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Abstract

Given the projected diversity among the U.S. national population by 2065, immigrant leisure travelers will increase, are unique and understudied. In a three-article format, this dissertation examines immigrant leisure travelers’ stress, coping, revisit intention, and acculturation among Korean immigrants residing in the United States. The first article proposes an adapted framework that incorporates acculturation as a sociocultural factor underlying immigrants’ leisure travel stress experiences. The second article assesses the relationships within the stress and coping model including primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, coping, and revisit intention using structural equation modeling. Findings suggest that leisure travelers experienced stress across travel phases, employed both problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies to manage stress, and that coping positively related to revisit intentions. The utility and application of the transactional stress and coping model was demonstrated and supported. The third article identifies leisure travel stressors encountered in three select travel phases, and examines if and how acculturation strategies Korean immigrants use to adjust to the new culture differentiates them. Findings revealed perceived travel stress differed by acculturation strategies at all three travel phases and within select individual stressors. Overall, those seeking marginalization and separation perceived significantly higher stress levels than those seeking integration and assimilation. Implications for theory and management and future research are discussed for each chapter.
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Chapter 1: Introduction & Overview

As of 2020, the United States is witnessing a significant demographic change, particularly with Asian Americans. According to the 2017 U.S. Census Bureau population estimates, Asian Americans exhibited rapid demographic growth of 72% between 2000 and 2015 (from 11.9 million to 20.4 million), with approximately 60% of it attributable to immigration (López, Ruiz, & Patten, 2017). Given their rapid growth rate and expanding spending power, foreign-born Asian Americans in the United States represent a niche travel market with a future growth potential. While existing studies have documented the importance of travel stress and coping, investigations of stress experienced by immigrant travelers and subsequent responses in tourism settings are lacking. Further, investigations as to what and how various sociocultural factors shape immigrant leisure travelers’ stress perceptions and the heterogeneity within immigrant subgroups are still nascent. Recognizing and understanding the issues and challenges faced by immigrant travelers will provide the basis for effective visitor travel management and maximize travel benefits for all visitors.

Following a three-article format, this dissertation proposes and tests an adapted travel stress-coping model and then compares stress among travelling Korean immigrants in the United States. Specifically, the first article, titled ‘The role of acculturation in immigrant travel stress and coping: A conceptual approach’, (1) reviews the extant literature on stress incited by leisure travel, and (2) advances leisure travel stress research by presenting an approach to enhance conceptualization of travel stress experienced by immigrants in their host cultural environment (Targeted for submission to Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism). The conceptual literature review
theoretically situates the broad study in relation to transactive stress-coping theory and acculturation theory. Building on the transactional stress-coping model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), the first article proposes an adapted stress-coping framework that integrates acculturation as a personal factor to explain immigrant leisure travelers’ experiences to travel stress in addition to a series of situational factors. The theoretical contribution of this work is an adapted model which accounts for the scope and breadth of immigrant leisure travelers’ perspective: how they appraise travel stress, the extent they employ coping mechanisms, and how stress associates with short-term (e.g., revisit intention) and long-term (e.g., discontinued use of an area) outcomes. The paper also contributes to the stress literature as it extends the debate on travel as a source of stress and contributes to a better understanding of how traveling may incite stress among immigrants.

Next, the proposed model is empirically examined among a select immigrant sample in the U.S. (‘Testing a stress and coping framework to understand immigrant leisure travel stress’, formatted for submission to Tourism Management). An online questionnaire was administered to a U.S. sample of Korean immigrant adults during the Summer of 2019 (n=249). The study sample were recruited on a web-based recruiting platform to target those (a) who were born in Korea and moved to the U.S. either as adults (first generation) or between 6-17 years of age (1.5 generation; Zhou, 1997), (b) identified as a U.S. resident, and (c) who had travel experiences in the U.S. within the past 12 months. Findings revealed stress was encountered across pre-travel preparations, en route, and at destinations and that leisure travelers employed both problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies. Coping related positively to revisit intentions. The
theoretical contribution of the second article is a novel and comprehensive application of a travel-related stress and coping model within a domestic leisure travel context among Korean immigrants. Further, similar to previous findings (Propst et al., 2008; Schuster et al. 2006a, 2006b), this work confirmed a general coping scheme exists to manage leisure traveler stress. Results inform future research directions in leisure travel stress research and managerial efforts. While the sample size was adequate to examine the relationships among most of the components using structural equation modeling, the sample sizes across acculturation strategies were uneven and insufficient for the desired modeling. However, while not directly testing acculturation strategies in the structural model, age of arrival, English proficiency, and length of stay in the U.S. were included as control variables and acculturation proxy indicators (Lee et al., 2011). Finally, a direct relationship between acculturation strategies and immigrants’ leisure travel stress tests if and how acculturation strategies influence immigrants’ perceived stress levels (Formatted for submission to *Tourism Management Perspectives*). This research integrates Berry’s (1997) four-fold bidimensional acculturation model and Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional stress model and differentiates leisure travel and stressors encountered by Korean immigrant travelers across travel phases (pre-trip, en route, at destination. Findings reveal that the U.S. domestic Korean market is heterogeneous, providing further support to consider intra-ethnic group consumer differences (Fernandez et al., 2015; Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Schneider et al., 2014). Specifically, perceived stress levels varied by acculturation strategy both across phases and among selected individual stressors. Overall, marginalized and separated Korean immigrants perceived significantly higher stress levels than those seeking integration
and assimilation. In addition, both general and ethnic-related stressors were experienced by Korean immigrants. Implications for marketing, management, and planning are discussed. The final section of the dissertation addresses important theoretical contributions and applied management implications, with discussion of future research opportunities.
1.1 References


Chapter 2: The Role of Acculturation in Immigrant Travel Stress and Coping: A Conceptual Approach

Abstract

Immigrant travel is an increasing and unique travel segment. Absent in the travel literature is a theoretical and dynamic model that approaches immigrant travel cohesively and throughout travel phases. While leisure research has explored immigrants’ constraints and stress, the tourism literature is sparse in this area. As such, a transactive stress-coping model is proposed to explain the immigrants’ leisure travel context, enhance understanding of leisure travel and inform management. Considering multiple travel experience phases and multiple stress appraisal processes, the adapted model presents an iterative, inclusive and experiential approach to understand immigrant leisure travel including the important role of acculturation.

Keywords: Constraints to leisure travel, Immigration, Travel phases, Discrimination

2.1 Introduction

Leisure travel both incites and relieves stress. On the one hand, scholars have addressed tourists’ recovery experiences and the myriad benefits of leisure travel at both the individual and societal level (Chen et al., 2016; Coleman &Iso-Ahola, 1993; Moura et al., 2017; Neal et al., 1999). In contrast, literature suggests that tourists encounter various situations in leisure travel experiences that create stress, such as developing itineraries, traffic jams, and poor service deliveries (Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhu et al.,
Stress experienced in leisure travel may result in unsatisfactory travel experiences and hinder individuals from realizing positive benefits (Furnham, 1984; Schneider, 2007; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schneider et al., 2011; Zhu et al., 2020). Further, if left unmanaged and unreduced, leisure travelers’ stress will likely influence destination choices, future activity demand (Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006), and subsequently, management actions (Schneider, 1995).

Given that stressful travel experiences can impact travelers’ physical and psychological health (Dolnicar et al., 2012), understanding and recognizing the extent of travel-related stress is important, but understudied. Empirical studies verifying leisure travel stress, its potential consequences, and the underlying factors that influence such stress remain scant and fragmented in the published literature. Further, while existing travel stress research has informed stress within the general population (Chen, 2017; DeFrank et al., 2000; Gao & Kerstetter, 2018; Lin, 2018; Schneider et al., 2011; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012), relatively few studies have examined immigrant travel stress despite diversifying publics in the U.S. and beyond (Huang, 2012; Moufakkir, 2011; Schermann et al., 2015).

Since the mid-1990s leisure and outdoor recreation research has applied the transactional model of stress and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) to study how visitors appraise and cope with stress in recreation settings (Kim, 2015; Miller & McCool, 2003; Peden & Schuster, 2008; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006). While the term, ‘travel stress’ was defined in 2000 within a business travel context (DeFrank et al., 2000), only since 2010 have researchers empirically sought to understand leisure travel stress. However, a paucity of tourism research examines it in a
leisure travel setting using the transactional stress-coping model, and, when it does, it is fragmented and with homogenous samples (Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhu et al., 2020). As a result, considerably less is known about diverse tourists and stress.

Existing studies further highlight the role of coping (Ferguson, 2016; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider, 1995; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schneider et al., 2011; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006; Zhu et al., 2020). According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), coping is defined as “constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person” (p. 141). How people cope with undesirable situations, in turn, determines whether they are stressed by the experience and thereby in travel, the quality of visitor experiences. Thus, it is important to understand not only stressors, but the coping in response to the stress as well.

Given the diversifying demographics across the globe and the significant role of immigrants as potential tourists, greater investigations into immigrant groups and individuals are warranted. In 2018, for example, the U.S. had more than 44.8 million foreign-born immigrant population, accounting for 13.7% of the total population (Budiman, 2020). By 2065, Asian immigrants are projected to become the largest immigrant group and constitute 38% of all U.S. immigrants (Budiman, 2020). With the projections that populations will continue to become more diverse, immigrants are anticipated to shape a niche visitor segment in the nation’s domestic travel and tourism. Hence, the need to more comprehensively understand how immigrants perceive and cope with stressful leisure travel experiences in their new cultural setting is crucial and timely (Shen et al., 2018).
Existing studies suggest that the travel behavior of immigrants and the stress that they experience may be accompanied by certain characteristics that may not be found among the non-Hispanic White mainstream or U.S.-born population (Krmykowski et al., 2014; Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska, 1998). For example, immigrants encounter a variety of stressors, including lack of time/money, and access to information about destination amenities that can constrain their leisure travel participation (Schermann et al., 2015). However, in most cases, immigrants are faced with the additional task of adapting to the host society and while undergoing cultural changes and they may lack sufficient social networks, language proficiency, and familiarity with norms and values (Stodolska, 1998). Moreover, insufficient bilingual services at the destination, as well as either overt or subtle forms of discrimination from other cultural groups, may constitute potential stressors that can also affect leisure travel experience of immigrants (Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska et al., 2019). By understanding these unique attributes and identifying factors potentially contributing to immigrants’ travel stress, we can incorporate leisure travel stress research as subfield of immigrant leisure travel (Stodolska, 1998).

How immigrants perceive and experience stress have been linked to a range of antecedent factors, both cultural and psychological (Berry, 2006b; Ward & Szabo, 2020). One unique personal factor likely to describe and influence immigrant travel stress is acculturation. Acculturation refers to the ways in which “the dual process of cultural and psychological change” occurs when two (or more) cultural groups interact (Berry, 2005, p. 698). It involves changes in values, attitudes, behaviors, and identities of individuals both in acculturating groups and in the host society (Berry, 2005). It is also an important
explanatory variable to assess individual differences in the psychological study among ethnic groups in intercultural contact settings (Berry et al., 1986; Yoon et al., 2012). Existing evidence supports the association between acculturation and immigrants’ travel behavior, including participation patterns, preferences, and constraints (Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Stodolska, 1998) through travel stress such as language restrictions, lack of knowledge of travel opportunities, unfamiliarity with the host culture, being stared at, or feeling unwelcomed (Huang, 2012). In addition, as Stodolska and Yi-Kook (2005) described, “because immigration-related constraints will become superimposed on those related to ethnic origin and culture” (p. 65), domestic leisure travel can be stressful for immigrants. Accordingly, acculturation may function as a distinct personal immigrant attribute that differentiates travel stress appraisal. Thus, a conceptualization of leisure-travel stress that accounts for acculturation is proposed to address an increasingly important leisure travel segment, advance theory, and inform management.

2.2 Literature Review

2.2.1 Transactional Approach to Stress and Coping

Although experienced universally, a single definition of stress that satisfies all scholars and contexts is unknown (Cox, 1978; Fink, 2016). Stress definitions, thus, vary depending on theoretical context (e.g., psychological approach, sociological approach, physiological approach) and research questions addressed (Baquotayan, 2015). Among several stress-related models, this study is based on the transactional model of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) that holds stress is contextual and iterative with an interwoven transaction between the person and the environment (Folkman, 2013).
Accordingly, events are stressful only when the person perceives them as personally significant or exceed one’s current resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Using this view, not every individual evaluates the same events to be stressful to the same degree. The transactional model thereby allows for individual differences in the appraisal processes, interpretations of stress-inducing events, and selection of relevant resources (Lazarus, 2006). This approach is perhaps the most widely used stress and coping theory and validated empirically by researchers across psychology, health, tourism, and social work disciplines (e.g., Dewe & Ng, 1999; Jordan et al., 2015; Kessler, 1998). Further, beyond useful (Chishima et al., 2018, p. 2), Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) stress and coping model is “one of the most comprehensive theories of stress and coping” (Zakowski et al., 2001, p. 158).

With its emphasis on the individual’s cognitive appraisal and subjective interpretation of the experience of stress, Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional stress model considers such person-environment transactions in their entirety. Accordingly, the transactional model identifies four major components: person and environmental factors (influencing factors), appraisals, coping, and short- and long-term outcomes. Person factors relate to a person’s commitments or beliefs, while environmental factors relate to the properties of a potentially stressful event (e.g., novelty, predictability, duration, and imminence). Both factors shape the overall appraisal process, and has effect on coping and outcomes (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In essence, these influencing factors are unique to and individually vary (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995, 2007).
Within the stress and coping paradigm, cognitive appraisal of stressors has been proposed as the core process (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Cognitive appraisal is generally defined as a process by which an individual evaluates the personal significance (e.g., What is happening? Does it matter to me personally, and if so, in what ways?) and the level of controllability of a stressful situation (e.g., What needs to be done?). Lazarus and Folkman (1984) focused on two forms of cognitive appraisal determining if and how stress is assessed and addressed: (1) primary appraisal and (2) secondary appraisal.

Primary appraisal evaluates what is at stake and is shaped by the person’s own values, needs, personal beliefs, and goals (Folkman, 2013). As a result, three outcomes are possible from this evaluation: irrelevant (i.e., no implications to oneself), benign-positive (i.e., positive emotions or promising benefits), or stressful (i.e., perceived to threaten well-being) (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Stress appraisals can, further, be labeled as: harm/loss referring to damage that has already occurred, threat that concerns anticipated harm or loss, and challenge that represents an opportunity to grow from interacting with stress that can be overcome. For example, in leisure travel settings, the appraisal of a stressful encounter may differ meaningfully among individuals whereby one perceives the stressful situation as highly challenging, indicating an opportunity to grow as opposed to potential harm, threatening one’s ability to enjoy the trip. Thus, each leisure traveler may perceive and respond to stressors differently (Schneider & Hammitt, 1995).

If individuals find certain situations as personally relevant with stress appraisals, then, secondary appraisal is initiated. The secondary appraisal provides an assessment of
the person’s coping options and ability to cope with a stressor (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

More recent cognitive appraisal literature suggests that the differentiation of the two major forms of appraisal (i.e., primary and secondary appraisal) is not the only way to conceptualize cognitive appraisal. For example, in the cognitive appraisal theory of emotions, whether a situation is considered stressful or not depends on the goals of the person and consequently, comparing the actual state and the desired goals (i.e., goal congruence; Lazarus, 1991; Scherer et al., 2001; Skavronska et al., 2017; So et al., 2015). Indeed, researchers have noted that perceived effort to sustain the person’s goals is an integral determinant of individuals’ performance (Pattyn et al., 2018). In addition to goal congruence, limited studies in tourism have identified a set of appraisal dimensions including goal relevance, novelty, agency, certainty, and the degree of goal realization to understand the antecedents and consequences of positive tourist emotions (Ma et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2017). Due to limited testing of more recent cognitive appraisal conceptualizations (Ma et al., 2017), testing the two forms of appraisal in relation to coping are of interest to this paper, as theoretically described.

Primary and secondary appraisal are conceptualized to occur almost simultaneously and do not always reflect the dominance of one dimension over the other (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). As a result, primary and secondary appraisal interact and decide the presence of stress with the relevance of the situation to well-being and availability of coping resources and the effectiveness of coping strategies. If considered necessary, both cognitive (i.e., emotion-focused) and behavioral (i.e., problem-focused) coping responses are then considered to facilitate a desired outcome. Coping may vary
with the stress intensity; it is not always a linear process and could fail (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). If the use of a coping strategy fails to yield the desired outcome, stressor reappraisal occurs.

Depending on the coping success, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) described that both short- and long-term outcomes, which include physiological, affective, and effective components. Short-term outcomes may include positive and negative feelings, quality of encounter outcome, or physiological changes. Long-term outcomes include social functioning, morale, well-being, or somatic health not resulting from a single stressful event but from an aggregate of multiple stressful encounters over time (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

2.2.2 Stress-Coping Research in Tourism

The transactional model of stress developed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) provides a strong conceptual basis to explain tourism-related stress and coping in the tourism discipline and inform management. However, limited tourism studies using the transactional stress model exist and those that do, follow its introduction in the leisure literature (Schneider, 1995; Schneider & Hammit, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Wilhelm Stanis, 2007). Scholars call for more research to comprehend how this model functions in travel and tourism settings (Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhu et al., 2020).

Empirical support exists for the transactional stress and coping among tourists (Ferguson, 2016; Kim, 2015; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012) and business travelers (Chen, 2017).
Beyond travelers, the model has been expanded to gateway community residents as well (Jordan et al., 2019a, 2019b; Jordan & Vogt, 2017; Jordan et al., 2015). However, only five studies to date (Jordan et al., 2015; Kim, 2015; Schneider, 1995; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003) investigate both primary and secondary cognitive appraisals. Further, studies that fully incorporate the transactional stress theory (i.e., influencing factors, primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, coping, and outcome) remain considerably limited (Kim, 2015; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995).

Two existing studies empirically assessed travel-related stress, but neither explored the appraisal dimensions concurrently nor the coping among travelers. Among a small U.S. sample of recent leisure travelers (n= 110), Zehrer and Crotts (2012) proposed a vacation stress model and categorized stress into three stages of travel: pre-trip, during-trip (en route), and destination. Their study found leisure travelers experienced stress triggered by pre-trip stressors (e.g., travel arrangements, budget concerns), en route stressors (e.g., travel logistics, commuting, weather), and on-site destination stressors (e.g., finding accommodation, food, interacting with host culture). While the vacation stress model allows the examination of a second-order factor model and tests whether the three types of stress factors load on an overall vacation stress construct, the study exclusively measured one facet of stress appraisal with outcome variables (i.e., willingness to revisit, willingness to recommend).

Similar to Zehrer and Crotts (2012), but with a business travel focus, Chen (2017) identified possible stressors from three travel phases (i.e., pre-trip, during the trip, and post-trip) and the impact of personal stress, work stress, and health behavior on six types of business travel stress: travel inconvenience, hotel/airline preferences, travel
arrangements, work/personal life, making home arrangements, difficulty of maintaining a healthy lifestyle, and destination concerns. The subscales and the overall travel stress items’ reliability were strong and similar to leisure travel stress measures (Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). Unlike Zehrer and Crotts’ (2012) 5-point scale stress measure, Chen (2012) scored travel stress items using a 10-point scale and created an averaged summative travel stress score. However, the distinct dimensions of cognitive appraisal process and coping mechanisms were absent. Collectively, these studies suggest that stress experiences can occur at various stages of the travel experience. Thus, they highlight the consideration of multiple travel phases and corresponding stressors when measuring tourists’ stress. However, the assessment of the full realm of stress-coping process among leisure travelers was sparse in these studies.

More recent studies addressed stressors within an environmental context, such as undesirable weather (Kim, 2015) and water conditions (Ferguson, 2016). Weather conditions created stress among outdoor recreationists, resulted in both problem and emotion-focused coping and affected the overall visitor satisfaction (Kim, 2015). Similarly, Ferguson (2016) found the degradation of water level and water quality conditions inspired both emotion and problem-focused coping responses among water-based outdoor recreation visitors. More broadly, Stodolska et al.’s (2017) study of immigrants suggest that nature-based destinations provoked stress. Although these studies did not directly examine the antecedents of stress, their results suggest that Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) stress-coping model may provide a helpful conceptual framework for studying how stress in leisure travel settings develops.
The transactive stress-coping framework likely applies to immigrant leisure travel but requires modification due to the unique person-environment situation of immigrants. Stress can be a subjective phenomenon as what may be perceived as stressful to one individual may not be the same for another due to variations in individual’s characteristics and situational factors (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). As discussed by Krymkowski et al. (2014), immigrants, when they travel in a new culture, may exhibit different travel experiences, behaviors, and needs than the non-Hispanic White or U.S.-born population. Accordingly, some leisure travel stressors may be unique or perceived particularly stronger among immigrants pertaining to the immigration-related factors (Schneider et al., 2014; Stodolska et al., 2019).

Research on immigrant tourism and travel is rare (Huang, 2012). Moreover, previous studies in a leisure context have primarily focused on the positive functions of leisure with travel as a means to reduce immigrants' physical and psychological distress, foster interracial/interethnic interactions and social cohesion (Stodolska, 2015), contribute to cross-cultural understanding and facilitating acculturation (Kim et al., 2016), or alleviate acculturative stress (Kim & Iwasaki, 2016; Walker et al., 2011). These studies, however, have overlooked the possibility that leisure and travel also incites stress and the need for coping (Stodolska, 2000; Walker et al., 2011; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012).

To understand if and how immigrants experience stress in a tourism context, applying leisure literature may prove fruitful as researchers explicitly address stress as a leisure constraint (Crawford et al., 1991; Iwasaki & Schneider, 2003; Schneider & Wilhelm Stanis, 2007). Through the lens of the leisure constraint, existing studies have
documented various constraints, or likely sources of leisure travel stress, that are both commonly and uncommonly found within the general population. For example, in a study of first-generation Polish immigrants, Stodolska (1998) confirmed that immigrants are subject to constraints that the general population may encounter such as lack of time and money. Similarly, Scott et al.’s (2006) study of Korean immigrants reported they encounter universal constraints including lack of time, lack of money, and lack of information.

