TLI = .611, CFI = .968, RMSEA = .143. Because of the poor to acceptable model fit, the next step of re-specification was that paths with a $p$ value of .20 or lower were set to zero (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1989; Burkholder & Harlow, 2003). The following paths were identified and eliminated during this step of re-specification: (a) association from independent self-construal to interaction of autonomy and life events, (b) association from interaction of autonomy and life events to depressive symptoms, (c) association from collective self-construal to autonomy, (d) association from collective self-construal to interaction of autonomy and life events, (e) association from relational self-construal to interaction of autonomy and life events, (e) association from relational self-construal to interaction of autonomy and life events, and (f) correlation between autonomy and interaction of autonomy and life events. Model fit indices for the revised model (see Figure 3), $\chi^2 (11) = 44.32, p< .001, \chi^2/df = 4.03$, TLI = .900, CFI = .969, RMSEA = .072, indicated a good model fit.

An alternative model with no interaction of personality styles and domain-specific life events was tested (see Figure 4). Results of path analysis for the model without interaction, $\chi^2 (3) = 36.88, p< .001, \chi^2/df = 12.29$, TLI = .764, CFI = .966, RMSEA = .140, yielded a poor to fair model fit. Re-specification was conducted based on the above outlined empirical criterion, and one path was identified and eliminated: the association from collective self-construal to autonomy. Model fit indices for the
Figure 3. Modified Model
Figure 4. Model without Interactions
modified model without interaction (see Figure 5), $\chi^2 (6) = 39.87, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 6.65, TLI = .882, CFI = .966, RMSEA = .099$, indicated a acceptable model fit.

A comparison was conducted to calculate the difference between CFI values for the modified model and the modified model without interaction. Results indicated a $\Delta$CFI of .003, which is larger than the suggested value of .002, so the modified model with interaction was kept. Standardized regression weights for this optimal model were presented in Table 4.

**Tests for Mediation**

Total effects, direct effects, and indirect effects are shown in Table 5. Analysis of indirect effects was conducted to test for mediation effects of personality styles on the association between self-construals and depressive symptoms using 95% bootstrapping confidence intervals. There was only one significant indirect effect found from collective self-construal to depressive symptoms, $B = .057, p = .001, 95\% CI [.028, .097]$. To test for individual mediation effects of sociotropy, result showed that sociotropy is a significant mediator for the path of collective self-construal to depressive symptoms, $\beta = .057, SE = .015, 95\% CI [.03, .088]$. 
Table 4

*Standardized Regression Weights (N = 579)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety → Collective Self-Construal</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Self-Construal → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Self-Construal → Autonomy</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Self-Construal → Interaction of Sociotropy and Life Events</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Self-Construal → Interaction of Autonomy and Life Events</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Construal → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Self-Construal → Interaction of Sociotropy and Life Events</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-Construal → Sociotropy</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-Construal → Autonomy</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Self-Construal → Interaction of Sociotropy and Life Events</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety → Autonomy</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety → Interaction of Autonomy and Life Events</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Anxiety → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotropy → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Autonomy and Life Events → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p* < .05
Table 5  
*Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects and Their 95% Confidence Intervals Testing for Multiple Mediations*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Interaction of A &amp; ILS</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Autonomy</td>
<td>-.324*</td>
<td>-.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.655*</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Interaction of S &amp; ILS</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Autonomy</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Sociotropy</td>
<td>-.541*</td>
<td>-.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Interaction of S &amp; ILS</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.336*</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Interaction of S &amp; ILS</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of A &amp; ILS → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>1.088*</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotropy → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Interaction of A &amp; ILS</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Autonomy</td>
<td>-.324*</td>
<td>-.518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Table 5 (continued)
*Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects and Their 95% Confidence Intervals Testing for Multiple Mediations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.655*</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Interaction of S &amp; ILS</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Autonomy</td>
<td>.295*</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Sociotropy</td>
<td>-.541*</td>
<td>-.788</td>
<td>-.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Interaction of S &amp; ILS</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Sociotropy</td>
<td>.336*</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Interaction of S &amp; ILS</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of A &amp; ILS → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>1.088*</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociotropy → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Lower CI</th>
<th>Upper CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relational SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective SC → Depressive Symptoms</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CI = Confidence Interval; SC = Self-Construal; Interaction of A & ILS = Interaction of Autonomy and Life Events; Interaction of S & ILS = Interaction of Sociotropy and Life Events. *$p < .05$. 
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Figure 5. Modified Model without Interactions
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

This study aimed to examine the relationships among self-construals, personality styles, interactions of personality styles and domain specific life events, and depressive symptoms in international students. Results of path analyses confirmed one of the four proposed hypotheses while the other three hypotheses were partially supported. Social anxiety did not influence the associations of self-construals and personality styles with depressive symptoms. In addition, self-construals were found to be positively associated with corresponding personality styles; that is, relational-interdependent self-construal and collective-interdependent self-construal both were positively related to sociotropic personality style while independent self-construal was positively related to autonomous personality style. The interaction of autonomous personality style and stressful achievement life events was associated with international students’ depressive symptoms. Results also supported the mediation effect of sociotropy for the relationship between collective self-construal and depressive symptoms.

However, while results supported the relationships between self-construals and their corresponding personality styles, there were unexpected negative associations found between relational self-construal and autonomy and between individual self-construal and sociotropy. Also, contrary to the hypotheses, none of the self-construals was related to...
the interactions of personality styles and domain-specific life events. Further, there was no relationship between interaction of sociotropy and interpersonal negative life events to depressive symptoms.

Before discussing each result in details, it should be noted that the intercorrelations between relational self-construal and collective self-construal \((r = .59)\) and between relational self-construal and independent self-construal \((r = .56)\) were considerably high, which raised a question whether these constructs were independent from one another. In the original scale development, Kashima and Hardie (2000) also encountered similar high intercorrelations among the RIC subscales \((r = .53\) for relational self-construal and collective self-construal and \(r = .58\) for relational self-construal and individual self-construal). They argued these high intercorrelations are caused by the context the subscales share, since each scenario was asked three times to assess three different self-aspects in the RIC scale. Another possibility is that self-construals might be related to an individual’s self-evaluation. Someone with a positive self-evaluation is likely to rate him-/herself consistently positive and therefore respond to items of all self-construals similarly. While further research like confirmatory factor analysis is warranted to investigate the relationship among constructs, it is possible that there might be overlaps among self-construals measured by the RIC scale.

**Relationships between Self-Construals and Personality Styles**

The literature in general supported no correlation between interdependence and autonomy (Gorski & Young, 2002; Sato & McCann, 1998; Mak et al., 2011). Thus, it was hypothesized that relational self-construal and collective self-construal would be associated with sociotropy but not with autonomy. Contrary to this hypothesis, results
yielded a negative association from relational self-construal to autonomy. Considering that relational self-construal refers to the degree individuals define themselves through relatedness to others and that defensive separation is one subscale measured by autonomy, it is possible that one might endorse opposite scores on the scales of relational self-construal and autonomy and thus resulted in the negative association. Further investigation is warranted to replicate and confirm such relationship.

Similarly, it was hypothesized that independent self-construal would be associated with autonomy but not with sociotropy. Results of this study yielded an unexpected negative association between independent self-construal and sociotropy. However, the results fit partially with previous findings as previous research showed mixed results regarding the existence of negative association between independent self-construal and sociotropy (Gorski & Young, 2002; Mak et al., 2011; Sato & McCann, 1998). Studies that supported negative association between the independent self-construal and sociotropy (Mak et al., 2011; Sato & McCann, 1998) suggested that the negative association was a reflection of individuals’ adaptiveness to independence in the American cultural context. While participants from those previous studies were American undergraduate students (Sato & McCann, 1998) and Americans with minority ethnic identities (Mak et al., 2011), participants of this current study were mostly international students from cultures that are less likely value independence (e.g., China, India, South Korea, and Taiwan; Fernández, Paez, & González, 2005; Morling, & Fiske, 1999) and matriculating through the process of acculturation. It is possible that international students might still identify strongly with their own cultural values, while rejecting and not incorporating American culture into their sense of self (Berry, 1997; Searle & Ward,
Therefore, one might interpret the negative association between independent self-construal and sociotropy as a reflection of the limited acculturation of international students included in the current study.