Conversely, studies also revealed that immigrant populations encounter certain stressful conditions that differ from those encountered by the general population. For example, Schermann et al. (2015) found that Hmong travelers in the United States had significant stress related to family-travel in that there were travel constraints uniquely related to food and cultural traditions within travel parties and that much of the travel included visits to see family rather than completely unobligated leisure travel. Similarly, but in leisure context, existing studies identified stress-inducing factors including insufficient English language competence, lack of familiarity, feeling alienated from the mainstream culture, fear of discrimination, undocumented status, or lengths of time in the community which inhibit immigrants’ leisure activity participation (Scott et al., 2006; Stodolska, 1998; Stodolska & Yi, 2003; Stodolska et al., 2019). In particular, discrimination was seen to concern many immigrants when they visit public parks and forests in their new host country (Livengood & Stodolska, 2004; Sharaievska et al., 2010; Stodolska et al., 2017). Studies suggest that such experience not only results in feeling unwelcome but also adversely affects destination selections, adjustment to the host country, and overall health (Schmitt et al., 2014; Scott et al., 2006). Among the
other difficulties that immigrants deal with is the unfamiliarity with laws and regulations in outdoor recreation settings, which can constrain their outdoor recreation participation (Bengston & Schermann, 2008). While there are potential stress factors likely to be experienced by all ethnic groups, researchers suggest others such as language difficulties and lack of information or opportunities may be more salient to first-generation immigrants (Stodolska et al., 2019). Taken together, these studies suggest that leisure travel stress experienced and perceived by immigrants is likely to be profound in its effects and its scope. However, there is still little in-depth understanding of how these immigrants experience stress at the intersection of immigration and leisure travel. To understand the travel stress experience among immigrants, of particular interest and need is considering acculturation as a key personal factor as antecedents of the transactional stress-coping process.

2.2.3 Acculturation

Acculturation has gained extensive scholarly attention since the 1930s, and as of 2000, was positioned as an integral topic in cross-cultural psychology (Berry, 2003). At the core of the acculturation concept are contact between two distinct cultural groups, change, and process. Acculturation definitions can be broadly divided into two approaches: group-level and individual-level. Early definitions viewed culture change as a group phenomenon with the classical definition, according to Redfield et al. (1936, p. 149): “Culture change which results from continuous first-hand contact between groups of individuals having different cultures through which changes occur in the original culture patterns of either or both groups”.
At the individual level, Graves (1967) introduced the concept of psychological acculturation and claimed cultural and psychological changes result in individuals that are directly influenced by both the host culture and home culture. Here, the emphasis shifted from cultural change within groups to the individual level. Hence, studying psychological changes and eventual adaptation individuals experience became the research focus.

In general, such distinction at the two levels (i.e., group and individual) is important because even though general acculturation may take place at the group level, not everyone engages in or changes in the same way during their acculturation (Berry, 1997; Graves, 1967). Thus, individuals can vary in terms of the degree, duration, and pace of the acculturation process, even among those with the same cultural origin (Nauck, 2008). Consistent with these views, Berry (2005) defined acculturation as “the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members” (p. 698). According to Berry (2005), at the individual level, acculturation entails behavioral shifts (e.g., way of speaking and eating) as well as changes in values, attitudes, and motives. In line with the stress and coping model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which emphasizes and allows for individual variation in perceptions and responses to stressors, the individual level approach to acculturation is of particular focus of this study.

2.2.4 Unidimensional and Bidimensional Models of Acculturation

To investigate the acculturation process, the existing literature presents two central models: unidimensional and bidimensional. These two approaches differ in how
the relationship between the heritage and the host cultures are viewed (Ryder et al., 2000). Unidimensional models view acculturation as a straight-line process whereby maintenance of one’s home culture and full adoption of one’s host culture are placed as opposite ends (e.g., from unacculturated to fully acculturated) (Gordon, 1964). However, the unidimensional approach has been primarily criticized for conceptualizing changes as only occurring on the part of ethnic/cultural minorities and that their heritage culture will eventually disappear (Gordon, 1964). Further, it did not adequately capture the variety of acculturative changes (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013).

In contrast, a bidimensional model argues that acculturation can be understood as the degree to which individuals prefer to retain their ethnic values and cultures and to which they prefer to adopt those of the mainstream without necessarily abandoning their original cultural identity (Berry, 1997). Thus, this approach implies that the two dimensions are independent and vary among individuals (Berry, 1980).

2.2.5 Acculturation Strategies

Berry (1980, 1994, 1997, 2005) emphasized acculturation is a long-term process, taking years and even several generations, particularly in a culturally diverse society. Further, he claimed, individuals engage in acculturation processes differently with respect to the speed of change and with multiple cultural identities possible. Taking the individual variations into account, Berry (1980) introduced four types of acculturation strategy along two dimensions (1) preference to maintain one’s heritage culture and identity and (2) preference to have contact and participate in the mainstream culture (Figure 2.1).
According to Berry (1997, 2005), when individuals relinquish their home culture and seek to become more involved in the new culture, the *assimilation* strategy is used. In contrast, when individuals maintain their home culture but refuse to interact with new culture the *separation* strategy is used. When individuals want to maintain their home culture while simultaneously adapt to the new culture, an *integration* strategy is used. Finally, when individuals abandon both the home culture and the new culture, the *marginalization* strategy is used. Based on this bidimensional approach, assimilation is not the only outcome possible and variations in the acculturation process should be sought out to understand the acculturation process at the individual level (Berry, 1980). In this paper, Berry’s (1997) acculturation strategies framework will be used as it “constitutes a broader and more valid framework for studying acculturation” (Ryder et
al., 2000, p. 62), and will better address why immigrants may differ with regard to their travel stress experiences.

2.2.6 Immigrants’ Acculturation and Leisure Travel

Existing studies suggest that the foreign-born residents (e.g., first or 1.5 generation immigrants) often struggle with sense of belonging and identity confusion during cultural transition (Kim & Stodolska, 2013; Kuo, 2014). As noted by Berry (2006a), the cultural transition which entails challenges of navigating different systems of culture, policy, society, language, and economy can make acculturating immigrants more subject to stress compared to the majority population. It is, thus, reasonable to posit that these unique, intrinsically stressful experiences shape not only day to day life, but also travel experiences and behaviors.

Within the acculturation literature, studies of immigrants’ different orientations toward their acculturation process (e.g., acculturation strategies) suggest both home and host cultural affiliations contribute to immigrants’ stress-coping mechanisms (Araújo Dawson, 2009; Berry, 2006b; Scottham & Dias, 2010; Ward & Szabo, 2020). These may include the types and frequency of stressors experienced, perceived stressfulness, and selection of coping strategies. For example, there is some evidence that immigrants, depending on their extent of acculturation can have different perceptions of leisure constraints (Stodolska, 1998). As such, individuals who are less ethnically enclosed and have greater tendencies to mirror consumption patterns and behaviors of the mainstream population as they adjust to the new environment, are likely to perceive immigration-related constraints as less pronounced. Similarly, in a study of Korean immigrants, Scott
et al. (2006) revealed that those who strongly endorsed ethnic culture were more likely to report lower English proficiency as constraining their desired leisure participation than those who were more oriented toward the host culture. However, their study produced mixed results as individuals who had more contact with the mainstream culture were subject to more discrimination than those who were enclosed within their ethnic communities. Thus, within-group variation is to be expected in terms of the acculturation differences, types of stressors, and the level of stress perceived.

In relation to coping, past research has suggested cultural characteristics can influence the way immigrants perceive and cope with stressful leisure travel settings. For example, many East Asian cultures value interdependence and social harmony (Yeh et al., 2006). Thus, when experiencing stress in leisure travel, it is plausible that Asian immigrants may internalize the experience or modify their own behavior to the social context to manage stress (Kim et al., 2012).

Other studies have reported immigrants who primarily speak their ethnic languages and are racially distinct are more likely to experience negative reactions from mainstream visitors at public parks than immigrants who appear as white (Stodolska et al., 2017). On a similar note, Huang (2012) suggested the greater the cultural contrast between host and home country, identity conflict, and discrimination immigrants perceive, the more individuals are likely to be involved in diaspora tourism where they travel to the home country instead of traveling domestically for leisure purposes.

Immigrants are particularly subject to stress managing everyday lives as they must learn how to navigate successfully between at least two cultural worlds (both home and host) while adjusting to the host society (Berry, 2006b). This finding indicates
distinct travel patterns or behaviors may exist among immigrant populations. Further, as Stodolska (1998) pointed out, constraints are “dynamic phenomena which evolves in conjunction with changing acculturation processes.” (p. 523). This aspect of constraints suggests that stress has both a static and dynamic nature to it, and that as an individual’s acculturation process changes over time, it may reflect changes in meaning, intensity, appraisal, and responses to leisure travel stress. Presumably, travel stress experienced by immigrants may gradually become akin to that of the mainstream population in relation to increasing intercultural contact. For example, it appears reasonable that more assimilated or integrated immigrants may perceive language barrier as less stressful and less limiting to their participation and enjoyment of leisure travel compared to more marginalized or separated immigrants.

In summary, the understanding of the relationship between leisure travel stress-coping, immigration, and acculturation is very limited as of 2020. Moreover, despite the evidence that both host and home cultural orientations can contribute to stress and coping, the travel and tourism literature does not address how acculturation strategies may fit into a stress and coping framework. In response to a changing demography, the obligation and opportunity to provide quality travel experiences, and a dearth of research in the area, research on immigrant travel is needed. Behavioral models focused on immigrants without direct attention to acculturation are likely be inadequate and may have lower predictive power. By failing to consider acculturative perspective, we risk omitting a crucial element that accounts for individual differences in stress perceptions and outcomes, and the occurring changes within individuals following intercultural contact.
Thus, an adapted model is proposed and presented for use and critical evaluation (Figure 2.2). Consistent with the original work (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), Figure 2.2 presents a graphic illustration of the immigrants’ travel stress and coping processes, including the influential personal and situational factors. Integrating research from travel and stress literature, leisure travel stress is defined as a situation encountered in one or more phases of travel experience involving a person-environment relationship that is appraised as personally significant and exceeds the person’s resources for coping.

Inasmuch as the transactive model of stress recognizes the individual differences in the appraisals and responses to stressful situations, acculturation strategies appear appropriate and most relevant to include as a personal factor in modelling immigrants’ leisure travel stress. Further, it may offer a mechanism for directly examining the
varying effects of ethnicity and culture on leisure travel stress (Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Scott et al., 2006).

In addition, a situational factor is equally relevant to the adapted model. Along with situational/environmental factors addressed in previous research (e.g., trip duration, cultural and geographic distance, the number and type of travel party; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Zhang et al., 2021), a variable that is also important to consider and pertinent to leisure travel is multiple travel stages. These different phases of travel (e.g., pre-trip, en route to the destination, onsite, return travel/recollection; Fridgen, 1984) are important in travel and tourism to predict and discern potential stressors, as well as to characterize stressful occurrences.

As mentioned earlier, coping response to leisure travel stress can be categorized under problem- and emotion-focused coping. Lastly, the outcomes of the stress and coping process in leisure travel settings include both short- (e.g., revisiting intention, visitor satisfaction) and long-term outcomes (e.g., discontinued visit to an area – although this is not an exhaustive list). The exact short- and long-term outcomes are likely determined by the types of coping option chosen and also vary depending on a setting (Folkman et al., 1986).

2.3 Conclusion

This paper proposed an adapted stress-coping model which provides for a more holistic understanding of the experiences of immigrant leisure travel and informs researchers, planners and destinations alike in the service of a diverse and demographically important visitor segment. The proposed model advances the
complexity of stress appraisal and coping processes by examining leisure travel stress from the immigrant’s perspective. Critical to understanding leisure travel stress faced by immigrants is the inclusion of acculturation as a crucial personal factor which jointly determines the stress process with situational factors. This model helps explain the process that is uniquely shaped and influenced by immigrants’ ethnic identity and cultural characteristics (Aldwin, 2007). Also, the addition of multiple travel phases as situational factors may provide for a more holistic understanding of immigrant leisure travel and help inform researchers, planners and destinations alike to make more accurate predictions when they discern and examine the stress-coping process and their relationships. For example, the proposed model can guide both researchers and practitioners to uncover (1) where and when stress occurs (e.g., whether prior to the trip or at the destination) and (2) how immigrant individuals undergoing cultural transitions perceive and respond to stress with varying acculturation backgrounds, and (3) what short- or long-term outcomes are prompted. In this regard, the proposed model advances the complexity of stress appraisal and coping processes, influencing factors, and outcomes describing person-environment transactions in its entirety. Further, the model extends the debate on travel as a source of stress and contributes to a better understanding of how traveling may incite stress among immigrants.

Second, the model may increase practitioners’ understanding of the connections between immigrant status, immigrant groups’ travel behavior, perceptions, and needs for the U.S. domestic tourism industry. Clearly, both researchers and practitioners should avoid over generalizations about leisure travel experiences and behaviors among specific immigrant populations (Scott et al., 2006). Additionally, testing the model will identify
what primarily causes stress among individual members of a group as well as how such stress is experienced in ways that are similar or different to other ethnic or racial groups. Moreover, by identifying the most commonly reported stress events at each phase of travel, tourism practitioners can prioritize their management efforts. Further, in response to the increasing diversity in the national population, it is important that tourism service personnel are trained to be “ethical, respectful, and helpful” (Dattilo et al., 2019, p. 85) so that leisure travelers regardless of their ethnic backgrounds feel welcomed, develop authentic connections and social connections to learn about the ways of life at the place of settlement. Practitioners can prioritize management efforts that aim to accommodate all people. In particular, there is a greater need to understand those who often experience oppression and marginalization with limited leisure travel opportunities and/or constrained quality of leisure travel experiences for enhancing the rights of all to benefit from leisure travel (Dattilo et al., 2019; Moura et al., 2017).

Finally, future studies should continue to investigate travel stress among immigrants, whose experiences may be qualitatively different from those of the general population. Both qualitative and quantitative examinations are suggested to provide a more complete basis for and supplemental understanding of complexity of stress-coping phenomena in our diverse society. Specifically, a mixed-methods approach may be useful to provide rich information about travel-related stress and coping unique to immigrants through qualitative approach and enhancing a self-report instrument by assessing its face validity and cultural relevance (Creswell, 2015). Also, of interest is the heterogeneity among immigrants regarding the acculturation process, stress appraisal, and coping, including the stressors that may be particularly salient within or between
groups. For example, Asian immigrants are often considered as a homogenous entity which negates important distinctions among the experiences of different Asian groups (Scott et al., 2006). Future research empirically clarifying the relation between stress and its outcomes can support the use of a stress-coping framework in leisure travel research, its utility in understanding ethnically and racially diverse travelers, and point to opportunities to improve leisure travel experiences for immigrants by developing management strategies that foster visitor satisfaction and promoting social inclusion across diverse leisure travel experiences.

In addition, to study stress and coping as an ongoing transactive and iterative process, both longitudinal design (e.g., latent growth modeling; Duncan et al., 1999) and repeated measures are needed to assess appraisals and reappraisals (Eschleman et al., 2012; Schneider & Wilhelm Stanis, 2007). Future research should also continue to explore how personal and situational factors shape the stress appraisal process as it remains underexplored and has mainly received attention in outdoor recreation (Ferguson, 2016; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995) and air-travel stress contexts (Zhang et al., 2021). Thus, future studies identifying these factors and their influence on leisure travel stress are important and necessary. As stress does not occur alone cognitively but in tandem with the contextual factors in the environment, they can work together to affect the magnitude and direction of stress during the trip.
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Chapter 3: Testing a stress and coping framework to understand immigrant leisure travel stress

Abstract
In a novel theoretical approach considering multiple travel phases and using a transactional stress and coping model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), this study examined perceptions and coping responses to stress experienced in domestic leisure travel settings. Relationships among primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, coping, and revisit intention were examined in a sample of 249 Korean immigrants, both first and 1.5 generation. Results indicate stress across travel phases (prior to the trip, en route to the destination, and onsite) and both problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies mitigated stress. Coping had a positive relationship with behavioral intentions to revisit. Overall, the study supports the utility and application of the stress and coping model. Results inform future research directions and managerial efforts.

Keywords: Structural equation modeling, immigration, stress, coping, revisit intention

3.1 Introduction
While one of the most salient motivational forces associated with leisure traveler is to escape stressful environments (Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987), stress inevitably reveals itself in numerous forms through leisure travel: tedious trip planning, budgeting, health and/or safety concerns, unfavorable weather, or inaccessible services at the destination (Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). Researchers suggest ethnic and racial groups
and immigrants are probably more subject to disadvantaged circumstances or to unique and more intense stress-generating situations while traveling as they experience various challenges such as lack of multilingual staff/services onsite, limited access to resources and information, limited social networks, discrimination, and cultural differences (Byrne, 2012; Dillette et al., 2019; Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska et al., 2019).

Unmitigated stress can result in a variety of negative psychological and physical outcomes, degrading the quality of the leisure travel experience and limiting destination choices (Chen, 2017; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). Understanding and managing leisure travelers’ stress is, thus, important to researchers and tourism managers alike, but understudied.

As of 2020, a limited but growing body of research has adopted some form of the transactional stress and coping model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) to understand how leisure travelers appraise and respond to potential stress (Kim, 2015; Miller & McCool, 2003; Propst et al., 2008; Schneider, 1995; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006a, 2006b; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). Modelling responses to stress is nascent but necessary in the tourism literature as the relationships among appraisal, coping and outcomes remain relatively unknown (Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a).

Additionally, despite the growing recognition of ethnic and racial diversity among travelers (Huang & Chen, 2020; Kim & Stodolska, 2013; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska & Floyd, 2014), there is still a relative dearth of published literature on immigrants’ appraisal of and responses to stress within travel and tourism context as of 2020. Existing research has been informative about stress appraisal and coping among the members of the non-Hispanic White population, but little is
known about leisure travel experiences of immigrants. Given the growing importance of immigrant populations in an increasingly changing and complex globalized world (Frey, 2018), greater investigation into these populations are warranted.

As of 2020, the United States is witnessing a significant demographic change, particularly with Asian Americans. According to the 2017 Census Bureau population estimates, Asian Americans exhibited rapid demographic growth of 72% between 2000 and 2015 in the United States (from 11.9 million to 20.4 million), with approximately 60% of it attributable to immigration (López et al., 2017). The few national datasets reveal Asian Americans’ domestic person-trips accounted for 82 million in 2010, most for leisure purposes (Cook, 2011) destined to the Western United States (U.S. Travel Association, 2014). The most recent 2019 survey also projects Asian American buying power to reach $1.3 trillion by 2023 and that Asian Americans are twice as more likely to seek travel-related websites and apps than the national average (Nielsen, 2019). Considering their rapid growth rate and expanding spending power, Asian American consumers are anticipated to shape niche travel markets in the U.S. (Benavides, 2015; Nielsen, 2019).

In light of this trend and to respond to the literature gap, this study examines the utility of a transactional stress-coping model to assess and predict immigrants’ appraisals and responses to stress in domestic leisure travel context in the United States. Specifically, this study explores the relationship between primary and secondary stress appraisal, coping, and revisit intention among first and 1.5 generation Korean immigrants across three travel phases.
3.2 Literature Review

3.2.1 The Stress and Coping Model as a Framework

The concept of stress has received much attention across various disciplines, yet a single definition is elusive. Stress definitions, in fact, vary by the context of the research (e.g., physiological, sociological, and psychological approach) (Lazarus, 1999). Although a variety of stress models exist, this study uses Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional model of stress and coping as it captures psychological stress at the individual level and is most relevant to the travel experience (Choi & Schneider, in review; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). According to the model, stress results from neither a person nor an environment alone. Stress occurs as a result of “a particular relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised as taxing or exceeding the individual resources [to cope] and endangering one’s well-being” (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 19). More recent definitions incorporate the colloquial uses of stress referring to distress, or anything that elicits negative psychological states (e.g., negative affect, anxiety, or depression) (Parker & Ragsdale, 2015; Jordan et al., 2019).

Recognizing the individuals’ subjective interpretation of a stressor and of their own resources, the model is hypothesized as follows: when encountering a potentially stressful situation, the individual (a) engages in a cognitive appraisal process where they internally assess if it primarily threatens their psychological or physical well-being (primary appraisal) and (b) evaluates potential coping options to manage stress (secondary appraisal), then (c) identifies and applies the optimal coping strategies (coping) to pursue an ideal outcome (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Additionally, the
transactive and iterative process of the model allows the ongoing appraisal and adaptation process that is sometimes subconscious among individuals (Schneider & Wilhelm Stanis, 2007). The meanings and importance that individuals give to situations (appraisals), as Lazarus and Folkman (1984) describe it, are at the core of the stress and coping process, as it brings together the person and the stressful situation, further activating coping. And because of this, the relationship between appraisal and coping cannot be understood independently (Dewe & Ng, 1999).

The stress and coping model formed the theoretical foundation to create testable hypotheses in this study. Survey data with immigrant samples were used to create a structural model to understand the appraisals of leisure travel stress, coping responses, and revisit intention as a short-term outcome. A short-term outcome of stressful encounters in leisure travel (i.e., intention to revisit) is the focus of the analysis.

3.2.2 Stress Appraisal

Appraisal is a pervasive concept within the psychology literature and refers to the cognitive interpretation of a stressor and includes an evaluative process (Lazarus and Folkman 1984). According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), two major forms of appraisal exist: (a) primary appraisal and (b) secondary appraisal. Primary appraisal determines the significance of a given situation to each perceiver. It recognizes the sense of importance that something is at stake (Folkman, 2013), and answers the questions of: What is happening? Does it threaten my health or well-being, and if so, why? If a person finds a situation as personally relevant and threatening, secondary appraisal is initiated. Secondary appraisal determines which coping options are available and effective to
implement, such as seeking more information, holding back from acting impulsively, altering the situation, or accepting the situation (Folkman et al., 1986; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Secondary appraisal recognizes the level of controllability of a stressful situation and answers the questions of: Do I have an ability to control the situation? What can be done? (Folkman et al., 1986; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In addition, the appraisal process further prompts emotions such as fear and anxiety associated with threat (Folkman, 2013).

Since the introduction of the model, research into the cognitive appraisal theory has focused on the formation of emotions and predicted the emotion elicited based on a set of different cognitive appraisal dimensions (Skavronskaya et al., 2017). For example, appraisal dimensions such as goal congruence, agency, certainty, intensity, and novelty have been identified to conceptualize the emotion of delight (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988) and the similar framework has been applied in leisure travel research in the context of tourist emotional responses towards destinations (Hosany, 2012), service experiences (Su & Hsu, 2013), and theme parks (Ma et al., 2013; Ma et al., 2017). However, the evaluation of primary and secondary appraisal of leisure travel experiences still remains to be fully explored and is the focus of this study.

Stress has been studied in the context of recreationists (Kim, 2015; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006a, 2006b; Miller & McCool, 2003); vacation travelers (Zehrer & Crotts, 2012); business travelers (Chen, 2017; DeFrank et al., 2000; Jensen, 2014); and tourism host community residents (Jordan et al., 2019a, 2019b, 2019c; Jordan & Vogt, 2017; Jordan et al., 2015). Specifically, in the realm of leisure travel, the primary application of the work of Lazarus and Folkman (1984) was
introduced to the field by Schneider (1995) and Schneider and Hammitt (1995) in the 1990s when they examined recreationists’ appraisal of and response to onsite stress. Since the turn of the 21st century, a series of leisure travel research studies have tested the stress and coping model (Ferguson, 2016; Kim, 2015; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006a, 2006b; Miller & McCool, 2003; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012).

A limitation of this travel research is that primary and secondary appraisals have neither been consistently operationalized nor examined concurrently. Primary stress appraisal has been operationalized in a number of ways. Some researchers have operationalized entire stressful events by labeling them according to a type of problem (Schneider & Hammit, 1995; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012) or by measuring emotions (Schneider, 1995; Miller & McCool, 2003). Other researchers have measured primary appraisal in terms of threat, challenge or importance (Jordan et al., 2015; Peacock & Wong, 1993), or by using a single-item scale assessing the intensity or frequency of stress (Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006a). In these cases, single-item measures functioned as an indicator of the primary appraisal. Primary appraisal has also been measured in a combination of methods. For instance, Miller and McCool (2003) measured primary appraisal with both emotions and two single items measuring the level of perceived stress and concern level, respectively.

In addition to the various forms of primary appraisal measures, few researchers (Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006b) have measured secondary appraisal in the stressful leisure travel experiences. Secondary appraisal was originally designed to describe possible coping options (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980) and has been most frequently operationalized by four items to determine the extent to which the stressful
situation was one that a person: (1) could change, (2) had to accept, (3) needed to have more information, and (4) had to hold back oneself from acting impulsively (Folkman et al. 1986). Though treated inconsistently, both Schneider (1995) and Schuster et al. (2003, 2006b) used the four-item measure. The secondary appraisal items were operationalized as independent measures in the work of Schneider (1995), whereas Schuster et al. (2003, 2006b) treated them as a scale. Outside the leisure travel context, a Stress Appraisal Measure (SAM; Peacock & Wong, 1990) was applied in tourism research among community residents (Jordan et al., 2015). Despite the advantage of assessing the multidimensional nature of the primary (e.g., threat, centrality, challenge) and secondary appraisal (e.g., controllable by self, others, uncontrollable), the primary appraisal measure suffered from poor internal reliability. Further, dividing of factors into more than one latent construct was deemed problematic due to the lack of support for construct validity. Accordingly, Jordan et al. (2015) urged future studies to replace poorly performing measurement scale items with new measurements tailored for a tourism context.

Interestingly, despite the theoretical model distinguishing between primary and secondary appraisal, very few studies of leisure travel stress have done so. Only a few researchers have measured both primary and secondary elements simultaneously (Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006b). Thus, it is difficult to determine whether the theoretical distinction made by the original model was empirically warranted. As Dewe and Ng (1999) have pointed out, two conclusions can be drawn: (a) studies examining the appraisal process are imperative if we are to advance our understanding of leisure travel stress, and (b) measurement should reflect the theory (Lazarus and
Folkman 1984) to closely capture the cognitive activities tied to both the primary and secondary appraisal process.

Similarly, very little is known about the relationship between primary and secondary appraisal. As Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) model posits, stressors are perceived as stressful when they are personally relevant, pose a threat (i.e., primary appraisal), and are evaluated as uncontrollable (i.e., secondary appraisal) beyond coping efforts. Further, both primary and secondary appraisals play an important role in determining the degree of stress and a person’s coping responses (Kessler, 1998; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Given the theoretical sequence between primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, and coping, the relationship among these constructs can be explored (Dewe, 1991).

Some studies have provided evidence that associations exist between primary and secondary appraisals. For example, examining the transactional model of stress and coping in an occupational stress context, Goh et al. (2010) revealed that chronological order of impact exists between primary and secondary appraisal. Kessler (1998) also provided support for the relationship between the stress appraisals as the more harmful a stressor is appraised initially the more person needs to know about coping options before they act. Similarly, Eschleman et al. (2012) found that primary appraisals were associated with secondary appraisals in general. These findings add support to examining the associations between primary and secondary appraisals. However, the relationship remains unclear in the tourism context. To address this gap and inform a holistic understanding of the appraisal processes among immigrant leisure travelers,
investigating both primary and secondary appraisal and their associations is appropriate. Based on the above literature, this research hypothesized the following:

*Hypothesis 1:* Primary appraisal of leisure travel stressors will have a significant positive relationship with secondary appraisal.

3.2.3 Coping

Coping refers to “constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts” to manage the internal and external demands of stressful situations (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 141). Managing demands may include attempts to change, avoid, confront, or accept stressful situations and this can vary with the stress intensity (Aldwin & Revenson 1987; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The transactional model proposes appraisals influence coping, but depending on the success of coping efforts, they can further influence stress reappraisals over time (Eschleman et al., 2012; Folkman & Lazarus, 1980).

Stress and coping models focus on two general coping dimensions: emotion- and problem-focused (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Emotion-focused coping mechanisms are cognitive efforts to regulate or decrease emotional distress using strategies such as avoidance, distancing, self-control, accepting responsibility, seeking social support, and redefinition of the situation (e.g., positive comparisons, seeking good in negative). Individuals engage in this coping approach when harmful, threatening, or challenging situations are evaluated as uncontrollable or less controllable (Folkman & Lazarus, 1988; Mattlin et al., 1990; Peacock et al., 1993).
Problem-focused coping mechanisms are action-focused efforts that are used when stressful situation is perceived as controllable and/or changeable. The key goal of problem-focused forms of coping is to alter the situations causing the distress using behavior-oriented strategies like planful problem-solving and confrontive coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Peacock et al., 1993). As researchers pointed out, although a variety of coping models exist, Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) appraisal and coping process is considered the “most utilized model by a wide margin” (Jordan et al., 2015, p. 502).

In response to stressful leisure travel experiences, researchers have documented both problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies employed by leisure travelers help them manage stress and attain enhanced travel experience quality (Ferguson et al., 2018; Manning & Valliere, 2001; Miller & McCool, 2003; Propst et al., 2008; Schneider, 1995; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a). The coping literature, however, notes that while these two coping domains appear conceptually separate, they often perform interdependently and combine to form an overall coping process (Folkman et al., 1986; Lazarus, 2000; Schuster et al., 2006a; Propst et al., 2008). Thus, researchers have highlighted the need to consider that in response to stress, leisure travelers would develop a general coping scheme that combines both problem- and emotion-focused forms of coping to reduce the stress (Schuster et al., 2006b). Accordingly, in the present study, it was hypothesized that the use of the general coping scheme with the use of both problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies would be associated with mitigating stress experienced in leisure travel.
Consistent with the view that appraisals are important determinants of coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), existing studies have found a significant relationship between stress appraisals and both behavioral and cognitive coping responses to stress (Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a, 2006b). For example, in a study of recreationists, Schneider (1995) found a direct link between the secondary appraisal of holding back and both problem-focused coping behavior of altering moves and emotion-focused coping response of wishing the situation would go away. Miller and McCool (2003) demonstrated similar effects: stress appraisals predicted increased problem-focused forms of coping (e.g., absolute displacement), whereas stress appraisals were also related to lower levels of cognitive adjustments and substitutions (e.g., temporal, resources). Additionally, Schuster et al. (2006b) revealed the secondary stress appraisal resulted in increased use of problem-focused coping and less use of emotion-focused coping. These studies provide supporting evidence for the relationship between the stress appraisals and coping. Further, the previous studies suggest the form of coping used by a person varies depending on how the potentially stressful situation was appraised (Folkman et al., 1986; Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006b).

Lazarus and Folkman (1984) proposed the cognitive appraisal of a stressor involve both primary and secondary appraisals that work in tandem to determine coping. However, the literature has focused more on a single dimension of cognitive appraisal (e.g., either primary or secondary) when testing its effect on coping. Thereby, the mechanism is still unclear whether and how both components of cognitive appraisals affect coping. Testing the relationship between appraisals and coping in its entirety makes sense (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Kessler, 1998). In doing so, this study
examines both primary and secondary appraisals towards the coping responses. Taken together, the following is hypothesized:

**Hypothesis 2**: Primary appraisal will have a significant positive relationship with coping.

- **Hypothesis 2a**: Primary appraisal will have a significant positive relationship with problem-focused coping.
- **Hypothesis 2b**: Primary appraisal will have a significant positive relationship with emotion-focused coping.

**Hypothesis 3**: Secondary appraisal will have a significant positive relationship with coping.

- **Hypothesis 2a**: Secondary appraisal will have a significant positive relationship with problem-focused coping.
- **Hypothesis 2b**: Secondary appraisal will have a significant positive relationship with emotion-focused coping.

3.2.4 Outcomes

The appraisal of stress and coping results in both short-term and long-term adaptational outcomes that include effective, affective, and physiological components (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Short-term outcomes are immediate positive and negative feelings or physiological changes. In the case of leisure travel, short-term outcomes often include the level of satisfaction, detraction from the visitor experience, willingness to recommend, and revisit intention in a brief period of time. Long-term outcomes
include social functioning, morale, health issues, or psychological well-being. These long-term outcomes do not result from a single stressful event but from the aggregating effects of “multiple stressful encounters over a long time” (Lazarus & Folkman, 1986, p. 74). Long-term outcomes take forms of, for example, public support for or opposition to management decisions and discontinued visit to an area in leisure travel context (Ferguson et al., 2018; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). In the mid-2000s, calls for implementing short-term outcome measures of the stress and coping process existed (Schuster et al., 2006a), but such research remains scant in 2020 (Kim, 2015; Schuster et al., 2006a, 2006b). Among these studies, level of detraction (Schuster et al., 2006a, 2006b) and satisfaction (Kim, 2015) from the recreation experience were measured as short-term outcomes influenced by the stress-coping process.

Consistent with Schneider and Hammitt’s (1995) recommendation that the stress and coping process needs to be considered in its entirety, the short-term outcome of the stress-coping process was measured as revisit intention. Understanding revisit intention is one of the central issues for destination managers because it is a proxy of both travel experience quality and destination loyalty (Stylos & Bellou, 2019). Further, repeat visitors could provide more revenue (Lehto et al., 2004), stay longer than first-time visitors (Oppermann, 1998), create more favorable information through word of mouth, and minimize the marketing costs (Shoemaker & Lewis, 1999; Matzler et al., 2019).

Existing studies suggested revisit intention as an adequate outcome indicator of travel stress (Choi & Schneider, in review; Reichel et al., 2007; Stylos & Bellou, 2019; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). Although the relationship between stress-coping and revisit
intention is scantly examined in tourism literature, the findings of prior researchers in
different disciplines have generally supported behavioral intention as an ultimate
behavioral outcome of stress appraisal (Kim et al., 2020; Lee & Larsen, 2009; Sengupta
et al., 2015). In consumer behavior contexts, Sengupta et al. (2015) found that the more
severe a negative incident is, the more negatively it affects behavioral intention.
Similarly, drawing on the stress and coping model, Kim et al. (2020) examined revisit
intention as the appraisal-coping outcomes and found that coping significantly mediated
the relationship between primary appraisal and revisit intention. Likewise, threat and
coping appraisal significantly influenced behavioral intention (Lee & Larsen, 2009).
These studies suggested that the behavioral intention of a person is essential a result of
an appraisal of a situation as personally significant (e.g., threat, perceived severity) as
well as coping resources.

In a tourism context, prior research has examined revisit intentions in terms of
leisure travel-related stress and relevant constructs such as perceived constraints and risk
perceptions (Huang & Hsu, 2009; Quintal & Phau, 2008; Reichel et al., 2007; Zehrer &
Croots, 2012). In one of the few studies examining revisit intention in relation to leisure
travel stress, Zehrer and Crotts (2012) found that the overall leisure travel stress had an
impact on the participants’ intention to revisit the same destination. Moreover, they
revealed that revisit intention levels could remain high, regardless of the stress
encountered. However, coping was not measured in their study, hence the relationship
between the coping and the revisit intention was absent. Similarly, in tourist risk
perception studies, researchers found that the process of tourists’ decision making in
revisiting a travel destination is influenced by perceptions of risk and the subjective
expectation and appraisal of loss (Quintal et al., 2010; Reichel et al., 2007). In contrast, Huang and Hsu (2009) demonstrated perceived constraints did not have a significant effect on revisit intention. They suggested this may be due to how constraints have been well negotiated during the decision-making process and called for further investigation. Hence, these findings suggested the potential role of coping efforts which can drive leisure travelers’ intentions despite the stress perceived. However, this relationship has not been empirically tested. Taken together, this research hypothesized the following:

**Hypothesis 4:** Coping will have a significant positive relationship with revisit intention.

- **Hypothesis 4-1:** Problem-focused coping will have a significant positive relationship with revisit intention.

- **Hypothesis 4-2:** Emotion-focused coping will have a significant positive relationship with revisit intention.

Important to understanding the leisure travel stress is the individuals’ perceptions, judgment, and management towards stress. Dewe and Ng (1999) suggested fully exploring the stress and coping processes requires empirically recognizing both appraisals and coping processes in its entirety and explicitly reflecting them when developing measuring instruments.

Given the gap in previous literature and opportunities in immigrant leisure travel research, this study explored immigrants’ appraisals, coping responses, and revisit intention towards stress in domestic leisure travel context. Figure 3.1 provides a proposed model with hypothesized paths.
In particular, Korean immigrants were selected for this study for two main reasons. First, Asian Americans have often been treated as a composite group which masks important distinctions among different Asian nationalities (Lee & Stodolska, 2017). Asian immigrants trace their roots to more than 20 countries each with unique histories, cultures, and languages. Korean immigrants are not an exception and need further investigation. Second, although Korean Americans are the fifth largest immigrant group in the U.S. (Budiman et al., 2019), their perceptions, experiences, and behaviors in general remain underexplored in the context of domestic leisure travel.

**Figure 3.1 Proposed Model with Hypothesized Paths**

![Proposed Model with Hypothesized Paths](image)

### 3.3 Methods

#### 3.3.1 Survey Sample and Data Collection

Korean immigrants (18 years of age or over) living in the United States were recruited for an online Qualtrics survey that was administered between August and October 2019. A commercially available online panel served as a sampling frame to obtain a nationally representative sample of Korean immigrants. Eligible study
participants were screened to ensure they were (a) born in South Korea and emigrated to the U.S. as adults (1st generation) or as children or adolescents between 6-17 years of age (1.5 generation) (Zhou, 1997), (b) permanently residing in the U.S. regardless of their status (e.g., Citizen or Permanent Resident), and (c) someone who took at least one domestic leisure trip in the past 12 months. Of the 446 questionnaires collected, after removing participants with ineligible data such as (1) incompletes – completed less than 30% of the questionnaire (14.13%), (2) patterned data (3.36 %), (3) traveled to non-US destinations (5.61 %), (4) under age (3.81%), (5) primarily business purpose trip (0.45%), and (6) did not experience any travel stress within the past 12 months (16.82%), a total of 249 valid responses remained for analysis.

A questionnaire was developed based on the existing literature and interviews with immigrants from a larger project (Choi & Schneider, in review). The initial questionnaire developed in English was translated into Korean and then back-translated by two people fluent in both Korean and English. Budruk (2010) and Guo and Schneider (2015) suggested offering translated versions of English-written questionnaires as an important path to developing culturally sensitive and inclusive research approaches (surveying a more inclusive demographic population). Following their recommendations, both Korean and English version questionnaires were used for this study.

Before finalizing the questionnaire, it was pilot tested with a panel of tourism academics and a convenience sample of Korean Americans for wording and content. Minor adjustments to the wording of the questions, interpretation, and flow were made. For example, in terms of the primary appraisal measurement, the pilot test used the
wording, “had a negative impact on me” as well as “had a negative outcome” from the original stress appraisal measure developed by Peacock and Wong (1990). However, researchers found that the pre-test respondents did not draw a stark distinction between the two items. Thus, the wording “negative impact” was changed to “left a bad impression with me.”

The questionnaire included four sections. The first section served to screen respondents on country of birth, age of arrival to the U.S. (measured in years of age), and leisure travel experience in the U.S. (yes/no). The second section asked questions regarding trip characteristics of their most recent leisure trip taken in the U.S. within the last 12 months including primary destination, length of trip (day trip/overnight), main activities, mode of transportation, travel party, and month travelled. The third section addressed the main questions regarding stressor type, stress appraisals, coping, and revisit intention in the next 12 months. Respondents recalled stressful conditions or events they had experienced during different travel phases such as pre-trip, en route to the destination, and at the destination and rate the level of stress. Next, respondents indicated a single most stressful stressor across all phases of travel in general. The rest of the questionnaire was designed in a way that all other questions were answered in relation to the most stressful encounter or conditions described. The final section included demographic questions including age, gender, length of residency in the U.S. (measured in years), English proficiency (measured by three items from the East Asian Acculturation Measure (EAAM; Barry, 2001), education, and income. All study procedures were reviewed and approved by the University of Minnesota Institutional Review Board (IRB).
The minimum sample size for this study was determined based on the statistical power analysis. Setting significance at \( \alpha = .01 \) with a medium effect size (.15) and power level of .80, the required sample size was 199 (Cohen 1988). The final sample of 249 fulfilled this statistical requirement.

3.3.2 Measures

*Leisure travel stressors.* A list of leisure travel stressors was offered for three travel phases (i.e., prior to the trip, en route to the destination, at the destination) synthesized from the literature (Chen, 2017; Stodolska, 1998; Walker et al., 2011; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012) and interviews conducted prior to launching this survey portion (Choi & Schneider, in review). In addition to what can be considered as traditional stressors (e.g., developing travel itinerary, weather, health concerns, commuting to attractions from accommodation), stressors unique to the study population (e.g., getting information in Korean language, interactions with other travelers who are non-Koreans, feeling that people treat me differently because I am Korean) were elicited from interviews and immigrant leisure constraints literature (Stodolska, 1998; Walker et al., 2011) and added to the questionnaire. Subsequently, a total of 48 items were developed and modified for inclusion. For each item, respondents indicated the level of stress on a 5-point unipolar scale (1 = *not at all stressful* to 5 = *extremely stressful*). Among the stressors described, respondents selected one item from the stressor list that was most stressful. The category “other” was also included in each travel phase with an option to specify a source of stress not described in the provided list. Of the 446 respondents, 83%
(n = 371) indicated that some sort of stress was experienced throughout the trip. Respondents who indicated no stress experience were excluded from the final analysis.

*Primary stress appraisal.* Primary stress appraisal was measured by four single items to assess the meanings individuals gave to the most stressful stressor. Adapted and modified from Peacock and Wong’s (1990) Stress Appraisal Measure, the term “negative impact” was replaced with the term “bad impression” after pilot testing. Examples of primary appraisal items included: “It was threatening,” “It made me feel anxious,” “had a negative outcome,” and “left a bad impression with me.” Responses were made on a 5-point bipolar scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*)

*Secondary stress appraisal.* Following past research (Folkman et al., 1986; Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider 1995), secondary stress appraisal was measured with four single items (e.g., I could change the situation, had to accept it, needed more information before I could act, and had to hold myself back from acting) on a 5-point bipolar scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Respondents were asked to consider each of the items and indicate which described the situation they had selected as most stressful.

*Coping.* Coping scales were based on modified versions of Folkman and Lazarus’s (1980) Ways of Coping Questionnaire, using a 23-item instrument which measures five coping factors: planful problem-solving, confrontive coping, accepting responsibility, self-control, and seeking social support. The scale employed in this study represented both problem- and emotion-focused coping responses to deal with stressful leisure travel settings that were commonly used and previously validated in other research (Miller and McCool, 2003; Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a, 2006b).
Participants indicated the frequency with which they used coping behaviors (e.g., I refused to think too much about it) in response to the most stressful situation they described. Items were rated on a 4-point unipolar scale (1 = not used at all, 4 = used a great deal). The planful problem-solving coping scale integrated responses that were indicative of absolute and temporal displacement as a coping mechanism employed by Miller and McCool (2003).

Revisit intention. Intention to revisit a destination that participant described for both the appraisal and coping portion of the survey consisted of four items adapted from Huang and Hsu (2009; e.g., I plan to revisit in the next 12 months). Items were rated on a 5-point bipolar scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

3.3.3 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS 25 and AMOS 25. As a first step, descriptive statistics were performed by SPSS 25. As a second step, the two-step structural equation modeling (SEM) approach recommended by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was conducted using AMOS 25. Accordingly, a measurement model was estimated through confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and then the structural model consisted of theoretically based relationships among primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, coping, and revisit intention was estimated. SEM was chosen as it jointly tests the proposed hypotheses and examines whether a structural model is consistent with the data to reflect the theory (Kline, 2010).

To identify which model best fits the data, several goodness-of-fit indices were examined (Browne & Cudeck, 1993; Hair et al., 2010). In addition to the $\chi^2$ significant
test which is sensitive to sample sizes, additional absolute and parsimonious goodness-of-fit index such as the root means squared error of approximation (RMSEA < .05 denotes close fit, < .08 denotes reasonable fit, > .10 denotes poor fit) and incremental model fit index including comparative fit index (CFI > .90) and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI > .90), normed fit index (NFI > .90) were assessed and reported. Lastly, Akaike information criterion (AIC) was also included for model selection; smaller values reflect better model fit (Akaike, 1987). For all estimation to consider missing values, a full information maximum likelihood (FIML) was used (Enders & Bandalos, 2001; Schafer & Graham, 2002).

Before testing the measurement model, item parceling was undertaken on coping measures to form an overall coping construct combining both problem- and emotion-focused coping mechanisms. Parceling serves as a useful analytical tool when investigating populations difficult to access because it could provide more stable factor solutions than item-level data in small-sample analyses (e.g., N=100 or 250) with a large number of items (Little et al., 2002; Matsunaga, 2008; Yang et al., 2010). Also, Bandalos and Finney (2001) suggest that parceled solutions can provide better model fits and distribution properties because they have fewer parameters to estimate. Parcels were created based on an internal-consistency approach (Kishton & Widaman, 1994).