**Relationship between Self-Construals and Interaction of Personality Styles and Domain-Specific Life Events**

Based on the assumptions that there are associations between self-construals and personality styles, it was hypothesized that self-construals would be related to the corresponding interaction of personality styles and domain-specific life events. For example, relational-interdependent self-construal and collective-interdependent self-construal would be related to the interaction of sociotropic personality style and interpersonal life events. Similarly, it was proposed that independent self-construal would be positively related to the interaction of autonomous personality style and achievement life events. As mentioned above, the proposed associations between self-construals and personality styles were confirmed in this study. However, the hypotheses regarding the self-construals and the interactions of personality styles and life-events were not supported by the results.

To understand the lack of relationships between self-construals and the interaction of personality styles and domain-specific life events, one might consider the relationship between self-construals and stressful life events first. A majority of previous studies have focused on the indirect impact of self-construals on perceived stress and adjustment, such as through coping (Lam & Zane, 2004; Oguri & Gudykunst, 2002; Yang, Noels, & Saumure, 2006). Only Cross (1995) analyzed the direct association between self-construals and perceived stress for 71 East Asian international students and 79 American
graduate students. Results showed that only interdependent self-construal (which is comparable to collective self-construals), but not independent self-construal, had a positive direct effect on stress for the sample of international students. While Cross (1995) found the association between interdependent self-construal and perceived stress was significant among international students, more research is needed to explain the contrary findings.

In the literature there is no pre-established significant relationship between relational self-construal and stress or between independent self-construal and stress, thus making the current examination of this relationship exploratory in nature. In addition, the main effects of stressful life events were not studied in the present study. Since there were no significant relationships between the main effect of stress and relational self-construal or independent self-construal, it is no surprise that there were no significant associations between self-construals and the interactions of personality styles and stressful life events beyond the main effects of life events.

**Association between Interaction of Sociotropy and Interpersonal Life Events and Depressive Symptoms**

Contrary to expectations, no relationship was found between the interaction of sociotropy and interpersonal life events and depressive symptoms. In Beck’s theory (1983), individuals with sociotropic personality style who encounter negative interpersonal life events, such as rejection and loss of loved ones, may experience depressive symptoms. In the current study, stressful interpersonal life events were measured using the Interpersonal Distress subscale of the Index of Life Stress, which measures mainly one’s perceived racial discrimination (e.g., “I can feel racial
Thus, one could argue that the results of interpersonal distress obtained in this study were limited to perceived discrimination, instead of interpersonal negative life events that are congruent with the concept of sociotropy. Therefore, the lack of association between the interaction of sociotropy and negative interpersonal life events and depressive symptoms might not be contrary to Beck’s theory (1983) and the proposed hypothesis.