In performing reliability tests of all theoretical constructs using Cronbach’s alpha coefficients to assess internal-consistency, three of the a priori scaled coping sub-domains (i.e., confrontive coping, self-control, and seeking social support) did not meet acceptable reliability measures. In contrast, all three remaining sub-domains (i.e., planful problem-solving, distancing, and accepting responsibility) achieved acceptable
coefficient for reliability greater than .70 (Nunnally, 1978). Coping scales thus had three identifiable dimensions (i.e., planful problem-solving for measuring problem-focused coping and both distancing and accepting responsibility for emotion-focused coping). These are consistent with factor analyses of previous studies (Folkman et al., 1986; Jordan et al., 2015; Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a). Hence, coping featured three parcels (planful, distancing, responsibility) consisting of six, eight, and three items, respectively. Little (2013) recommended if the number of items going into each parcel differs as in this case, using the averages instead of the total score will have similar metrics as the original items. Thus, average scores across each dimension were used in this study. In addition, item parcels were not used for revisit intention because it was adequately represented by the original four items.

Still, given the relatively small sample size, primary stress appraisal and secondary stress appraisal variables were treated and assessed as manifest variables rather than latent constructs for this study, consistent with Schneider (1995). Although Schuster et al. (2003) examined secondary appraisal as a latent factor to maintain a more parsimonious model, the items are not tau-equivalent, and thus, inappropriate to create a scale by averaging responses to all four items (MacCullum & Austin, 2000). Based on the previous recreation-stress research (Schneider, 1995), individual indicators were preferred for both primary and secondary appraisal variables.
3.4 Results

3.4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Sample Characteristics

Initial data analysis produced skewness and kurtosis indices with cutoff values for 2.0 and 7.0 respectively, which revealed that the study data meet the multivariate normality assumptions (Curran et al., 1996). In addition, Pearson correlations measured interrelations among tested and controlled variables. No multicollinearity problems emerged (Table 3.1 - Appendix).

In terms of the respondent sociodemographic characteristics and immigration status, 33.3% (n=83) of respondents were first generation immigrants and 66.7% (n=166) were 1.5 generation immigrants. The average length of stay in the United States was 18.4 years, ranging between 1 and 63 years (Table 3.2). The average age at migration was 16.1 years of age (minimum age of arrival = 6, maximum age of arrival = 80). The proportion of female participants (58.6%) was higher than that of the male participants (38.6%) and non-binary (2.8%). In terms of the age distribution, the most prevalent age group was 18 to 29 years (41.4%), with an average age of 34.5. University-level graduates or higher were predominant, representing 69.5% of the respondents, and 19.7% considered themselves to be middle to high-annual household income earners ($100,000 and above) and middle-income earners ($50,000 to $74,999).
Table 3.2. Sociodemographic Profiles of Korean Immigrant Leisure Travelers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Generational Level</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st generation</td>
<td>83 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>96 (38.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5th generation</td>
<td>166 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>146 (58.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>7 (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td>Avg: 34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of Residence in the U.S.</td>
<td>Avg: 18.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>103 (41.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>26 (10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>73 (29.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>46 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>41 (16.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>46 (18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>26 (10.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>35 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>6 (2.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>33 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school or less</td>
<td>8 (3.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>43 (17.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>15 (6.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>25 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year college</td>
<td>28 (11.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college</td>
<td>94 (37.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>166 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>79 (31.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>61 (24.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-41</td>
<td>19 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>25 (10.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42-53</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$49,999</td>
<td>34 (13.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54+</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$74,999</td>
<td>44 (17.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>43 (17.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>49 (19.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 and over</td>
<td>28 (11.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>9 (3.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’d rather not answer</td>
<td>17 (6.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Leisure Travel Stressors

Among the most stressful leisure travel stressor reported by respondents during their trip, travel issues (e.g., traffic jams and flight delays) while traveling to the destination were experienced most frequently (17%). By phase, respondents reported developing a travel itinerary (9.6%), deciding what to bring (7.2%), choosing a safe
destination (4%), finding information to plan the trip (3.2%), making travel reservations in English, or getting information in Korean language (2%) prior to the trip as stressful. While travelling, travel issues (17%), health concerns (4.4%), safety concerns (3.6%), way finding (3.2%), and feeling that people treat me differently because I am Korean (2.4%) were reported as most stressful. At the destination, weather conditions (4%), number of people at the destination (2.4%), cleanliness, interacting with travelers in my own travel party, and lack of food choices (all 2%), feeling that people speak differently to me because I am Korean (1.2%) were found the most recognized sources of stress. Overall, regardless of the intensity, stress frequency ranged from 1 to 48 and the average number of stressors encountered was 22.65 across all three travel stages combined. By travel phase, the average number of stressors reported were most frequent in destination (9.4) followed by en route (8.1) and pre-travel (4.98).

3.4.3 Measurement Model

The CFA results of the measurement model indicated a good fit (Table 3.3): $\chi^2 = 16.104$, df = 13, $p = .244$, $\chi^2$/df = 1.239, CFI = .997, TLI = .993, NFI = 983, RMSEA = .031. Testing for reliability, the Cronbach’s alpha and the composite reliability (CR) all exceeded .70, suggesting acceptable internal consistency (Nunnally, 1978; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The measurement model also achieved convergent validity since all factor loadings and the average variance extracted (AVE) value for each latent construct exceeded the suggested value of .50 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Further, the AVEs were greater than the squared correlation between constructs (.134), confirming a good
discriminant validity. Therefore, the measurement model presented a good fit and was used to examine the theoretical structural model.

### Table 3.3. Measurement Model from Confirmatory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs/Items</th>
<th>Standardized Loadings</th>
<th>(t) Statistic (&gt; 1.64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coping ((\alpha = .768;) AVE = .551; CR = .977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 1 (Planful, P)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I planned to never visit again</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>8.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decided to avoid the area on my next visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decided that visiting during a different season would help me avoid the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I decided that visiting at a different time of day would help me avoid the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made a plan of action and followed it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I came up with a couple of different solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 2 (Distancing, E)</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>8.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refused to get too serious about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refused to think too much about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried to forget the whole thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told myself there was nothing I could do about it, so I just enjoyed the experience for what it was.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told myself to continue on as if nothing had happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made light of the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wished that the situation would go away or be over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel 3 (Responsibility, E)</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>8.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I criticized or lectured myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I realized I brought the situation on myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apologized or did something to make the situation better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit Intention ((\alpha = .914;) AVE = .730; CR = 1.166)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to revisit the place in the next 12 months.</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>13.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to revisit in the next 12 months.</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>21.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire to visit in the next 12 months.</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I probably will revisit in the next 12 months.</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>18.306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted; P = Problem-focused strategy; E = Emotion-focused strategy
3.4.4 Structural Model

In accordance with past immigrant studies (Scott & Lee, 2006; Szabo et al., 2016), age of arrival, English proficiency, and length of stay in the U.S. were controlled. The goodness-of-fit statistics of the initial model all reached close to the acceptable levels ($\chi^2 = 190.236$, df = 82, $p = .00$, $\chi^2$/df = 2.320, CFI = .930, TLI = .855, NFI = .890, RMSEA = .073).

To rigorously test the validity of the research model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988), four alternative models were formulated and compared to the initial model, Model 1 (Table 3.4). Based on theoretical consideration, it was considered acceptable to add two covariance links between the residual variances associated with secondary stress appraisal variables in Model 2: first, between the two observed variables, “I had to know more about the situation before I could act” and “I had to hold myself back from doing what I wanted,” and second, between “I could change the situation” and “I had to know more,” because conceptually, they measure similar content. For example, when individuals did not feel they had enough information, the need to hold back was present (Schuster et al., 2003). Additionally, when individuals felt they could change or more information about the situation was needed, they were more likely to enact problem-focused coping (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980; Schneider, 1995). Following Model 2 as a baseline, the paths between primary and secondary appraisal, and between primary appraisal and coping were removed respectively in Models 3 and 4. All four models met criteria close to good fit, but only Model 2 met all pre-specified fit criteria: $\chi^2 = 145.572$, df = 80, $p = .00$, $\chi^2$/df = 1.820, CFI = .958, TLI = .910, NFI = .916, RMSEA = .057. In addition to the model fit indices, a chi-square difference test was performed to see which
model is significantly better (Anderson & Gerbing, 1992). The chi-square difference statistic between the initial model and Model 2 indicated that Model 2 is significantly more valid ($\Delta \chi^2 = 44.664$, $\Delta df = 2$, $p < .001$). The AIC value of Model 2 also decreased from 404.236 to 363.572. Further, the highest percentage of the variance in coping (21.2%) and revisit intention (3.9%) were explained by Model 2. Hence, these findings verified that the initial model modification was a good solution and thus, Model 2 was chosen for the final research model as it indicated a better fit.

### Table 3.4. Comparison of Structural Equation Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>190.236</td>
<td>145.572</td>
<td>161.177</td>
<td>229.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Pr &gt; \chi^2$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/df</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>2.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta \chi^2$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-44.664</td>
<td>-29.059</td>
<td>+39.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.916</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>404.236</td>
<td>363.572</td>
<td>371.177</td>
<td>415.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: df = Degrees of freedom; Pr = probability*

### 3.4.5 Results of Hypotheses Testing

The results of hypotheses tests are presented in Figure 2. *Hypothesis 1*

speculated immigrant travelers’ primary stress appraisal would be positively associated with secondary stress appraisal. Results revealed partial support of *Hypothesis 1* (Table 3.5). Specifically, four paths from primary appraisal to secondary appraisal were statistically significant: (1) situations appraised as threatening were positively associated with had to hold back ($\beta = .182$, $t = 2.545$, $p < .01$); (2) situations appraised as anxious
were positively related to had to accept (β = .276, t = 3.839, p < .01) and at the same time, had a positive effect on (3) needed to know more about the situation (β = .156, t = 2.130, p < .01). Having a bad impression about the stressful situation was negatively associated with accepting the situation in the secondary appraisal (β = -.181, t = -2.094, p < .01).

Paths from primary appraisal and coping were not significant, indicating no support for Hypothesis 2. In contrast, Hypothesis 3 was partially confirmed: secondary appraisal – situations appraised as requiring more information about the stressful situation (β = .143, t = 1.985, p < .01) was positively related to overall coping. Finally, more use of overall coping was positively related to revisit intention (β = .147, t = 2.009, p < .01; Hypothesis 4 supported). Two of the three control variables included in this study had a significant effect on select secondary appraisal constructs: age of arrival which negatively affected secondary appraisal of had to hold back (β = -.017, p < .05), and English proficiency which negatively impacted on secondary appraisal of had to know more (β = -.146, p < .05) and positively impacted on secondary appraisal of had to accept (β = .131, p < .05).
Table 3.5. Results of Hypothesis Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA_Threat -&gt; SA_Change</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Threat -&gt; SA_Accept</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Threat -&gt; SA_Know</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>1.398</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Threat -&gt; SA_Hold</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Anxious -&gt; SA_Change</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Anxious -&gt; SA_Accept</td>
<td>.276**</td>
<td>3.839</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Anxious -&gt; SA_Know</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Anxious -&gt; SA_Hold</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Negative -&gt; SA_Change</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Negative -&gt; SA_Accept</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Negative -&gt; SA_Know</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>-.987</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Negative -&gt; SA_Hold</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>1.879</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Bad_Impression -&gt; SA_Change</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-1.402</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Bad_Impression -&gt; SA_Accept</td>
<td>-.181*</td>
<td>-2.094</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Bad_Impression -&gt; SA_Know</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Bad_Impression -&gt; SA_Hold</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Threat -&gt; COP</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Anxious -&gt; COP</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Negative -&gt; COP</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.107</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA_Bad_Impression -&gt; COP</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_Change -&gt; COP</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_Accept -&gt; COP</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_Know -&gt; COP</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_Hold -&gt; COP</td>
<td>.114**</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping -&gt; RI</td>
<td>.147*</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=249; PA_Threat = It was threatening (Primary Appraisal); PA_Anxious = It made me feel anxious (Primary Appraisal); PA_Negative = It had a negative outcome (Primary Appraisal); PA_Bad_Impression = It left a bad impression with me (Primary Appraisal); SA_Change = I could change the situation (Secondary Appraisal); SA_Accept = I had to accept the situation (Secondary Appraisal); SA_Know = I needed to know more about the situation before I could act (Secondary Appraisal); SA_Hold = I had to hold myself back from doing what I wanted (Secondary Appraisal); COP = Coping; RI = Revisit Intention

*p < .05; **p < .01
3.5 Discussion and Conclusion

Leisure travel stress research has advanced since the 1990s, but rarely have immigrant leisure travelers’ stress and coping responses been considered. This study uncovers the relationship between primary appraisal, secondary appraisal, coping, and revisit intention with a sample of Korean immigrants residing in the United States. Based on the work of Lazarus and Folkman (1984), this study demonstrates the utility of the transactional stress and coping model to understand the appraisal and response to stress by immigrants, in the context of domestic leisure travel.

Study findings advance the literature on leisure travel stress by comprehensively assessing a travel stress-coping model among immigrant leisure travelers. This important and unique contribution investigates the pattern of stress-coping relationships among immigrants and confirms the structural model, subsequently providing a comprehensive and a new perspective on these relationships. Specifically, this study sheds new light on: (1) the associations between primary and secondary appraisal, (2) contribution of
cognitive stress appraisals to coping responses, and (3) coping upon revisit intention.

3.5.1 Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical perspective, an examination of the relationship between primary appraisal and secondary appraisal revealed patterns generally in line with the hypothesized relationships (Eschleman et al., 2012; Jordan, 2014; Kessler, 1998). This study supports the assumption that leisure travelers’ primary appraisal may facilitate secondary appraisal. More specifically, the more leisure travelers identify what is at stake, the more they reported the need to consider what needs to be done and how. Additionally, this study sought to reconcile the gaps in the literature by testing both forms of appraisal, primary and secondary, simultaneously. Indeed, primary appraisal and secondary appraisal are conceptually distinguishable and provide a descriptive context determining the extent each indicator was employed by immigrants. Interestingly, in situations that left a bad impression, a significant negative effect was found on secondary appraisal. At face value, this finding indicated the more immigrant leisure travelers perceived the stressor had left a bad impression with them, the less they felt the need to accept the situation. Perhaps a possible explanation to this outcome is, situations appraised as less threatening may result in an increased controllability. Based on the previous research on the relation between stress appraisal and coping (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980; Schuster et al., 2003), it was expected that the need to accept the situation in secondary appraisal is more related to the perceived inability to act upon or control it. Further, in encounters appraised as changeable or controllable, the less individuals desired to accept the situation as it was and were more likely to exercise
problem-focused coping to alter the situation (Jordan, 2014; Schuster et al., 2006a). The findings from the present study are consistent with these expectations and provide elaboration that encounters appraised as giving a bad impression might not have exerted as much threat (i.e., not so much at stake) to the perceiver’s well-being and subsequently, the situation could have been interpreted as somewhat controllable and changeable.

Contrary to expectations, no significant effect was found for the secondary appraisal indicator of could change. This finding may be attributable to the cultural characteristics of the study sample. For example, maintaining group harmony in the relationships with others is a culturally important concept for Koreans due to the collectivistic and interdependent nature of their culture (Yeh et al., 2006). Thus, when dealing with a stressful situation, it is possible that Korean immigrants may try to withhold their problems and alter their own behaviors to the social context rather than attempting to actively change the difficult situation as it is deemed as culturally appropriate (Kim et al., 2012; Morling & Fiske, 1999). The study results also seem to be in accord with previous studies linking the secondary appraisal of having to hold back to less perceived desire to act upon or less perceived control to adjust the situation.

Previous studies concluded that both forms of cognitive appraisal (i.e., primary and secondary) activate coping (Folkman et al., 1986; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), but few leisure travel studies examined their joint impact on coping responses. Notably, this study answered the call for studies to investigate the linkages among primary/secondary appraisal and coping (Carpenter, 2015; Kessler, 1998; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). A model in which primary appraisal was assumed to have direct effects and indirect effects
on coping through secondary appraisal had a good fit for the data. Although some investigators have found an association between primary appraisal and coping in cross-sectional studies (Kim, 2015; Miller & McCool, 2003), there were no associations between these variables in this study. Potential reasons for differences include the use of dissimilar measures and study samples. Further, results imply that perhaps secondary appraisal concerning coping options and perceived controllability dictate the choice of coping (Schuster et al., 2006b). The congruence between how a situation is appraised (e.g., is it changeable or controllable) and the coping strategies selected in response to the stressful situation may explain why there were no statistically significant associations between primary appraisal and coping, but there were between secondary appraisal and coping in this sample. Despite differences, primary appraisal has neither been integrated into analysis simultaneously with secondary appraisal nor fully explored in its relevance to coping responses toward leisure travel stress even with its central role in the appraisal process (Schuster et al., 2003, 2006b). Thus, continued debate and discussion on such causal pathway is needed.

Consistent with the literature, study findings suggest secondary appraisal can be related to leisure travelers’ overall coping responses (Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006b). Results indicated had to know more had the strongest relationship with overall coping. Previous studies undertaken with immigrants reveal those with increased needs for information and understanding of the stressful situations are more inclined to use coping both inward directed (emotion-focused) and behavioral-oriented to handle stressful situations (Szabo et al., 2016; Szabo et al., 2016). Thus, our findings indicate those who seek information to make sense out of issues that arise in stressful situations
are less likely to ruminate on feelings that may prevent them from taking practical action and use a general coping scheme that combines both problem- and emotion-focused coping strategies (Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006b). This finding is also in line with previous studies administered among the general population where individuals who felt additional information about the situation used more planful problem-solving, social support, and self-control (Folkman et al., 1986; Schneider, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006a, 2006b). Thus, whether reflected in intrapersonal information processing or interpersonal information seeking, increased needs for information and understanding of the stressful situations may initiate both behavioral and cognitive efforts to reduce stress. Thus, including secondary appraisal measures in conjunction with primary appraisal in future leisure travel stress response research seems necessary (Carpenter, 2015; Kessler, 1998).

Congruent with the results of existing studies that found coping efforts generate positive behavioral intentions (Herath et al., 2014; Lee & Larsen, 2009), positive association was found between coping and revisit intention as hypothesized. Since there has been scant research empirically testing the relationship between overall coping mechanisms and revisit intention, the study finding is an important contribution to the current leisure travel literature. From another perspective, a significant, weak-positive relationship existed between overall coping and revisit intention. This finding could imply that people’s attitude toward revisiting a destination is partly determined by their desire to search for novelty at the destination. Responses to an open-ended question revealed that a number of respondents considered lack of novelty (e.g., “already visited and would rather visit different places and explore new things”) as well as lack of interest (e.g., “destination was not as fun or interesting,” “not much to do”) when asked
“Why would you not visit this destination again?” among participants who indicated they would not revisit their destinations again. Thus, this effect might have been confounding the relations between coping and revisit intention. This interpretation needs to be further investigated.

Interestingly, in terms of the identified stressors, Korean immigrants tended to perceive leisure travel stressors that are commonly reported among the general population more frequently than ethnic-specific stressors. This finding suggests that generic travel stressors may be more important and prevalent in comparison to stressors related to language concerns and unfair treatment attributed to one’s ethnicity when they travel. Existing studies on immigrant leisure constraints confirm this finding (Scott et al., 2006; Stodolska, 1998). For example, Scott et al. (2006) found that constraints typically believed to be unique to immigrants (e.g., fear of discrimination and lack of English proficiency) were perceived as far less important by Korean immigrants in comparison to the general leisure constraints (e.g., lack of time). Similarly, Stodolska (1998) found that constraints that are not typically applicable to the general population (e.g., not feeling at ease among the mainstream, insufficient language skills) were less important for first-generation Polish immigrants than the universal constraints (e.g., lack of time, money). It is conceivable that the generic stressors overwhelm all other stress factors given the amount of effort, financial resources, and time it takes for foreign-born immigrants to establish a new career/household in the new host society (Scott et al., 2006; Stodolska & Yi-Kook, 2005). These results could also be attributed to the different ways of acculturating among immigrants as those who are less ethnically enclosed and actively engage in the host culture tend to resemble more host culture behaviors and
fewer heritage culture; thus, less likely to perceive ethnicity-related stressors as salient (Stodolska, 1998). Further exploration into the underlying factors that may influence and differentiate the leisure travel stress experience seems appropriate and necessary.

In summary, this study advanced stress and coping research examining (1) the stress and coping model comprehensively and (2) perceptions and responses to leisure travel stress among Korean immigrants. Overall, this study supports the utility and application of the transactional stress and coping model as study results acted in a similar manner as previous stress and coping models. It went beyond examining appraisals and coping responses and found stress appraisals and coping influenced immigrants’ revisiting intentions.

Further, in regard to coping strategies, similar to prior literature (Propst et al., 2008; Schuster et al., 2006a, 2006b) this study confirmed/evidenced that general coping scheme integrating both emotion- and problem-focused forms of coping efforts can be used as tools to manage stress by leisure travelers. As Folkman et al. (1986) described, although problem- and emotion-focused coping seem to target opposite purposes, they can be “mutually facilitative based on the nature of the threats” (p. 1000). Similarly, Lazarus (2000) argued that it can be misleading and even a “strategic mistake” (p. 669) pitting emotion- and problem-focused coping constructs against each other. Study findings highlight that the two forms of coping are not independent and can work in conjunction to shape the overall coping process.

Additionally, our findings indicate that along with the use of planful problem-solving behaviors, Korean immigrants reported simultaneous motivation to use indirect coping strategies such as distancing and acceptance of responsibility to regulate negative
feelings so that leisure travel stressors are more manageable or less overwhelming. Lee and Mason (2014) described how using distancing and accepting responsibility as a coping strategy among Korean immigrants may fit into relational and collectivist cultural orientations, where individuals are hesitant to express negative feelings and suppress their behaviors to avoid creating potential interpersonal conflicts. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Bjorck et al., 2001; Lee & Mason, 2014) that have found Korean Americans tend to use more passive coping patterns, such as acceptance of responsibility or self-blame and social withdrawal than Caucasian Americans. More research is necessary, however, to better assess the cross-cultural differences in coping strategies selected between Koreans and non-Koreans as well as within Korean immigrant populations. On the other hand, immigrants may feel more helpless and resultantly, may take a more passive approach to coping. For example, previous studies suggest more frequent use of distancing and accepting responsibility may reflect the fact that Korean immigrants perceive they do not have much control over their situations (Chun et al., 2006; Lee & Mason, 2014; Yi, 2005). Therefore, when immigrants see their situations as not controllable or changeable, they may rely on more indirect forms of coping. Given the present results, it may be fruitful in future studies to further evaluate the role of problem-focused coping strategies (e.g., planful problem-solving strategy) in comparison to emotion-focused coping strategies (e.g., distancing, accepting responsibility) among Korean immigrants.