Another possible explanation for the lack of association between the interaction of sociotropy and negative interpersonal life events and depressive symptoms is that relationships between perceived discrimination and depressive symptoms is inconsistent. Some studies confirmed a direct relationship between perceived racial discrimination and depressive symptoms (Chae, Lee, Lincoln, & Ihara, 2012; Finch, Kolody, & Vega, 2000; Rahman & Rollock, 2004; Wei, Ku, Russel, Mallinckrodt, & Liao, 2008) while others found no direct impact of discrimination on depressive symptoms (Budhwani, Hearld, & Chavez-Yenter, 2015; Lau, Tsai, Shih, Liu, Hwang, & Takeuchi, 2013). In general, when encountering racial discrimination, U.S.-born racial minorities were found to be more prone to depressive symptoms and other mental health concerns than their non-U.S. born counterparts (Budhwani et al., 2015; Lau et al., 2013). To be more specific, Wei and colleagues (2008) found that there was no relationship between racial discrimination and depressive symptoms in Asian international students. Therefore, one could argue that foreign-born international students are less likely to react to discrimination-based interpersonal distress with depressive symptoms.
A third possible explanation for the lack of association between interaction of sociotropy and negative interpersonal life events and depressive symptoms is the categorization of negative life events (Abramson, Alloy, & Hogan, 1997; Coyne & Whiffen, 1995). Some researchers speculated that individuals experiencing life events might interpret such events as belonging to a different category than what the developers of an instrument had in mind (Abramson et al., 1997; Kwon & Whisman, 1998). Because of this varied categorization, there is a potential for mixed findings between the interaction of personality styles and life events and depressive symptoms for the current study.

Finally, while individuals are likely to focus on self-relevant life events, achievement life events are more prevalent to college student populations (Giordano, Wood, & Michaela, 2000). Thus, it is possible that international students are more academically-driven and react to achievement life events more than to interpersonal life events. This hypothesis is supported by two other studies using non-clinical college students in which no association between the interaction of sociotropy and negative interpersonal life events and depressive symptoms could be found (Clark & Oates, 1995; Giordano et al., 2000). These previous studies align with that of the current study.

**Mediating Effects of Personality Styles**

The hypotheses were that the main effects of personality styles and the interactions of personality styles and domain-specific stressful life events would mediate the relationships between self-construals and depressive symptoms. The previous section provides a possible explanation for the lack of relationships between the interaction of sociotropic personality styles and stressful interpersonal life events and depressive
symptoms and between independent self-construal and the interaction of autonomous personality style and negative achievement life events outlined. While these non-significant relationships among variables suggest no mediation effects, they do not explain why sociotropy was only found to mediate the relationship between collective self-construal and depressive symptoms but not for relational self-construal.

One explanation for this pattern of findings might be that relational self-construal referred to one’s close relationships, like partners and friends. One third of international students in the current sample identified as either married or in a committed relationship, while two-thirds of the sample were single. This demographic composition might have influenced what this group of international students would refer to as their close relationship. The concept of defining oneself through close relationships might become more complex in the context of international students adapting to U.S. culture. As international students adjust to the U.S., they grieve the loss of their social support system and face the challenge of building a comparable social support system (Mallinckrodt & Leong, 1992; Sandhu, 1995; Yeh & Inose, 2003). For this reason, students may define one of various social relationships as “close.” For example, close relationships may refer to friends and family back at home or friends they make in the U.S. This redefinition of close relationships for international students helps possibly explain why sociotropy did not mediate the association between relational self-construal and depressive symptoms. For example, if international students refer their friendship back home as close relationships, the influence of “close relationships” on their responses to sociotropy might not be as present as those who refer to nearby “close relationships,”
as sociotropy measures “concern about what others think”, “dependence”, and “pleasing others.”