This research represents the first application of travel-related stress and coping conceptualizations within a domestic leisure travel context from the perspective of Korean immigrants. Further, it also underscores the validity of models who have been
previously shown to apply to “mainstream” populations. Expanding the framework of leisure travel stress research to include immigrants is an important step toward understanding how tourism/leisure travel impacts underrepresented groups. As there are few published pieces on immigrants within tourism research, studying how leisure travelers of diverse ethnic and racial backgrounds including immigrants are experiencing the domestic leisure travel environments will broaden our knowledge and contribute toward creating more socially inclusive and inviting leisure travel experiences for these groups whose voices remained unheard (Dillette et al., 2019).

3.5.2 Practical Implications

This study provides an understanding of cognitive stress appraisals, coping responses, and behavioral intentions to revisit among leisure travelers who are immigrants. First, this study revealed that Korean immigrants experienced stress throughout all three travel phases when traveling within the U.S. This implies that effective stress management should be addressed that can prevent stress experienced among travelers. One way tourism managers and planners could approach this is to reduce negative emotional and psychological outcomes. For instance, providing information resources, increasing self-efficacy and competence, and fostering social support among leisure travelers could increase their positive appraisals and reduce the perception of potentially stressful sources as less threatening and more manageable. Second, based on the study findings, the highest number of stressors were found predominantly at the destination-level (e.g., crowding, cleanliness, weather, food choices, interacting with travelers in my own travel party) and a majority of the
immigrant leisure travelers were coping and using multiple coping strategies to handle stress. From a management perspective, this offers destination managers opportunities to address and reduce stress. Visitors are taking this somewhat into their own hands by using multiple coping mechanisms. As Propst et al. (2008) noted, perhaps multiple coping strategies were essential to have a desired experience. Future research can assess variations among stressors in terms of frequency, duration, distance, intensity, activity, visitation patterns, and demographic variables (Dewe & Ng, 1999; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995). Third, continual monitoring of visitor return rate and revisit intention and qualitative research for those rates can inform the success of management actions employed. While current coping efforts appear to ameliorate stressful situations, they may not continue to be effective if destination conditions that generate problems persist or worsen. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of leisure travel stressors, stress appraisals, coping responses, and behavioral intentions to revisit among leisure travelers can help inform planning and management to meet the needs and address the multitude of challenges facing leisure travelers. Lastly, in addition to more conventional sources of stress in leisure travel (e.g., way finding, trip planning), Korean immigrants also reported stress related to language barriers or perceived discrimination (e.g., feeling that people treat them differently because of their ethnicity) consistently across all three stages of travel. A relatively simple approach to the language issue is to critically evaluate opportunities to inform, serve and enhance quality experiences and destination decisions in target market languages of choice. Furthermore, findings imply that there is an ongoing need to make a conscious effort to deliver inclusive leisure travel services (Dattilo et al., 2019). Multidimensional approaches should be employed to provide and
promote a context in which everyone belongs, is welcomed, and safe to assist people in
coping with their stress throughout travel (e.g., creating programs and environments that
are culturally sensitive) and to ensure all community members perceive benefits in
engaging in leisure travel.

3.6. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

While this research allows for a more comprehensive consideration of the stress
process in leisure travel research, both limitations and opportunities remain. First,
generalizability to other population groups should be made with caution. This research
only tested the hypothesized relationships among Korean immigrant sample. Future
research could also test it among other immigrant communities to see if similar patterns
of appraisal and coping processes occur and to allow for greater details on potential
differences in relative importance of stress and coping components. For example, sample
segmentation in relation to acculturation orientations or strategies (e.g., adherence to
one’s traditional cultural values, practices, norms, ideas) could offer insights into distinct
groups of immigrant tourists. Second, this study is limited in revealing system-level or
addressing sociopolitical, and economic contexts beyond that may be more salient or
relevant to immigrants. Based on the notion that recreation constraints encountered by
immigrants needs to be considered not only at personal-level but also at the broader
level encompassing social conditions and political discourses (Stodolska et al., 2019),
the sources of travel stress needs to be considered in light of the broader socio-political
climate likewise. For example, changes in national and state immigration policies,
heightened xenophobia and racism directed toward immigrants of color (Suárez-Orozco
et al., 2018) can differentially allocate resources and opportunities to travel/recreate and be linked to increased experiences of discrimination and deep fears, creating stress among immigrants. The consideration of stressors within the broader context may result in an expansive portrait of the current conditions and hindrance immigrants encounter in realizing wide-ranging benefits of leisure travel. Specifically, focusing more on the racial distinctiveness of travelers may be needed in future research. Thus, assessments of stress events that include only personal level stressors will likely provide an incomplete picture. Taking into account these broader climate could help (a) expose the reality of the immigrant or different ethnic and racial group members’ stressful experiences to policymakers, (b) tailor research and management efforts to accurately reflect unique contexts of these visitors, and (c) develop effective strategies to successfully cope with the problems. Third, although self-report is suitable to measure concepts such as stress and coping, the cross-sectional and retrospective design of this study limits the ability to comprehensively reflect individuals’ reactions and behaviors and precludes any causal interpretations, highlighting the need for longitudinal research. Other more objective measurements or triangulation of data collection methods (e.g., onsite questionnaire, diary entry during the actual trip) may provide more comprehensive reflection. Further, it should be noted that while a process approach is preferable for an ongoing transactional stress and coping process, this entails the inherent challenge which leaves numerous researchers to use a single analysis (Schuster et al., 2006a). This single approach presumes that the individual appraisals and coping responses at the time of data collection is actually indicative of the person in the stressful settings. The stressor list used for this study represented the individual assessment and coping responses.
during the period of time when they were traveling. Finally, to go in hand in hand with the changing society and to be prepared for the demographic shifts, a greater understanding of culturally and ethnically diverse visitors is warranted. Thus, future investigations should expand the stress and coping inquiries by including other ethnic and racial groups and immigrants. This can reveal the underexplored patterns of perceptions and responses to stress experienced in leisure travel settings.
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Chapter 4: The relationship between acculturation and tourist stress: The case of U.S. Korean immigrant leisure travelers

Abstract

The increasing number of foreign-born residents in the United States creates a niche tourism market opportunity. Optimal marketing and management depend on consumer knowledge and satisfaction. Among immigrant travelers, this information is lacking; in particular, how immigrants interact with and experience leisure travel in a new society varies with acculturation and stress. Based on Berry’s (1997) four-fold acculturation model and Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) transactional stress model, this study identified acculturation strategies, leisure travel stressors, and the associations between them among Korean American immigrants. A sample of 249 Korean immigrant adults completed an online questionnaire in English or Korean in summer 2019. Following past research, the findings reveal four distinct acculturation strategies: separation (14.5%), marginalization (12.9%), assimilation (15.3%), and integration (57.4%). Korean immigrants experienced travel stress during the three travel phases assessed: pre-travel, en route, and at destination sites. Perceived stress levels varied by acculturation strategy. Overall, marginalized and separated Korean immigrants’ stress levels were significantly higher than those seeking integration and assimilation. Implications for marketing, management, and planning are discussed.

Keywords: Acculturation strategies, Cultural change, Stress management, Ethnicity, Immigration, Travel stages, Tourist perception
4.1 Introduction

As of 2019, more than 272 million people lived in a country other than the one they were born in (International Organization for Migration, 2019). Between 1970 to 2019, U.S. immigrants increased fivefold: from less than 12 million to 51 million. The 2018 American Community Survey data estimated one in seven U.S. residents was foreign born, primarily originating from Latin American or Asian countries. Among the new arrivals, Asian immigrants have outnumbered Hispanic immigrants since 2010 and are projected to become the largest immigrant population by 2065 (38%; López et al., 2017). Given such projections, Asian Americans are anticipated to be an important segment in the nation’s domestic travel and tourism market. For example, driven primarily by foreign-born adult population, the average yearly trip expenditure of Asian Americans is 2.4 times higher than that of the typical U.S. traveler (Nielsen, 2016) and they are more likely to purchase online travel products, including airline tickets and travel reservations, compared to non-Hispanic Whites (Nielsen, 2018). Additionally, the U.S. Travel Association (2014) estimates that just in 2012, more than half (51%) of Asian Americans (either immigrants from Asia or descendants of immigrants) had taken a domestic plane trip and that they travel most frequently for leisure (Nielsen, 2013).

In response to the growth of foreign-born residents, inquiries surrounding immigrant adaptation and cross-cultural changes have been an integral part of research since the 1930s (Berry, 1970). Previous studies revealed that acculturation – broadly defined as cultural and psychological changes resulting from intercultural contact — is an essential feature of the immigrant adaptation process that influences the degree of
inclusion (Berry, 1995; 2005; Berry & Hou, 2016). Acculturation strategies reflect different ways immigrants relate to their heritage group and to the larger society (Berry, 1997). Ranging from full participation to full rejection of either culture, acculturation strategies predict adaptation outcomes as well as influence immigrants’ behaviors and perceptions (Berry & Hou, 2016; Ward, 1996), including stress appraisal (Berry, 2006). However, these relationships are infrequently examined in the tourism arena.

Despite the progress in acculturation research on Asian immigrants across disciplines (Farver & Lee-Shin, 2000; Jang et al., 2007; Kuo & Roysircar, 2004), as of 2020, research on their travel and tourist behaviors is only emerging (Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Shen et al., 2018). While academic attention has increasingly focused on Asian immigrants’ leisure (e.g., Huang et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2005; Kim et al., 2019; Lee & Stodolska, 2017; Scott et al., 2006; Walker & Deng, 2014) and recreation participation (Stodolska et al., 2020; Yu & Berryman, 1996; Winter et al., 2004; Winter et al., 2020), few tourism publications address them. The existing tourism studies attended mostly to Asian immigrants’ travel to their home countries rather than within the country of settlement (Huang et al., 2018; Hung et al., 2013; Kim & Stodolska, 2013). In addition, acculturation differentiates foreign-born immigrants’ travel behaviors, motivations, preferences, and attitudes from Anglos and native-born populations (Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Shen et al., 2018). However, to date, little research has addressed acculturation strategies concerning immigrants’ travel or perceptions of leisure travel stress.

Despite the benefits of leisure travel and its role in diminishing stress (Kim & Iwasaki, 2016; Moon et al., 2019), immigrants face multiple challenges that may
actually create stress in their leisure travel experience and limit their enjoyment (Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska et al., 2019). Some of these challenges may be specific to their immigrant status and to the ongoing acculturation process including language barrier, feeling unwelcome in the host society, safety concerns, limited knowledge about available resources, and the dual tasks of balancing origin and the culture of the host society (Berry, 1980; Cobb et al., 2020; Padilla et al., 1985; Ward & Geeraert, 2016). In addition, the challenges and difficulties immigrants encounter in their day-to-day lives can be stressful and could tangibly or intangibly translate into domestic tourism contexts. Given that the United States is becoming more culturally diverse and the experiences of travel in a new society will likely vary among acculturating immigrants, immigrant-specific stress research within the field of tourism is warranted.

Calls for immigrant-specific travel and tourism research exist, including stress and acculturation, but research remains unanswered as of 2021 (Kim & Stodolska, 2013; Klemm, 2002; Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Moon et al., 2019; Schermann et al., 2015; Shen et al., 2018; Ward, 2008). Recognizing and understanding the issues faced by multicultural travelers including immigrants will provide the basis for effective visitor travel management, maximize travel and tourism practitioners’ ability to alleviate constraints, plan for the future, and offer appropriate services and programs in the present for high quality visitor experiences. Further, considering the multiple social, health, and education-related benefits of tourism (Coleman & Iso-Ahola, 1993; Moura et al., 2017; Neal et al., 1999), it is important that these opportunities are attainable to all. Ensuring these traditionally underserved domestic audience of visitors feel satisfied,
secure, and well-served when they travel can enhance both the traveler and destination
well-being (Aguilar, 2016).

In particular, in leisure travel context, there is a dearth of research that looks
specifically at Korean American populations who, according to the 2017 American
Community Survey, represent the fifth largest of all Asian American ethnic groups (U.S.
Census Bureau, 2019); thus, they deserve more attention. Among Korean American
adults, the majority (74%) are foreign-born, with sizable populations living in California
(Lee et al., 2020; O’Connor & Batalova, 2019). The challenges faced by the first and 1.5
generation immigrants (both born in Korean and immigrated to the U.S. as adults or as
children, respectively) are unique as they constantly face foreignness in the host country
while overcoming cultural and social barriers such as linguistic and cultural differences,
limited social contacts, and discrimination (Lee & Lee, 2020). In 2018, Korean ranked
seventh in top languages spoken at home among both immigrants and U.S.-born
individuals with limited English proficiency (Zeigler & Camarota, 2019). Existing
studies in psychology and health literature report Korean immigrant adults often remain
monolingual and socialize primarily with other Koreans, which also leads to
cultural/ethnic isolation (Choi et al., 2009) and mental and physical stress (Jang et al.,
2020; Park & Bernstein, 2008).

Both how these challenges would manifest in the leisure travel context within
the host country and what sociocultural factors would make unique contributions to the
stress experienced by immigrants should be examined in tourism studies. Unmasking
challenges and constraints to leisure travel faced by immigrants will allow tourism
managers to ensure accurate visitor management and service planning for this population and diverse ethnic communities.

From a leisure travel perspective, Korean immigrants have higher incomes and educational attainment than the overall immigrant population (O’Connor & Batalova, 2019), and therefore, are more likely to travel. Despite presenting as a distinct and promising travel group, however, neither Korean immigrants nor their perceptions of stress in leisure travel have been addressed. Thus, this study focuses on a sample of Korean immigrants and explores the relationship between acculturation and perceived leisure travel stress. Specifically, this study aims to address two research questions: (1) What stressors do Korean immigrants encounter before and during their leisure travel experience? and (2) If and how do acculturation strategies relate to perceived leisure travel stress?

4.2 Literature Review

4.2.1 Acculturation

Acculturation is classically defined as “phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact, with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Redfield et al., 1936, p. 149). Since its early conceptualization in the 1930s as a group-level phenomenon (Redfield et al., 1936), acculturation has received extensive scholarly attention in both cross-cultural psychology (e.g., Berry, 1980) and anthropology (e.g., Graves, 1967).
In leisure research, two major theoretical approaches dominate understanding of immigrants’ leisure and cross-cultural differences: assimilation and acculturation (Gordon, 1964; Berry, 1997). According to the assimilationist approach, acculturation is a unidimensional process where changes occur along a single continuum, going from the maintenance of heritage culture to the full adoption of mainstream culture over time (Gordon, 1964). According to Gordon (1964), acculturation is one of the seven subprocesses of assimilation and refers to the “change of cultural patterns to those of host society” (p. 71) with the host society mainly depicted as homogenous and unitary (e.g., middle class, White, Anglo Saxon, Protestant). Gordon (1964) described assimilation as a linear process by which changes occur on the part of ethnic cultural minorities and their original culture eventually is erased. The unidirectional conceptualization, however, has been criticized as biased towards the dominant culture and inadequately capturing the richness and variety of changes, such as differences in immigrant choices and the degree of engagement in the acculturation process (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013; Schwartz et al., 2010). Additionally, the cultural standard of a seemingly homogeneous mainstream society was questioned (Portes & Zhou, 1993) and the need to consider individual’s orientations to both the heritage and settlement cultures suggested (Taft, 1986; Berry, 1980, 1997; Ryder et al., 2000).

As an alternative to the assimilationist view, acculturation conceptualizations were modified and/or extended to account for identification with the two cultures and acknowledge that acculturation is a multifaceted process that can follow multiple trajectories (Berry, 1997; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Ryder et al., 2000; Ward, 1996; Waters, 1994). In contrast to Gordon’s conceptualization (1964), Berry (2005) described
acculturation as “dual process of cultural and psychological changes take place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individuals” (p. 698), and viewed assimilation as one of the strategies that acculturating individuals can pursue.

Considering that an individual can learn or identify with the new culture, without necessarily losing the heritage culture, Berry (1990; 1997) recognized that acculturation is a bidimensional process. Based on the orientations to the two dimensions (i.e., cultural maintenance and intercultural contact), Berry (1997) proposed four strategies for immigrant acculturation: (1) marginalization (low engagement with both heritage culture and that of the larger society), (2) separation (high heritage culture affiliation, low new culture engagement), (3) assimilation (high new culture engagement, low heritage culture affiliation), and (4) integration (high engagement with both cultures; also equated with biculturalism). Acculturation strategies encompass both attitudinal and behavioral components, and additionally, may be a result of an individual’s personal preferences or forced acculturation given the “power differences between the groups in contact” (Berry & Sam, 2016, p. 23). Berry (1997, 2005) noted that marginalization is often defined for reasons of imposed denial (e.g., experiences of exclusion or discrimination) by society or enforced cultural loss. Similarly, integration strategy can only be attained and successfully pursued under certain preconditions: support for the value of cultural diversity (e.g., as in policies and ideologies), positive climate of mutual intercultural relations, and mutual acceptance are required in the wider societal level.
Beyond the bidimensional approach, acculturation research since 2010 takes into account multidimensional view (Ward & Geeraert, 2016). For example, Cohen (2010) proposed adding a third component to Berry’s acculturation strategies - community of co-ethnic migrants- and generated eight strategies of acculturation. More recently, acculturation researchers have introduced the concept of remote acculturation (Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012, 2015). In opposition to the view that acculturation occurs in direct and proximal interaction with the new culture, a form of non-migrant acculturation without direct or continuous intercultural contact, driven by globalization, has been suggested with multiple destination cultures considered (Ferguson & Bornstein, 2012; Ferguson et al., 2020). For example, research by Ferguson and Bornstein (2012) revealed non-migrant Jamaican Islanders displayed remote acculturation towards U.S. cultural attributes endorsing three cultural dimensions (Jamaican, African American, and European American cultures) without having been in direct cross-cultural contact, thus suggesting a consideration of tridimensional model.

Although the above theoretical approaches have their strengths and limitations, the bidimensional acculturation approach most effectively applies in the context of immigration in which the movement of people from one country of residence to another (e.g., from Korea to the United States) prompts intercultural contact and notably, is most widely used across psychological research on immigrants (Kuo, 2014). For the purpose of this study, the four-fold bidimensional acculturation model (Berry, 1997) offers a strong theoretical approach to explain why immigrants may vary in their travel stress perceptions, and thus, employed in the current study.
4.2.2 Acculturation and Leisure Travel

Although immigrant populations may pose a niche market opportunity in both domestic and international tourism, travel and tourism research among immigrants is rare (Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Moon et al., 2019; Shen et al., 2018). The limited existing studies that have investigated the relationship between various aspects of acculturation and immigrant tourism, focus on Korean Australians (Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007), Vietnamese married migrant women in Korea (Moon et al., 2019), and Chinese immigrants in Canada (Shen et al., 2018).

One line of research investigated the positive functions of domestic leisure travel to facilitate acculturation as well as mitigate its stress. For example, leisure travel in the host society has been associated with reducing physical and psychological distress among immigrants re-establishing themselves (Moon et al., 2019). Similarly, leisure participation has been linked with fostering interracial/interethnic interactions and social cohesion (Kim, 2012; Stodolska, 2015), and contributing to cross-cultural understanding (Kim & Iwasaki, 2016).

A second line of research focused on the impacts of acculturation on immigrants’ travel behavior. This approach assumed differences in travel behavioral patterns within a group depending on the extent of acculturation. For example, in a study with Korean immigrants in Australia, Lee and Cox (2007) found acculturation influenced immigrants’ travel lifestyles preferences postmigration, specifically related to their travel attitudes, interests, and opinions. Within-group differences existed in travel lifestyle patterns based on their acculturative experiences. Also, Lee and Sparks (2007) found evidence that travel preferences and behaviors change with immigrant
respondents’ acculturation experiences. Similarly, Shen et al. (2018) documented acculturation influenced tourist behavior, motivation, and attitudes across multiple travel phases (i.e., before, during, and post-trip) among three Chinese groups: Canadian-born Chinese, Chinese immigrants born in Mainland China, and Chinese immigrants born in Hong Kong.

Interestingly, although some of these studies have considered heritage culture maintenance and host culture engagement (e.g., Lee & Cox, 2007), most have been descriptive rather than theoretically based. To better understand the sociocultural factors underlying immigrants’ leisure and travel, more theory-based research is needed (Ward, 2008). In addition, although acculturation is conceptually different from assimilation, notable inconsistencies arise as the term “level of acculturation” seems to be used predominantly in the literature, quite often intended to equate with “level of assimilation” only. Precisely how these terms were operationalized vary by studies, however, Berry and Sam (2016) cautioned that “level” and “degree” of acculturation (e.g., as in “highly acculturated”) should not be used synonymously as assimilation, as it can cause problems with the interpretation of the results, and thus be discerned.

Further, despite relatively scarce research on acculturation in tourism contexts, even fewer studies employed Berry’s (1997) bidimensional acculturation model. Hung et al. (2013) conducted a qualitative study of the meaning and dynamics of immigrants’ home-bound travel in a sample of Mainland Chinese immigrants living in Hong Kong and identified three types of acculturation strategies equivalent to Berry’s integration, assimilation, and marginalization. Similarly, but in a hotel context, Weber Hsu, and Sparks (2016) studied consumer perceptions of and behavioral responses to a service
failure situation among Chinese-Americans and Mainland Chinese. They identified three acculturation groups (separation, integration, and assimilation) using the mean of the indicators. In leisure-time physical activity research, Walker et al. (2015) used non-hierarchical clustering to identify four acculturation groups among South Asian immigrants in Canada – two separation and integration strategies respectively, varying in preference levels (i.e., high/low) for cultural maintenance and involvement in the host culture.

Collectively, these studies illuminated the variety of acculturation strategies pursued by immigrants and revealed that integration was the most often used strategy with little if any separation or marginalization. In addition to the varied acculturation strategies pursued by immigrant populations, researchers found all four types of acculturation consistent with Berry’s model (integration, assimilation, marginalization, and separation) with recent and prospective international tourists from the U.S., Germany, and China to Australia (Rasmi et al., 2014). Taken together, these studies identified and confirmed the applicability of Berry’s acculturation model in leisure and tourism context.

4.2.3 Stress

Tourists are exposed to multiple stressors that can adversely impact the overall travel enjoyment and diminish the quality of the travel experience (Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995). The way in which tourists deal with potential stressful travel events depends on if and how they perceive and respond to those stressors. In the short term, stressed travelers view traveling as less enjoyable and less
satisfying, thereby, likely receive fewer travel benefits (Chen et al., 2016; Neal et al., 1999). In the long term, travel-related stress can negatively impact tourists’ intention to revisit (Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2006; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012).

As of 2020, limited but growing number of studies have documented stressful conditions or travel-related stressors (Chen, 2017; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Kim, 2015; Lin, 2018; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2020). In the business realm, travelers reported feeling overwhelmed with travel arrangements in the pre-trip phase, traffic jams and flight delays on the road, and the need for rapid cultural adjustments to the host culture at the destination (Chen, 2017). In the leisure travel realm, evidence suggested multiple situations generate stress including conflicts, physical health, travel partners, safety concerns, crowding, noise, and interacting with local residents (Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schuster et al., 2003, 2006a, 2006b; Miller & McCool, 2003; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhu et al., 2020).

While previous research recognized and documented a range of stress symptoms associated with tourism (Furnham, 1984; Pearce, 1981), only in 2000 was stress defined from a business travel perspective (DeFrank et al., 2000), and only since 2010 have growing number of researchers empirically sought to understand perceptions of tourism-related stress (Chen, 2017; Jordan et al., 2019a, 2019b; Jordan & Vogt, 2017; Jordan et al., 2015; Lin, 2018; Schermann et al., 2015; Schneider et al., 2011; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2020). Further, although in its infancy, a existing studies exploring leisure travelers’ stress have recognized stress as a dynamic and multifaceted phenomenon and proposed that stressors associated with leisure trips can be
experienced during multiple travel phases (e.g., pre-trip, traveling to the destination, and at destination; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2020).

In general, a transactive stress theory suggests personal and situational factors work interdependently to explain stress appraisal and coping reactions (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). This transactive approach has proven useful within leisure research (Miller & McCool, 2003; Schneider & Hammitt, 1995; Schneider & Wilhelm Stanis, 2007; Schuster et al., 2006), and was adapted in the tourism research literature since 2012 (Chen, 2017; Jordan & Vogt, 2017; Jordan et al., 2015; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012). However, the models have been tested primarily based on the experiences of homogenous, White samples. As a result, considerably less is known about racially and ethnically diverse tourist groups and stress, much less about differences between and within these diverse groups.

Evidence suggests that differences in leisure travel stress appraisals (including its types, frequency, and intensity) may exist based on race and ethnicity (Stanis et al., 2009). Although not explicitly measured, Stanis et al. (2009) found that among four racial and ethnic groups (i.e., Asian, Black/African American, non-Hispanic/Latino Whites, and Hispanic/Latinos of all races), significant constraint differences emerged among park visitors even when age, gender, education, and site location were controlled. In particular, safety concerns and fears due to racial conflict and feeling unwelcomed were experienced with stronger intensity by racially and ethnically diverse respondents than by non-Hispanic Whites. Additionally, Das, Fan, and French (2017) examined park-use behavior and park-related perceptions among several racially and ethnically diverse groups and found that foreign-born residents, Blacks, and Hispanics perceived
greater and unique constraints to park use in terms of feeling unwelcome, cultural/language restrictions, program schedule/pricing concerns, and facility maintenance and mismatch concerns. Similarly, existing studies documented crowding perceptions differ across racial and ethnic backgrounds at tourist destinations. For example, Lee et al. (2019) studied state park visitors in Missouri and found that Asian visitors felt more crowded than White visitors. However, they noted the relative intolerance of Asian visitors may be due to inadvertent effects of other factors (e.g., travel format) rather than their ethnic and racial identity, thus calling for further investigation.

Research among immigrants found evidence they face different types of stress than the general population. For example, Schermann et al. (2015) in their focus group study with Hmong immigrants found that English language challenges, perceived discrimination, and their specific cultural attributes (e.g., familial responsibility for elders, food preferences, large travel group size) were among the most apparent constraining factors to domestic leisure travel. They further suggested that immigrants undergoing different acculturative processes may exhibit differences in constraints to leisure travel and travel preferences. Indeed, within the fields of parks, recreation, and leisure studies, researchers suggested immigrant travel experiences may differ from the non-Hispanic White mainstream or U.S.-born population (Krymkowski et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 2014; Winter et al., 2004) and that traveling in a new society can be particularly stressful due to multitude challenges including unfamiliarity and language barriers, to name a few (Stodolska & Yi-Kook, 2005; Stodolska et al. 2019).
One possible unique factor likely to influence immigrants’ stress perception in travel is acculturation. Researchers documented acculturation can affect immigrants’ travel behavior, including participation patterns, preferences, and constraints (Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Schermann et al., 2015) through travel stress such as language restrictions, lack of knowledge of travel opportunities, unfamiliarity with the host culture, or feeling unwelcome (Huang, 2012). Despite being extremely influential in explaining and predicting immigrants’ behaviors and adaptation, the examination of the direct relationship between acculturation and stress perceived in a tourism context requires further attention. This study, thus, explores the leisure travel stress experienced by immigrants and investigates if and how acculturation strategies differentiate it among a sample of Korean immigrants.

4.3 Research Methods

4.3.1 Data Collection

The study population consisted of Korean adults (18 years or older) living in the United States. This study focused on individuals (1) who were born in Korea and moved to the United States either as adults or as children/adolescents with their parents and (2) who had travel experiences in the U.S. within the past 12 months. Study participants were recruited via Lucid, a web-based recruiting platform that uses quota sampling to match a nationally representative sample (Coppock & McClellan, 2019). Over a three-month period during the Summer of 2019, recruited participants completed an online questionnaire using Qualtrics. The respondents answered the questionnaire in the language of their choice (English or Korean). Of 446 completed online questionnaires,
55.46% (n = 249) questionnaires met the inclusion criteria and were retained for the data analysis.

4.3.2 Survey Instrument

A four-part questionnaire was pre-tested among a pool of tourism researchers and a convenience sample of Korean Americans (n=20) for content validity, then translated into Korean and back translated to English by two bilingual speakers to ascertain credibility, consistency, and clarity (Budruk, 2010; Guo & Schneider, 2015). The instrument assessed perceived stress of leisure travel, acculturation strategies, as well as details of a most recent leisure trip, and demographics.

For this study, leisure travel was operationalized as traveling to a main destination 50 miles or more and/or staying a minimum one night away from the primary residence for leisure purposes (World Tourism Organization, 1995). Additionally, destination included both non-nature (e.g., theme park, museum, concert) and nature-based (e.g., National Parks, beaches, mountain) as it was this study’s intent to examine experiences of immigrants with a wide-range of U.S. sites. Leisure travel stress was operationalized as the degree to which situations in one or more phases of leisure travel experience are appraised as stressful.

To assess perceived leisure travel stress, a list of 45 potential stressors was provided for three travel phases (pre-trip, en route, onsite) synthesized from previous literature including items such as health concerns, weather, interaction with local residents, cleanliness (Chen, 2017; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012) and those distinct among immigrants elicited from immigrant leisure constraints literature (e.g., making travel
reservations in English, getting information in my language, feeling that people treated me differently; Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska, 1998; Walker et al., 2011). The category “Other” with an option to describe a source of stress that was not on the existing list was also included for each phase. Within each travel phase, respondents indicated the extent to which they experienced stress on a 5-point unipolar scale, ranging from 1 “not at all stressful” and 5 “extremely stressful” or “Does not apply.” An average stress intensity score was computed for each of three travel phases (pre, en route, onsite). Additionally, stress frequency was computed based on a sum of all stressor items answered by each respondent as stressful, ranging from a minimum of one to maximum of 45.

To assess the four acculturation strategies adopted by Korean immigrants, Barry’s (2001) East Asian Acculturation Measure Scale (EAAM; Barry, 2001) was adapted. A total of 29 items with four subscales were asked on a 5-point bipolar scale, ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”: assimilation (8 items; e.g., “I find that Americans understand me better than Asians do”), integration (5 items; e.g., “I feel very comfortable around both Americans and Asians”), separation (7 items; e.g., “Asians should not date non-Asians”), and marginalization (9 items; e.g., “Generally, I find it difficult to socialize with anybody, Asian or American”). The original items had been designed for a group of East Asian immigrants (including Chinese, Japanese, and Korean in the United States) and assessed the following areas: communication styles (competency and ease or comfort in communicating) and social interaction in various settings. For this study, the word ‘Asian’ was replaced by ‘Korean.’ The assignment of
respondents to the four acculturation strategies was based on the highest mean score derived across the four strategy categories.

4.3.3 Data Analysis

All statistical analyses were completed using SPSS 25. As the first step in data analysis, descriptive statistics, preliminary data checks for normality, and internal consistency (Cronbach alpha coefficients) were computed for variables of interest. All scales demonstrated acceptable internal consistency scores (greater than 0.6; Nunnally, 1978) with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .81 to .91. Analysis then further proceeded through two steps.

First, based on three mean stress intensity scores (pre-trip, en route, and destination) stress across travel phases was compared by immigrants’ acculturation strategy (assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization) using a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and Pillai’s Trace coefficient as the measure of significance. This statistical test was considered appropriate given the unequal distribution of respondents in acculturation categories and that Pillai’s Trace is more robust than Wilk’s Lambda when between-group sizes are relatively unequal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Significant MANOVA results were followed by separate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) and Bonferroni adjusted post-hoc tests to assess which acculturation groups showed different means. To control for Type I error in multiple comparisons, adjustment of alpha level at 0.008 (adjusting a conventional 0.05 alpha level for six pairwise comparisons between acculturation groups, 0.05/6 = 0.008) was employed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Prior to the analysis, statistical assumptions of
MANOVA using Box’s M Test (p = 0.006) and Levene’s Test (p > 0.05) were verified. While Q-Q and P-P plots indicated mild deviations from normality in residuals, MANOVA is robust to small departures from normality in large samples (at least 30 cases in each cell) (Dattalo, 2013). Given the power analysis using G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2009) indicated a minimum sample size of 92 needed to detect a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.0625$; Cohen, 1988) on an alpha = 0.05 and power at 0.80, our sample size was adequate for these tests.

Second, based on individual responses to each potential stressor, item-level stress differences by acculturation strategy were tested using ANOVAs. For significant results, Bonferroni post-hoc tests for multiple comparisons with adjusted alpha level (of 0.008) followed.

### 4.4 Results

#### 4.4.1 Sample Characteristics

The average length of respondents’ U.S. residence was 18.4 years (SD = 11.33; range 1-63) and the average age of U.S. arrival 16.1 years old (SD = 9.17; range 6 - 80). The largest proportion of the respondents were categorized as integrated (57.4%), followed by assimilated (15.3%), separated (14.5%), and marginalized (12.9%).

#### 4.4.2 Perceived Stress during Travel Experience

Overall, the perceived stress levels were low, with means ranging from 1.48 to 2.24 (based on a 5-point scale). The pre-travel stage appeared to generate the highest level of stress for all groups, followed by en route, and destination. Respondents
experienced stress originating from 1 to 45 sources and the average number of stressors encountered on a trip was 22.65 (SD = 11.56). Overall, about 73.5% of participants indicated that deciding what to bring was the most common source of travel stress they experienced during the pre-travel experience. Participants also reported travel issues including traffic jams and delayed flights (83.1%) as a common travel stressor en route, and unfavorable weather conditions (63.1%) at the destination. Additionally, travel stressors encountered by Korean immigrants included getting information (39.4%) in Korean language and making travel reservations in English (33.3%) prior to their trip, and feeling that people treated differently for being Korean (46.2%) en route (Table 4.1).
Table 4.1. Distribution of Stressors Across Three Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-trip stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>183 (73.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>177 (71.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>162 (65.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>147 (59.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>126 (50.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>122 (49.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>98 (39.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>83 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>81 (32.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>En route stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>207 (83.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>164 (65.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>162 (65.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>154 (61.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>139 (55.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>125 (50.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>117 (47.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>116 (46.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>115 (46.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>111 (44.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>157 (63.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>155 (62.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>146 (58.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>142 (57.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>138 (55.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>129 (51.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>117 (47.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>114 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>114 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>112 (45.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Percentages are only for those respondents who indicated the item as a source of at least slight stress; Stressors were not mutually exclusive; Stressors in each phase are presented in a descending order.
4.4.3 Stress Differences by Phases of Travel and Acculturation Strategies

Statistically significant differences on perceived stress levels emerged across the travel phases and by acculturation strategy (Pillai’s Trace = 0.11, F (9, 726) = 3.042, p = 0.001, \( \eta^2 = .036 \)). Follow-up ANOVA revealed that stress levels were significantly different within each phase as well: 1) with respondents utilizing marginalization indicated significantly higher stress levels across the trip and within each phase towards pre-travel (\( M = 2.13, SD = 0.60 \)), en route (\( M = 2.12, SD = 0.63 \)), and destination (\( M = 2.00, SD = 0.57 \)) than those employing assimilation (\( M = 1.59, SD = 0.50 \)); (\( M = 1.58, SD = 0.57 \)); (\( M = 1.48, SD = 0.57 \)). and 2) those utilizing a separation strategy (\( M= 2.24, SD = 0.81 \)) experienced significantly greater stress than those employing assimilation (\( M = 1.59, SD = 0.50 \)) and integration (\( M = 1.79, SD = 0.66 \)) during pre-trip. En route, only those using assimilation (\( M = 1.48, SD = 0.57 \)) indicated significantly lower stress than those in the separation category (\( M = 1.99, SD = 0.76 \)) (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Differences in Perceived Stress Intensity by Phase and Acculturation Strategy Using MANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel stress intensity</th>
<th>Acculturation strategies</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization (n=32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation (n=36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration (n=141)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation (n=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-trip</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.13 (0.60)</td>
<td>2.24 (0.81)</td>
<td>1.79 (0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-route</td>
<td>2.12 (0.63)</td>
<td>2.04 (0.84)</td>
<td>1.77 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>2.00 (0.57)</td>
<td>1.99 (0.76)</td>
<td>1.69 (0.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: MANOVA model Pillai’s Trace = 0.11, F (9, 726) = 3.042, p = .001, \( \eta^2 = .036 \); Superscript letters indicate significant pairwise group differences based on post-hoc tests at the 0.008 level.*
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4.4.4 Stress Differences by Item and Acculturation Strategies

To further examine the item-level stress differences, a total of 29 individual stressors were compared by acculturation strategy. Significant differences in only 10 stressors existed: three for pre-trip, three in the en route phase, and four at the destination. Jointly, findings suggested that those using marginalization and separation strategies had similar levels of perceived stress, while those using assimilation and integration also had similar perceived stress levels to each other. It was common that immigrants in both marginalization and separation categories perceived more stress across and within phases. By contrast, stress levels tended to be lower among those both in integration and assimilation categories.

Specifically, post-hoc tests revealed that prior to a trip (Table 4.3), those utilizing marginalization reported significantly higher stress than those using integration in “getting information in Korean language.” In response to “making travel reservations in English,” those who use marginalization (M = 2.19, SD = 1.36) experienced significantly higher stress than those who use integration (M = 1.46, SD = .92), whereas those employing separation (M = 2.34, SD = 1.31) experienced significantly higher stress than those in both assimilation (M = 1.39, SD = .86) and integration categories (M = 1.46, SD = .92). While en route to a destination (Table 4.4), those employing marginalization (M = 2.38, SD = 1.21) and separation (M = 2.37, SD = 1.33) experienced significantly more stress “interacting with service employees” than those in both assimilation (M = 1.49, SD = 0.78) and integration categories (M = 1.64, SD = 0.93). For “feeling that people treated differently for being Korean,” those using marginalization (M = 2.42, SD = 1.41) experienced significantly higher stress than those
using assimilation (M = 1.51, SD = 0.78). At the destination (Table 4.5), those employing marginalization (M = 2.84, SD = 1.13) experienced significantly higher stress for “the number of people at the destination” than those employing assimilation (M = 1.92, SD = 1.28) and integration (M = 2.05, SD = 1.11). Similarly, those in marginalization category (M = 2.30, SD = 1.21) experienced significantly higher stress in “opening hours of attractions” than those in both assimilation (M = 1.54, SD = 0.78) and integration categories (M = 1.68, SD = 0.91). It should also be noted that within 10 stressor items, five items did not reveal any significant between-group differences: “thinking about the number of people traveling at the site,” “travel issues (traffic jams/flight delays),” “opening hours of attractions,” “interaction with local residents” and “interaction with hospitality service employees.”
Table 4.3. Perceived Stress Differences by Pre-Trip Stressors and Acculturation Strategy Using ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Stressors</th>
<th>Acculturation strategies</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting information in Korean language</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.72 (1.22)</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.39 (1.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.70 (1.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.75 (1.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>Developing itinerary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.43 (0.94)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.74 (1.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.27 (1.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.20 (0.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Finding information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to plan the trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.40 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.34 (1.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.15 (1.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.95 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Thinking about the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traveling at the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.25 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.03 (1.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.85 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.53 (0.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Deciding what to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.20 (1.13)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.71 (1.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.26 (1.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.21 (0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Making travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reservations in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.19 (1.35)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.34 (1.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.46 (0.92)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.39 (0.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>Thinking about the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traveling to the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.10 (1.00)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.94 (1.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.83 (0.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.61 (0.99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Choosing a destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where I would feel safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.03 (1.03)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.46 (1.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.09 (1.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.89 (0.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Thinking about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interacting with wild</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.90 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.91 (1.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.62 (1.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.63 (0.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Superscript letters indicate significant pairwise group differences based on post-hoc tests at the 0.008 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Stressors</th>
<th>Acculturation strategies</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 Travel issues (traffic jams, flight delays)</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.94 (1.29)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.53 (1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.83 (1.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.24 (1.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9 Feeling that people treat me differently for being Korean</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.42 (1.41)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.11 (1.47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.81 (1.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.51 (0.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 Interaction with service employees</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.38 (1.21)</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.37 (1.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.64 (0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.49 (0.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Wayfinding</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.30 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.18 (1.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.15 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.03 (1.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Personal safety concerns</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.25 (1.14)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.52 (1.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2.10 (1.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.08 (1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Weather conditions</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.19 (1.28)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.34 (1.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.23 (1.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.92 (1.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7 Personal health issues</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.16 (1.37)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91 (0.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.90 (1.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.64 (0.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6 Thinking about the number of people at the destination</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.06 (1.09)</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.97 (1.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.82 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.00 (1.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 Lack of food choices</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.00 (0.92)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.08 (1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.02 (1.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.71 (0.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interaction with members in my own travel party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Stressors</th>
<th>Acculturation strategies</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Onsite weather conditions</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.19 (1.22)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Cleanliness of the surrounding environment</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.26 (1.13)</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Number of people at the destination</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.84 (1.13)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Personal safety concerns</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.26 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Separation concerns</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.26 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Integration concerns</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.26 (1.13)</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Interaction with local residents</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.19 (1.22)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Separation concerns</td>
<td>Marginalization 31 2.19 (1.22)</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Opening hours of attractions</td>
<td>Marginalization 30 2.30 (1.21)</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Superscript letters indicate significant pairwise group differences based on post-hoc tests at the 0.008 level.

Table 4.5. Perceived Stress Differences by Destination Stressors and Acculturation Strategy Using ANOVA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commuting to attractions from my accommodation</th>
<th>Marginalization</th>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Integration</th>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>2.06 (1.00)</th>
<th>1.34</th>
<th>0.263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Lack of food choices</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>1.94 (0.89)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84 (0.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Lack of entertainment facilities</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>Separation</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>1.84 (0.97)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.84 (0.97)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Superscript letters indicate significant pairwise group differences based on post-hoc tests at the 0.008 level.

4.5 Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined leisure travel stressors and the differences in perceived stress by acculturation strategies among a sample of U.S. Korean immigrants. Study results confirm and provide further support to consider consumer differences within ethnic groups (Fernandez et al., 2015; Floyd & Gramann, 1993; Schneider et al., 2014). Findings indicate that the U.S. domestic Korean market is heterogenous and identifies opportunities to enhance domestic tourist experiences.

Like other groups, these Korea-born leisure travelers encountered stress during travel and across multiple travel phases (Chen, 2017; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2020). In line with previous findings, our results also confirmed that Korean immigrants encountered stress emanating from themselves, travel partners, environment, tourism infrastructure, and the service providers before and during the trip (Zhu et al., 2020). However, in contrast to Zhu et al.’s (2020) who identified tourists faced different stress in different phases, the present study revealed some stressors consistently emerge throughout the phases in: the number of people at the destination,
weather, lack of food choices, and safety concern. These results could stem from how stress was defined. In this study, leisure travel stress was defined as perceived threat to various conditions encountered during one or more phases of travel. In contrast, stress was measured by an interview assessing individuals’ responses to problems during travel in response to ongoing travel experience in Zhu et al.’s (2020) study. The choice of individuals’ past stress experiences in response to stressors encountered in more than one travel phases, as in the present study, may partly account for such different findings. Another explanation is population specificity. Had this study assessed stress experienced by Korean Americans born in the U.S., the amount or type of stress may have been perceived differently (e.g., less frequently or less intensely).

While Korean immigrant leisure travelers encountered some similar sources of stress found among non-Korean travelers (Martín, 2005; Moreno & Amelung, 2009; Zehrer & Crotts, 2012; Zhu et al., 2020), distinct travel stressors encountered by Korean immigrants also emerged: language barriers and perceived discrimination because of their ethnic background. Findings resonate with existing evidence among other travelers of color and ethnic communities, although language difficulties may be more pronounced for first-generation immigrants (e.g., Black/African American – Hmong; Krymkowski et al., 2014; Schermann et al., 2015; Stodolska, 1998; Dillette et al., 2019; Lee & Scott, 2017; Yang et al., 2018). However, the identified ethnic-specific stressors warrant discussion. First, these ethnic-related stressors were listed fairly infrequently by the study participants compared to the general stressors (e.g., traffic jams/flight delays, developing itineraries, health, weather). This finding is in line with previous findings from the leisure constraints literature where lack of time and money more important
constraining factor for immigrants, while limited English proficiency and discrimination (those related to immigrants’ ethnic characteristics) were less important constraining factor (Scott et al., 2006; Stodolska, 1998). Conceivably, the general stressors may have been more pressing among Korean immigrants because leisure travel is often more cost-intensive and requires more time, energy, and effort than regular daily activities.

Second, despite the fact that many of the respondents belonged in the integration category and immigrated to the U.S. at a relatively young age (16 years old on average), it is surprising that still, more than 30% of the respondents reported ethnic-related factors as stressful. Existing studies have portrayed that immigrants adopting integrative acculturation strategy as well as those immigrated at a young age are most adaptive and face fewer psychological distress due to language barriers and ethnic discrimination (Bae, 2019; Choi et al., 2016). This somewhat contradictory finding may suggest that acculturation is not static but an ongoing process. Additionally, previous research on immigrants suggests stress related to language barriers and perceived discrimination may occur together as the latter predominantly stems from the experiences with language problems and encountering negative ethnic stereotypes (Birman & Trickett, 2001; Mui, 2001). However, in this study, where the different treatment originates remains unclear and further exploration of these stressors is warranted.