Similarly, and contrary to the hypothesis, autonomy did not mediate the association between independent self-construal and depressive symptoms. This lack of mediation might be explained by the examining relationship between independent self-construal and depressive symptoms is exploratory, as previous studies did not find a consistent relationship between the two variables. Independent self-construal in this study reflected whether one lives up with his or her own value, develop uniqueness as an individual, and assume personal responsibility. If individuals with high independent self-construal lose their sense of uniqueness, one might speculate that it would trigger depressive symptoms and other negative emotional reactions. However, research also showed that independent self-construal is positively related to better coping and better psychological outcome compared to interdependent self-construal (Lam & Zane, 2004; Oguri & Gudykunst, 2002; Yang et al., 2006). Autonomy was positively related to independent self-construal in the current study and previous studies (Gorski & Young, 2002). While autonomy was found to be positively related to depressive symptoms in the current study, previous literature yielded mixed findings (related: Bagby et al., 2001; Bieling & Alden, 2001; Mongrain & Blackburn, 2005; Sato & McCann, 1998; Sutton et al., 2011; not related: Alford & Gerrity, 1995; Nelson et al., 2001). Nevertheless, independent self-construal was negatively correlated with depressive symptoms in this study, also supported by literature (Mak et al, 2011; Su et al., 2013). Despite the earlier speculation that independent self-construal would be positively related to depressive symptoms due to its positive correlation with autonomy, results of this study did not
support such relationship. Therefore, it would make sense that in the current study autonomy was not found to be a significant mediator.

Limitations

While the findings of the current study have significant implications, results should be interpreted in consideration of its limitations. This study used a cross-sectional design, which does not allow for causal inferences.

Also, as mentioned previously, as it is unclear if international students’ refer to friends and family back in their home country or in the U.S., asking for close relationships might have led to mixed results regarding mediation effects in this study. Using a mixed design for future studies could potentially provide more nuances in understanding the influences of self-construals and personality styles for international students.

A further limitation is that eighty percent of the participants of this study were graduate students, with a mean age of 26.24 years old, who are presumably more mature than undergraduate students. Therefore, the generalizability of this study might be limited to graduate students. Another data collection to replicate and confirm the model fit would help address the limited generalizability.

As noted above, items used to assess interpersonal life events in the present study mainly measured participants perceived racial discrimination, which could be one aspect of stressful interpersonal life events but which is not representative at all. The lack of associations between the interaction of sociotropic personality style and stressful life events and other variables (e.g. collective self-construal or depressive symptoms) might relate to the limited number of items. In addition, the Index of Life Stress (ILS; Yang
&Clum, 1995), was developed two decades ago and would benefit from updates to its content. Thus, it might be that items failed to capture stressful interpersonal life events as defined by Beck (1983) and they are not being representative enough of current negative social life events. Future research might include items that reflect current trends of connecting with one another through social media and the stress related to the lacking of such connection.

Implications for Practice

Despite study limitations, results contribute to the literature of personality styles and mental health of international students. Several implications can be drawn from the current study. First, results of this study confirmed that the concept of self-construals was significantly related to personality styles of sociotropy and autonomy in international students. As this population is understudied, the present study expands the horizon of cross-cultural literature and provided practical implications for higher education personnel to working with international students in the U.S. In particular, results showed that sociotropy is significantly related to relational self-construal and collective self-construal, the previously defined interdependence, and that autonomy is related to independent self-construal. Therefore, identifying international students’ self-construals would help better understand their personality styles, which are vulnerabilities to depressive symptoms. Personnel who work with international students in higher education institutions, such as mental health professionals and academic advisors, can incorporate measures of the PSI-II or the RIC scale during intake assessment or initial meeting to profile international students’ personality style and provide according support. Considering there was a significant relationship between depressive symptoms and the
interaction of negative achievement life events and autonomy, it may be the case that international students who identify as achievement-driven are likely responding to stressful achievement related events when studying in the U.S. Thus, providing academic support through workshops or one-on-one guidance for this subgroup of international students would be beneficial in increasing academic self-efficacy and performance and potentially buffer depressive symptoms. Furthermore, results of this study provide evidence that international students display varying personality styles and self-construals. This helps keep personnel who work with international students in check regarding their assumptions that international students only display certain cultural and personality traits.

In sum, the present study is the first study of its kind to explore the relationships among self-construals, personality styles, and interactions of personality styles and stressful life events in international students. In addition, this study provides a more nuanced understanding of the way international students perceive themselves in an American context. This study adds knowledge to understand self-concepts and their relationships to depression for the growing international student population in the U.S. Results also provide higher education personnel more angles in understanding international students and provide according support.
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