Unlike Zehrer and Crotts (2012), who found destination stressors most stressful, our results indicated highest stress in the pre-travel stage. While the survey findings do not go into detail, travel requires a multitude of decisions concerning the products and services (Manrai & Manrai, 2011). The uncertainty and intangibility inherent in purchasing decisions before actual experiences and potential loss resulting from
improper decision making may reduce travelers’ confidence and act as a catalyst for increasing stress (Roehl & Fesenmaier, 1992). Certainly, this seems like it is higher for leisure travelers than business travelers who are not focused on their own travel purchases and whose itinerary is typically set by others. Another possible explanation for this finding is that when planning a trip to a culturally and geographically distant environment, the planning process may trigger higher stress levels as it requires more preparation time and planning efforts navigating unfamiliar rules and regulations, food choices, language, and locations. As such, travelers are more likely to consume physical and cognitive resources which may contribute to increased levels of pre-trip stress (Zhang et al., 2021). Again, compared to business travelers the leisure travel is more impacted. Further, Korean immigrants with lower English proficiency may face more difficulties seeking information about the destination and likely take longer time gathering travel information and for these reasons be considerably stressed in the pre-travel phase.

Consistent with Berry’s (1997) model and existing research, this study identified all four types of acculturation strategies with integration strategy dominant (Berry & Hou, 2016; Berry & Sabatier, 2011; Choi et al., 2016; Walker et al., 2015). Such results demonstrate a tendency for immigrants to maintain and preserve their own cultural assets in ethnic communities while accepting and engaging in the dominant culture.

Of central interest was the association between acculturation strategies and tourist stress perceptions among Korean immigrants. First, the study results are in line with Zane and Mak’s (2003) assertion that acculturation is an important individual difference variable in the study of ethnic minority populations and their stress appraisal
(Berry, 2006). Although few differences in the stress levels were found among individual stressors, perceived travel stress differed by acculturation strategies across all three travel phases and within select individual stressors. Also in keeping with much of the stress research carried out on other acculturating immigrants (Berry, 1998; Ramdhonee & Bhowon, 2012; Neto, 2002; Zheng & Berry, 1991), ethnic minorities (Berry, 2003), and international students (Sullivan & Kashubeck-West, 2015), individuals using both marginalization and separation strategies were associated with higher levels of travel stress than those adopting integration and assimilation strategies. For example, in the pre-travel stage, Korean immigrants employing marginalization strategy reported greater stress while making travel reservations in English than those using integration. Similarly, Korean immigrants using separation strategy experienced more stress than those using assimilation and integration strategies. As the existing literature shows, these results imply that developing and retaining higher level of connections to the host country may be important aspects in minimizing travel stress. Arguably, both integrated and assimilated individuals could have more resources to navigate (e.g., language and communication skills, social networks, familiarity with cultural values and beliefs of both societies) life in the host country and flexibly cope with stress factors which would also be transferred to domestic tourism contexts. This may be especially true for second or later generation Korean Americans, or those who left Korea at a young age (i.e., 1.5 generation), considering their proximity to U.S. culture throughout their lifetimes (Shin et al., 2017).

Overall, at both phase and specific stress source levels, marginalized individuals tended to perceive the highest stress levels compared to those with other three strategies.
This finding may add further support to the existing evidence that when immigrants remain disengaged from their heritage culture and from their new society (by way of marginalization), they are likely to be associated with more negative psychological outcomes (Berry, 2005; Berry & Hou, 2016). Berry and Hou (2016) suggested that due to “lacking bonding and bridging capital” (p. 260) to the larger society, marginalized individuals encounter both psychologically and physically demanding conditions in the acculturation process more so than do integrative or assimilated individuals. It could be that such demanding acculturation process heighten marginalized individuals’ vulnerability towards stress during their travel. Ways tourism professionals can assist these marginalized travelers and mitigate stress need both academic and practical attention. Similarly, research is essential to identify any underlying or undercurrent issues related to travel stress among immigrants undergoing acculturation process.

4.5.1 Theoretical and Practical Implications

To our knowledge, this study represents the first attempt to integrate Berry’s (1997) four-fold acculturation model and Lazarus and Folkman’s stress model to explore leisure travelers. As such, this article extends and theoretically grounds the scope of research on immigrants and ethnic group members’ travel and tourism (Kim & Stodolska, 2013; Lee & Cox, 2007; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Moon et al., 2019; Schermann et al., 2015; Shen et al., 2018). It thus sheds more light on the need to deconstruct potential influential factors underlying leisure travelers’ perceived stress at different travel phases.
In addition, the study results extend our understanding of leisure travel stressors. This study goes beyond the early findings of leisure travel stressors and include those encountered by immigrant travelers. It thus suggests that Korean immigrants experience contextually and culturally relevant sources of stress that should be assessed simultaneously along with those sources that are more general when examining their stress responses. By doing so, the study also calls for the necessity to distinguish and account for the identification of the stressors encountered by traditionally underserved population, including immigrants. Further, by documenting and assessing stress faced by a Korean immigrant sample and breaking down previously identified ‘Asian’ markets, this study extends the psychological discourse on stress and well-being (Aldwin, 2007; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Apart from the theoretical contributions, the study findings provide managerial implications for service providers that seek to serve culturally and ethnically diverse domestic leisure travelers in terms of visitor experience management, marketing communications, and customer service. First, recognizing tourists’ stress and identifying where it originates are essential for visitor travel management (Schneider et al., 2011). The study reinforces this perspective as Korean immigrants experienced stress in all three travel phases. Additionally, the study findings indicate that tourists’ stress experiences at the pre-travel stage should receive adequate managerial attention. An effective stress-mitigation strategy for destination marketing managers during this stage would include increasing information availability and relevancy to the needs of ethnically and culturally diverse customer base (Jonas & Mansfeld, 2017; Schneider & Kivel, 2016). Marketing communications with assuring messages tailored to suit specific
needs, clarifying what tourists can do and expect (e.g., tour itinerary recommendation, real-time data about safety, daily/weekly destination weather, location and time-based crowding information) are ways of reducing pre-trip stress and instilling a sense of competence in travelers. Besides, working towards a trip planning process that is easy, accessible, and convenient, destination marketers can further leverage digital platforms and channels that Koreans most frequently use including blogs (e.g., www.naver.com), online communities (e.g., www.milemoa.com; www.missycoupon.com), and mobile apps (e.g., KakaoTalk, Instagram) to augment market-specific messaging. However, further studies are needed to compare the use of information sources, preferences, and information search behaviors in pre-travel phase among Korean, and other, immigrants.

Second, the findings suggest that language issues are not solely experienced by international tourists but also within the domestic audience. Similarly, irrespective of their proclivity to employ an integration or assimilation approach to acculturate, Korean immigrants frequently reported stress from language issues (e.g., getting information in native language, making reservations in English). This finding is of practical importance because for individuals for whom English is not their native language, inadequate language support may make it difficult for individuals to navigate travel media, make reservations, find appropriate information, or communicate their needs and resolve various travel issues throughout the trip. Additionally, although some U.S. destinations are working to accommodate the needs to offer multiple language accommodations on their websites (e.g., GoHawaii), not all tourist destinations provide such language support. In the long run, to address such inconsistency, destination managers and tourism organizations should redefine their approach and consider attending to diverse customer
base and their needs in creating and developing services and products. To counteract the status quo, service providers should critically reassess the existing publications, social media, and various on/offline systems (e.g., booking procedure, customer services/feedback) to ensure if critical information is made accessible in travelers’ languages and highlight areas in need of additional guidance. Another consideration is routinely assessing language-related stress and being responsive to multilingual needs.

Destination marketing managers should also consider evaluating their marketing messages to ensure they are displayed in a culturally appropriate manner and demonstrate diversity and inclusion in mind. At the destination level, different approaches should be utilized to assist travelers. In particular, tourism destinations can incorporate interpretive visuals that are not primarily reliant on language comprehension (e.g., colors, images, music) and utilize multilingual or translated signage. Language stress at destinations can also be directly managed by destination managers through expanding the breadth of cultural knowledge by providing onsite employees with training in cross-cultural communication and recruiting diverse employee base.

Successfully planning a trip in one’s own language and going to a destination where multi-language options are available may increases the chances of cross-cultural interactions and increase tourists’ comfort and enjoyment in destination (Okafor et al., 2018).

Third, considering the stress elicited during service encounters, it is essential that frontline service professionals provide customer-oriented services embodied by willingness to serve and help (Keh et al., 2013). Studies suggest that helpful, reliable, and responsive frontline staff are more likely to delight customers, which in turn,
positively affects their intention to recommend (Jiang, 2020). Ensuring the ability to do this across cultures can work toward delighting the breadth of the diversifying consumer base.

Finally, while the study reinforced our understanding of immigrants’ leisure travel stressors and perceived stressfulness, the differences observed in stress levels based on acculturation strategies are just as important. The intersection between travel stress and acculturation is an important place for tourism practitioners to look to gain a fuller understanding of differences between immigrant groups.

4.6 Limitations and Future Research

This study is not without limitations. First, the study may not represent all Korean immigrants across the United States. As described earlier, a purposive sampling method recruited a sample where the majority had a college or higher education with middle to high income. Thus, the findings may not be generalizable to Korean immigrants who migrated to the U.S. before the age of 6 and the US-born Korean Americans in general. However, given the relationships of education and income to travel, they demonstrate a fairly representative sample of travelers.

Second, Korean travelers in this study revealed low levels of perceived stress intensity in general. A few potential explanations exist. One explanation is that the use of retrospective self-report measures will provide imperfect indicators of actual stress experiences as it may introduce bias. Although the risk of this was lessened by using previously validated measures, studies have reported fading affect bias, which explains that individuals remember positive emotions significantly better than negative ones.
(Kim & Youn, 2017; Ottenstein & Lischetzke, 2020). If the stress was somewhat effectively managed and resolved, this successful resolution might prompt the tendency among tourists to remember pleasant affect associated with tourism experiences rather than the unpleasant affect. Future studies may need to consider how the time lapse after the stressful event or how the intensity of stress evaluation would affect respondents’ recall of their experiences. Also, relatively short retrospective frames in the study design (e.g., momentary ratings, close to real time or real-time assessments shortly after the stress-eliciting event) could be used to reduce the recall bias. A second explanation is the sample itself. Previous studies on Korean immigrants have demonstrated how Korean culture is informed by Confucianism with its strong emphasis on group conformity and has influenced how Korean immigrants conceptualize stress and manifest their response to stress (Kim, 1998). Evidence suggests that Koreans tend to feel obligated to internalize or suppress their personal concerns or strong negative emotions to themselves as it is considered culturally and sociably appropriate, which may place a challenge on assessing their stress (Cho et al., 2003; Kim et al., 2014; Yeh, 2003). Given these cultural characteristics, the study participants conceivably might have felt less comfortable reporting their experiences of stress, and these possibilities may have influenced the data. Future studies might explore different methods for posing questions to participants to help them feel at ease sharing personal experiences with stress. A third and final explanation is that, compared to other life events, travel stress simply may not be that intense and the items chosen for stress measures might not have impacted Korean immigrants’ travel experiences acutely. Future efforts on stress events assessment that are appropriate for a given population is necessary if the research on stress processes is
to be expanded into other ethnic/cultural groups in a meaningful way. If some of the most important or relevant stressors for individuals in a given ethnic/cultural group are not fully included in the stress assessment, “a good deal of the important variability in the “real” severity of stressors experienced will go unmeasured” (Slavin et al., 1991, p. 161). Further, using culturally sensitive instruments to measure stress responses is integral for accurately understanding the stress experienced in a given group and to develop culturally sensitive intervention efforts to support individuals.

While a description of the stress and acculturation is important to develop a general understanding of multicultural travelers, future studies can investigate causal or intervening factors. For example, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) suggested that if individuals perceive themselves as having control over the situation and have resources to cope with stress, they are less likely to experience the situation as stressful. Also, it is possible that some variation in perceived stress across acculturation strategies have been introduced by generational differences, access to jobs, income, or acceptance by the mainstream society (Padilla et al., 1985; Yoon et al., 2008). Future research considering the multidimensionality of this relationship would advance the understanding of tourists’ stress and go beyond investigation of a simple, linear relationship.

In conclusion, this study models the influential role of acculturation in the tourist stress framework by demonstrating the effects of acculturation on perceived travel stress, with individual differences. The study findings provide empirical support for the idea that acculturation affects travel stress. Although some methodological restrictions apply, these data could set the stage for developing and validating more complex and dynamic models of travel stress accounting for ethnic and cultural
diversity. Both the stress model and the four-fold acculturation model have only briefly been focused on in previous research and deserves more attention. Correspondingly, given the projections for increasingly diverse society, it is more important than ever that both tourism managers and policymakers understand the opportunities and challenges faced by ethnically and culturally diverse domestic audience to serve them effectively.
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Chapter 5: Conclusion

This dissertation addressed traveler stress in three related articles. Collectively, the research proposed and empirically validated an adapted travel stress-coping model, as well as examined and compared leisure travel stress among Korean immigrants. Specifically, the first article reviewed the extant literature on stress and proposed a conceptual model designed to take a more holistic perspective and inform practice and future studies in the service of immigrant leisure travelers. Building on the transactional stress and coping model (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), the first article suggests an adapted stress-coping framework that integrates acculturation as an influential personal factor to explain immigrants’ appraisals and responses to stress in leisure travel context. The first article also articulates potential environmental factors that are trip-specific as well as the outcomes of the stress process suitable for leisure travel context. With the growing demographic diversity, practitioners can position their managerial efforts and service planning within the stress and coping framework to gain a better understanding of the sources of stress and resources needed to mitigate and address stress resulting from leisure travel to effectively serve ethnically and culturally diverse domestic audience.

Based on the proposed adapted stress model, the second article continued the travel stress and coping conversation with a focus on empirically testing the theoretical structure and the suitability of a stress-coping framework for exploring appraisals of and behavioral/emotional responses to leisure travel stress. More specifically, the second article sought to identify the relationship between the four main components of the stress-coping model including (a) primary stress appraisal, (b) secondary stress appraisal, (c) coping, and (d) revisit intention as a short-term outcome using structural
equation modeling (SEM). Initially, the second article intended to add acculturation strategy to the SEM analyses that could further explain relationships with stress-coping as proposed. However, sample sizes precluded the ability to do so. While acculturation was not directly tested in the structural model, three proxy indicators of acculturation (i.e., age of arrival to the U.S., length of stay, and English proficiency) were added as control variables. The structural equation modeling confirmed several important relationships between the constructs. Relationships within the stress and coping process indicated that (1) chronological impact between the two stress appraisals exist, and (2) the secondary appraisal is a significant predictor of the overall coping. Additionally, the structure of coping (creating a general coping scheme) offered some insight into how Korean immigrants cope with resulting stress in a leisure travel setting in the host society, as well as its positive impact on the revisit intention.

The third article leveraged the quantitative data collected and (1) established a list of 29 most commonly reported sources of stress in three select travel phases (pre-trip, en route, destination), and (2) identified acculturation strategies Korean immigrants adopted to adjust to the host culture, testing the direct relationship between them. Findings from the third article revealed that both general and ethnicity-related stressors were encountered by Korean immigrants, with the general stress factors being more prevalent at various travel stages. Further, acculturation strategies significantly differentiated levels of perceived travel stress at all three travel phases and within select individual stressors.

As a whole, this dissertation provides insight into how immigrants in a host society experience and respond to stress brought about by leisure travel by integrating
stress-coping theories and acculturation theories into the tourism literature. Further, the identification of the acculturation strategies and differences in stress levels, serve to illustrate further support for the necessity to consider intra-ethnic group differences (heterogeneity within immigrant subgroups) for both research and practice.

Given the importance of an increasingly diverse national population and the nascency of travel stress research in the tourism literature, the findings of this dissertation suggest four primary research areas moving forward:

1. To further develop, validate, and refine the measurement of travel stress among immigrants. To provide a more complete basis for and supplemental understanding of complexity of stress-coping phenomena in our diverse society, both qualitative and quantitative examinations are needed. Specifically, a triangulation of data collection methods may be beneficial to increase relevance and provide rich information about stressors and coping strategies unique to a given immigrant population. At present, although self-report is useful to measure stress-coping concepts, the cross-sectional and retrospective study design may hinder comprehensive and accurate reflection of stress. Future studies using triangulation of data collection methods with culturally sensitive instruments may be a valuable addition to the travel stress research and enhance relevance to the study population.

2. Use longitudinal design (e.g., latent growth modeling; Duncan et al., 1999) to elucidate fully the causal direction of relationships among key variables and repeated measures of stress and coping to more accurately assess changes in stress appraisals and reappraisals.
3. Further, while a description of the stress and acculturation is important to
develop a general understanding of ethnically and culturally diverse domestic
audience, the findings and discussions presented in this dissertation are only
a starting point. The potential sources of stress need to be considered in light
of the broader social, political, and economic fabric of the host society. While
writing this dissertation from 2019 to 2020, numerous changes within the
federal government accompanied with significant events, such as the
COVID-19 pandemic, heightened social divide, increased overt and covert
racism, and xenophobia that was especially directed toward Asians. Negative
media coverage of immigration, the creation of an image of “perpetual
foreigners” and growing anti-immigrant sentiments in the United States have
been linked to an increased experience of discrimination and economic
insecurity by immigrant members (Huynh et al., 2011, p. 133). Changes in
societal systems, such as national and state immigration policies as well as
attitudes toward immigrants, may manifest in both overt and covert forms.
An example of this is differentially allocating resources and opportunities to
travel and recreate for immigrants. Such trends of limited resource allocation
informed by changes in societal systems can lead to a greater level of risk for
physical and mental stress for immigrants of color than those who can “pass”
as white (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2018, p. 787). Thus, consideration of stressors
within the broader context may result in an expansive representation of the
reality of the immigrant experience and give voice to immigrant themselves.
4. Finally, to go in hand in hand with the changing society and to serve a diverse and demographically important segment of domestic audience, a greater understanding of culturally and ethnically diverse visitors is warranted. Thus, future investigations should expand the stress and coping inquiries by examining and comparing other cultural and ethnic groups. This can reveal the underexplored patterns of perceptions and responses to stress experienced in leisure travel settings.
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Appendix A: Study Questionnaire in English

Korean American’s Leisure Travel Experiences Survey

Hello,
Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire to improve understanding of leisure travel experiences for Korean Americans like you!

We have a few questions about your recent leisure travel experiences that will take about 15 minutes to answer. Please note that all the information you share is confidential. No names or contact information will be associated with any responses. If you wish, you can stop answering questions at any time. You may answer the questions in English or Korean. You can change the survey to your preferred language at anytime by clicking the top right-hand side. To begin the survey, click the maroon arrow at the bottom right-hand side of the page.

If you have any questions, please contact Ami Choi at the University of Minnesota via email: choix667@umn.edu

Thanks for your participation!

Ami Choi, Ph.D. Candidate
Natural Resources Science and Management
University of Minnesota

*This research has been approved by the University of Minnesota Institutional Research Board (IRB # STUDY00006654) and is being supervised by Dr. Ingrid E. Schneider, Professor, Forest Resources.
I. Screening Questions

First, please confirm your country of birth.

Screener 1. What country were you born in?
- U.S. [Thank and terminate]
- Korea
- Other (Please specify) _____________ [Thank and terminate]

Screener 2. [If “Korea” answered] How old were you when you moved to the U.S.?
____ (Please write in U.S. age)

Screener 3. Have you traveled for leisure in the last 12 months more than 50 miles from your primary residence or spent at least one night away from home for leisure purposes within the United States?
- Yes [If YES, proceed to Question 1-A]
- No [If NO, thank and terminate]

II. Next, a few questions about your leisure travel experiences.

1-A. [If YES in “Screener 3”] What types of leisure trips have you taken in the last 12 months? (Please mark all that apply as trips of 50 miles or more from your primary residence).
- Nature tourism (This refers to any type of natural places. Examples: National/State parks, forests, mountains, beaches, lakes, rivers, falls, wilderness areas)
- Shopping
- Historic sites/museums
- Food tours
- Sporting event
- Entertainment/concert
- Arts/culture
- Festivals
- Casinos
- Other (Please specify) _____________

i. [If “Nature tourism” selected] We would like to know more about your nature tourism experience. Please refer to this experience in the next questions.
Please write down a nature place or places you’ve visited on your most recent leisure trip within the U.S. in the last 12 months.

ii. [If “Nature tourism” is not selected] We would like to know more about your leisure travel experience. Please write down a place or places you’ve visited on your most recent leisure trip within the U.S. in the last 12 months and refer to this experience in the next questions.

1-B. [If Question 1-A answered & “Nature” selected] How long was your most recent trip to a nature-based destination(s)? OR [If Question 1-A answered & “Non-Nature” selected] How long was your most recent trip?

☑ One-Day trip [If “One-Day trip” selected]

i. What was the primary mode of transportation you used for this trip? (Check only one)

☐ Car/van/truck
☐ RV/Camper
☐ Airplane
☐ Bus
☐ Motorcycle
☐ Bike
☐ Other (Please specify) __________

ii. In total, how many hours did it take to travel from your home to the destination you visited?

__ hours

iii. In total, how many hours did you spend at the destination during your visit? __ hours

☑ Overnight [If “Overnight trip” selected]

i. What was the primary mode of transportation you used for this trip? (Check only one)

☐ Car/van/truck
☐ RV/Camper
☐ Airplane
☐ Bus
☐ Motorcycle
☐ Bike
☐ Other (Please specify) __________
ii. In total, how many hours did it take to get from home to the destination you visited?
   ___ hours

iii. In total, how many nights did you spend at the destination during your visit?
   ___ Number of nights

2. Who did you travel with on your most recent leisure trip?
   ❑ I travelled alone
   ❑ Family
   ❑ Friends
   ❑ Family and Friends
   ❑ Organized tour group
   ❑ Other (Please specify) ________________

3. How many people were in your personal travel group on the most recent trip?
   ___ Adults   ___ Children (under 18 years of age)

4. [If Nature-based] What was your primary activity during your most recent trip to nature-based destination in the U.S.? (Please mark all that apply)
   ❑ Boating/Kayaking/Canoeing  ❑ Viewing nature/wildlife
   ❑ Skiing  ❑ Photographing nature
   ❑ Relaxing  ❑ Snowmobiling
   ❑ Camping  ❑ Diving/Snorkeling
   ❑ Fishing/Hunting  ❑ Scenic driving
   ❑ Play/Swim in the water  ❑ Climbing
   ❑ Off road driving (e.g., ATV)  ❑ Biking
   ❑ Hiking  ❑ Backpacking
   ❑ Other ________________

4-A. [If NON-nature-based] What was your primary activity during your most recent trip to destination in the U.S.? (Please mark all that apply)
   ❑ Shopping
   ❑ Historic sites/museums
   ❑ Food tours
   ❑ Sporting event
   ❑ Entertainment/concert
5. In what month did you travel on this most recent leisure trip? (Choose one)

- January
- February
- March
- April
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December

6. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your intentions to return to this place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I intend to revisit the place in the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to revisit in the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire to visit in the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I probably will revisit in the next 12 months.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-A. [If “Strongly disagree” or “Disagree”] In your own words, briefly describe why you would not visit this destination again.

___________________________________________________________________
III. In this section, we would like to know more about your leisure travel experiences and anything that may have caused you stress as you prepared for it or during the trip. We are going to ask about possible stressor 1) before your trip, 2) while traveling to your destination and then 3) at the destination.

7. Prior to your trip, please indicate how stressful or not stressful the following trip-related situations were for your most recent trip. If it doesn’t apply, choose ‘Does not apply’.

Note: Here, the order of the items below will be randomized in Qualtrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Not at all stressful</th>
<th>Slightly stressful</th>
<th>Moderately stressful</th>
<th>Very stressful</th>
<th>Extremely stressful</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding information to plan the trip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding what to bring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing itinerary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about interacting with wild animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the number of people at the destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the number of people travelling to the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making travel reservations in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing a destination where I would feel safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting information in Korean language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. While traveling to the destination, please indicate how stressful or not stressful the following trip-related situations were for your most recent trip. If it doesn’t apply, choose ‘Does not apply’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>situation</th>
<th>Not at all stressful</th>
<th>Slightly Stressful</th>
<th>Moderately stressful</th>
<th>Very stressful</th>
<th>Extremely stressful</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with service employees (restaurant, fuel station, rental car company, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with travelers in my own travel party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel issues (traffic jams, flight delays)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with wild animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling that people speak differently to me because I am Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the number of people at the destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with other travelers who are non-Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **At the destination, please indicate how stressful or not stressful** the following trip-related situations were for your most recent trip. If it doesn’t apply, choose ‘Does not apply’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Not at all stressful</th>
<th>Slightly stressful</th>
<th>Moderately stressful</th>
<th>Very stressful</th>
<th>Extremely stressful</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with other travelers who are Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling uneasy because of being a Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information in Korean language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling that people treat me differently for being Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal health issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other _______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with employees of hospitality businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hotels, restaurants, attractions, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with travelers in my own travel party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling that people speak differently to me because I am Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing rules about personal behavior onsite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of the surrounding environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening hours of attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling that people treat me differently for being Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in my accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with wild animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of food choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with local residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling uneasy because of being Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people at the destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of entertainment facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information in Korean language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ____________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* [If all “Does not apply” or “Not at all” in any stage > (Section 6) > Acculturation > Demographics]*
IV. Now a few details about the most stressful situation during your most recent leisure trip.

10. [If any are “Moderately stressful” or greater from Question 7, 8, 9] Of the items you selected as stressful, which was the MOST stressful? (Choose only one)

Note: Here, a list of those items will be displayed to participants for all three phase combined.

11. Here, we are interested in how you viewed the most stressful trip-related situation in your most recent trip. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the most stressful situation you just described in the previous question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was threatening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It made me feel anxious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It had a negative outcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It left a bad impression with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about the most stressful trip-related situation you just described in Question 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I could change or do something about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to accept it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I needed to know more about it before I could act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this section, we would like to know what strategies you used to deal with stress during your leisure travel. The following are some strategies people use to deal with stress during leisure travel.

13. From the list below, how much did you use the following methods to deal with your most stressful situation from your recent leisure trip?

*Note: Items will be displayed randomly.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Not used at all</th>
<th>Used somewhat</th>
<th>Used quite a bit</th>
<th>Used a great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decided to talk to someone who could do something about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned to never visit again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided to avoid the area on my next visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided that visiting during a different season would help me avoid the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided that visiting at a different time of day would help me avoid the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told myself to continue on as if nothing had happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to think too much about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to forget the whole thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked to other members of my group about the incident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made light of the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to get too serious about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried to keep my feelings to myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept others from knowing how bad things were.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronted the cause of the incident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left the area and went to a different part of the destination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told myself there was nothing I could do about it, so I just enjoyed the experience for what it was.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted sympathy and understanding from someone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticized or lectured myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realized I brought the situation on myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I apologized or did something to make the situation better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wished that the situation would go away or be over.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made a plan of action and followed it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came up with a couple of different solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided being with people in general.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other __________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Beyond your leisure travel, we’re interested in a bit about you so destinations can better plan for a positive experience. The next set of questions refers to the Korean heritage culture and mainstream American culture.

14. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I write better in English than in Korean language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am in my house, I typically speak English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were asked to write poetry, I would prefer to write it in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get along better with Americans than Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that Americans understand me better than Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it easier to communicate my feelings to Americans than to Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more comfortable socializing with Americans than I do with Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my friends at work/school are American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the music I listen to is Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest friends are Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer going to social gatherings where most of the people are Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel Koreans treat me as an equal more so than Americans do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to go out on a date with a Korean than with an American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel more relaxed when I am with a Korean than when I am with an American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreans should not date non-Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I tell jokes both in English and in Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think as well in English as I do in Korean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have both American and Korean friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that both Koreans and Americans value me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very comfortable around both Americans and Koreans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally, I find it difficult to socialize with anybody, Korean or American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel neither Americans nor Koreans like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are times when I think no one understands me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes find it hard to communicate with people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes find it hard to make friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I feel Koreans and Americans do not accept me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes I find it hard to trust both Koreans and Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find both Koreans and Americans often have difficulty understanding me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find I do not feel comfortable when I am with other people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Finally, a few questions about you. This information will remain confidential.

18. In what **year** did you move to the U.S.? ________________

19. What is your **zipcode**? __________

20. In what **year** were you born? _____
21. What is your gender? (Choose one)
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female
   ☐ Non-binary
   ☐ Other ________

22. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ☐ Less than high school
   ☐ Some high school
   ☐ High school graduate
   ☐ Some college
   ☐ Two year college
   ☐ Four year college
   ☐ Graduate or professional degree

23. What is your annual household income (before taxes, US dollars)?
   ☐ Under $25,000
   ☐ $25,000-$49,999
   ☐ $50,000-$74,999
   ☐ $75,000-$99,999
   ☐ $100,000-$149,999
   ☐ $150,000 or more
   ☐ Don’t know
   ☐ I’d rather not answer

24. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your most recent leisure trip?

_______________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation!
If you have questions about this project, please feel free to contact Ami Choi at choix667@umn.edu
한인 여행 경험에 관한 설문조사

안녕하십니까?
바쁜 중에도 본 설문에 응해 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.

본 설문은 ‘미국에 거주하는 한국인 이민자들이 미국 내에서 여가를 목적으로 여행을 할 때 경험하는 스트레스와 그에 대한 대처반응’을 연구하기 위한 것입니다.

본 연구를 통해 미국 거주 한인들이 여행 시 겪는 불편함을 탐색하고 분석하여 미국 거주 이민자들이 조금 더 원활한 여행을 경험 할 수 있도록 기초 정보를 제공하고자 합니다.

귀하께서 지난 1년간 미국 내에서 여가 여행을 경험하신 적이 있다면, 아래 설문문항에 솔직하게 기입 부탁드립니다. 설문 답변에 흥미, 설문지 응답 소요시간은 약 15분입니다. 본 설문의 응답 내용은 철저히 비밀로 보장되며, 통계적 목적 이외의 어떠한 다른 목적으로도 활용되지 않습니다.

설문지 언어는 영어 또는 한국어로 선택 가능합니다. 시작하시려면 페이지의 오른쪽 하단에 있는 적갈색 화살표를 클릭하십시오.

본 연구와 관련된 문의는 최아미 (University of Minnesota) choix667@umn.edu 로 연락 주시기 바랍니다. 도움을 주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.

*본 연구는 University of Minnesota 연구윤리위원회의 심의 승인을 받았으며 (IRB 승인번호 STUDY00006654), Ingrid E. Schneider 교수님의 지도를 받고 있습니다.
I. 다음은 출생국가에 대한 질문입니다.

1. 귀하의 출생 국가는 어디입니까?
   - 미국
     → 끝 [죄송합니다. 본 설문의 대상이 아니므로, 설문을 중단해주시기 바랍니다.]
   - 대한민국
   - 기타 국가 (구체적으로 기재해 주세요.) __________
     → 끝 [죄송합니다. 본 설문의 대상이 아니므로, 설문을 중단해주시기 바랍니다.]

2. 미국에 이민 오셨을 때 나이는? (만 나이로 표기해주세요)

3. 지난 1년 동안 미국 내에서 여가 또는 휴가를 목적으로, 주거지에서 50 마일 이상 혹은 최소 1 박 이상 여행을 다녀온 적이 있었습니까?
   - 예 [1-A 문항으로 계속 진행해 주십시오]
   - 아니오 → 끝 [죄송합니다. 본 설문의 대상이 아니므로, 설문을 중단해주시기 바랍니다.]

II. 다음은 귀하께서 가장 최근에 다녀온 여가 여행에 관한 질문입니다.

1-A. 최근 1년 이내에 다녀온 여가 여행은 다음 중 어느 유형에 해당합니까? (모두 표시해 주세요.)
   - 자연 관광 (자연을 기반으로 하는 모든 관광지. 예시: 국립 공원, 주립 공원, 숲, 산, 해변, 호수, 강, 폭포, 야생지역 등)
   - 쇼핑
   - 역사 유적지/박물관 방문
   - 음식/미식 탐방
   - 스포츠 관람 및 참가
   - 오락/공연
   - 문화/예술
   - 축제
   - 카지노
   - 기타 __________
iii. [“자연 관광”으로 응답한 경우]
귀하의 자연 관광 경험이 대해서 더 자세히 알고 싶습니다. 지금부터는 가장 최근에 방문한 여행지와 그 당시 여행 경험에 한해서만 응답해 주시기 바랍니다.
최근 1년 이내에 다녀온 미국 국내 여행지 중 가장 최근에 방문한 여행지를 써주세요. ________________

iv. [자연 관광으로 응답하지 않은 경우]
귀하의 여가 여행 경험이 대해서 더 자세히 알고 싶습니다. 지금부터는 가장 최근에 방문한 여행지와 그 당시 여행 경험에 한해서만 응답해 주시기 바랍니다.
지난 1년 이내에 다녀온 미국 내 여행 중 가장 최근에 방문한 여행지를 기입해 주세요. ________________

1-B. [1-A 문항에서 “자연 관광”으로 응답한 경우]
귀하의 최근 여행은 당일 여행이었습니까, 아니면 여행지에서 숙박을 한 여행이었습니까?
☐ 당일 여행 [“당일 여행”으로 응답한 경우 다음 문항으로 계속 진행해 주십시오.]

i. 이번 여행 시 이용한 주요 교통수단은 무엇입니까? (하나만 선택해 주세요.)
☐ 자가용
☐ 캠핑카
☐ 비행기
☐ 버스
☐ 오토바이
☐ 자전거
☐ 기타 ______

ii. 집에서 여행지까지 가는데 소요된 시간은 총 몇 시간입니까?
____ 시간

iii. 여행지에서 머문 시간은 총 몇 시간입니까? ____ 시간

☐ 1박 이상 숙박 [“숙박 여행”으로 응답한 경우 다음 문항으로 계속 진행해 주십시오.]

i. 이번 여행 시 이용한 주요 교통수단은 무엇입니까? (하나만 선택해 주세요.)
☐ 자가용
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ii. 집에서 여행지까지 가는데 소요된 시간은 총 몇 시간입니까?
   ___ 시간

iii. 여행지에서 총 며칠동안 머무셨습니까?
   ___ 일

2. 누구와 함께 여행하셨습니까?
   ☐ 혼자
   ☐ 가족
   ☐ 친구
   ☐ 가족과 친구
   ☐ 여행사에서 기획한 단체여행
   ☐ 기타 _____________

3. 본인을 포함해 일행은 총 몇 명이었습니까?
   성인 ___ 명   어린이 (18 세 미만) ___ 명

4. [“자연 관광”으로 응답한 경우] 가장 최근에 방문한 자연 관광지에서 귀하께서 하신 주요 활동은 무엇입니다? (모두 표시해 주세요.)

| ☐ 보트/카약/카누 | ☐ 자연경관 감상 |
| ☐ 스키 | ☐ 자연풍경 사진 촬영 |
| ☐ 휴양/휴식 | ☐ 스포츠 모빌 |
| ☐ 캠핑 | ☐ 다이빙/스노클링 |
| ☐ 낚시/사냥 | ☐ 경치 좋은 도로 드라이브 |
□ 수영 □ 암벽/빙벽 등반
□ 오프로드 드라이브 (예: ATV) □ 자전거
□ 걷기/등산 □ 백패킹 (배낭 도보 여행)
□ 기타 ____________________

4-A. [자연 관광으로 응답하지 않은 경우] 가장 최근에 방문한 여행지에서 귀하께서 하신 주요 활동은 무엇입니까? (모두 표시해 주세요.)
□ 쇼핑
□ 역사 유적지/박물관 방문
□ 음식/미식 탐방
□ 스포츠 관람 및 참가
□ 오락/공연
□ 문화/예술
□ 축제
□ 카지노
□ 기타 ________________

5. 몇 월에 방문하셨습니까? (하나만 선택해 주세요.)
□ 1 월 □ 2 월 □ 3 월 □ 4 월
□ 5 월 □ 6 월 □ 7 월 □ 8 월
□ 9 월 □ 10 월 □ 11 월 □ 12 월
6. 다음은 귀하께서 방금 전까지 응답하셨던 여행지에 대한 재방문 의도에 관한 질문입니다. 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으시는 정도를 해당 랜에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>나는 향후 12개월 이내 그 여행지를 다시 방문할 의사가 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 향후 12개월 이내 그 여행지를 다시 방문할 것을 계획하고 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 향후 12개월 이내 그 여행지를 다시 방문하길 원한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 향후 12개월 이내 그 여행지를 아마도 다시 방문할 것이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6-A. [“전혀 그렇지 않다” 혹은 “그렇지 않다” 로 응답한 경우에만 한해서] 재방문하고 싶지 않은 이유를 아래 랜에 직접 써주세요.

III. 지금부터는 귀하께서 조금 전에 회상하신 가장 최근에 다녀온 미국 내 여가 여행 경험이 한해서만 응답해 주시면 됩니다. 다음은 그 당시 1) 여행하기 전, 2) 목적지로 이동 중, 3) 여행지에서 느낀 스트레스에 관한 질문입니다.

7. 다음은 그 당시 여행하기 전에 느낀 스트레스에 관한 질문입니다. 각 문항에 대하여 당시 여행하기 전에 느낀 스트레스 정도를 해당 랜에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다. 해당사항이 없는 경우, ‘해당사항 없음’으로 응답해 주세요.
전혀 스트레스를 느끼지 않았다. | 약간 스트레스를 느꼈다. | 보통 정도의 스트레스를 느꼈다. | 상당히 스트레스를 느꼈다. | 극심한 스트레스를 느꼈다. | 해당사항 없음
---|---|---|---|---|---
여행 계획과 관련한 정보 찾기

بعد كل شيء

여행 일정 짜기

여행 일정 짜기

야생동물과의 접촉에 대한 생각

목적지에 있을 사람들의 수에 대한 생각

목적지로 이동하는 사람들의 수에 대한 생각

영어로 여행과 관련된 예약하기

내가 안전하다고 느끼는 목적지 선택하기

한국어로 된 정보 열기

기타 __________

8. 다음은 그 당시 여행 목적지로 이동하시는 중에 느낀 스트레스에 관한 질문입니다. 각 문항에 대하여 당시 목적지로 이동 중에 느낀 스트레스 정도를 해당 란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다. 해당사항이 없는 경우, '해당사항 없음'으로 응답해 주세요.
다양한 음식 메뉴 부족
서비스 관련 종사원과의 접촉 (예: 음식점, 주유소, 렌터카 회사 등)
나와 함께 여행하는 멤버(들)와의 교류
날씨
교통 문제 (예: 차 막힘, 비행 지연)
야생동물과의 접촉
내가 한국인이라는 이유로 사람들이 나에게 다르게 말하는 느낌
목적지에 있을 사람들 수 터울리기
한국인이 아닌 여행자(들)과의 접촉
길 찾기
목적지로 이동 중
마주치는 다른 한국인 여행자(들)과의 접촉
내가 한국인이라는 이유로 느껴지는 불안함 및 불편함
한국어로 제공되는 정보 부족
개인 안전에 대한 염려
내가 한국인이라는 이유로 사람들이 나를 다르게 취급하고 있다는 느낌
9. 다음은 그 당시 여행지에서 느낀 스트레스에 관한 질문입니다. 각 문항에 대하여
당시 여행지에서 느낀 스트레스 정도를 해당란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.
해당사항이 없는 경우, '해당사항 없음'으로 응답해 주세요.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>개인 건강 문제</th>
<th>전형 스트레스를 느끼지 않았다.</th>
<th>약간 스트레스를 느꼈다.</th>
<th>보통 정도의 스트레스를 느꼈다.</th>
<th>상당한 스트레스를 느꼈다.</th>
<th>극심한 스트레스를 느꼈다.</th>
<th>해당사항 없음</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>기타 ___________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

여행지에서 마주치는 다른 한국인 여행자(들)과의 접촉
숙소에서 관광지로의 이동
관광 서비스 관련 종사원과 접촉 (예: 호텔, 음식점, 관광지 등)
나와 함께 여행하는 멤버(들)와의 교류
내가 한국인이라는 이유로 여행지의 사람들이 나에게 다르게 말하는 느낌
개인 행동에 대한 혼란스러운 규칙
주변 환경의 깨끗함
관광지 개장 시간
내가 한국인이라는 이유로 여행지의 사람들이 나를 다르게 취급하고 있다는 느낌
| 숙박시설 이용 |
| 날씨 |
| 야생동물과의 접촉 |
| 다양한 음식 메뉴 부족 |
| 지역민들과의 교류 |
| 한국인이 아닌 여행자(들)과의 접촉 |
| 내가 한국인이라는 이유로 느껴지는 불안함 및 불편함 |
| 개인 안전에 대한 열려 |
| 여행지에 있는 사람 수 |
| 관광지 시설 부족 |
| 여행지에서 제공되는 한국어 정보 부족 |
| 기타___________ |

⇒ [“해당사항 없음” 혹은 “전혀 스트레스를 느끼지 않았다” 로 응답한 경우 문화적응 & 인구통계와 관련된 질문으로 이동]

IV. 귀하께서 지금까지 회상하신 그 날의 여행 경험이에서 가장 스트레스를 많이 느낀 상황에 한해서만 응답해 주시면 됩니다.

10. [여행 전, 여행지로 이동 중, 목적지에서 “보통 정도의 스트레스” 혹은 그 이상으로 스트레스를 느꼈다고 응답한 경우에만 한해서] 아래의 목록은 귀하께서 방금 전에 스트레스를
느꼈다고 응답하신 항목들입니다. 다음 중 가장 스트레스를 받았던 상황은 어떤 것이었습니까? (하나만 선택해 주세요.)

11. 다음은 바로 전 질문에서 응답하셨던 귀하의 최근 여행 경험 중 가장 많이 스트레스를 받았던 상황에 대한 질문입니다. 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으시는 정도를 해당란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>당시의 그 상황은 나에게 위협적이었다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>당시의 그 상황은 나를 불안하게 만들었다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>당시의 그 상황은 여행활동을 하는데 부정적인 결과를 발생시켰다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>당시의 그 상황은 나에게 좋지 않은 인상을 남겼다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. 아래의 질문 역시 귀하께서 방금 전 선택하신 그 당시 상황에 한해서만 응답해주시면 됩니다. 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으시는 정도를 해당란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>나는 내가 처한 상황에 대하여 여건을 개선시키거나 해결할 수 있다고 생각했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 그 당시의 상황을 받아들이야 했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 행동하기에 앞서 그 당시의 상황에 대해서 더</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
많은 정보가 필요하다고 생각했다.
나는 내가 하고자 하는 것을 찾아야 했다.

Ⅴ. 다음은 귀하께서 조금 전 경험했다고 응답한 당시의 상황에서 다음과 같은 대처를 얼마나 하셨는지에 대한 질문입니다.

13. 귀하께서 조금 전 가장 많은 스트레스를 경험했다고 응답한 그 당시의 상황에서 다음과 같은 대처를 얼마나 하셨습니까?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>근거의 드물게</th>
<th>때때로</th>
<th>상당히</th>
<th>대부분</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>당시의 상황에 대해 구체적으로 무엇이 할 수 있는 사람에게 말해보려고 했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다시는 그 여행지를 방문하지 않기로 계획했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다음에 방문 시 그 지역을 피해가겠다고 생각했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>다른 계절에 방문하면 당시의 상황을 피하는데 도움이 될 것이라고 생각했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>하루 중 다른 시간에 방문하면 당시의 상황을 피하는데 도움이 될 것이라고 생각했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아무 일도 안 일어난 것처럼 계속해서 하던 일을 하고 스스로에게 말했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>너무 많이 생각하지 않으려고 했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>그 당시의 모든 상황을 맛어버리려고 노력했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나와 함께 여행 간 동반자들에게 내가 처한 당시 상황에 대해서나빴다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>더 큰 문제에 비해서 이러한 상황은 작은 문제라고 생각했다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
너무 심각하게 받아들이지 않으려고 했다.

내 감정을 누구에게도 알리지 않으려고 했다.

다른 사람들이 상황이 얼마나 나빴는지 모르게 했다.

당시 상황의 원인을 직면했다.

여행지 내에서 당시의 상황을 피할 수 있는 다른 장소로 이동했다.

내가 할 수 있는 것이 아무것도 없어서 있는 그대로 그 당시 상황을 즐기려고 했다.

당시 상황에 대해서 다른 사람에게 공감과 이해를 받았다.

내 자신을 스스로 비난했다.

내 스스로 문제를 일으켰다고 생각했다.

내가 처한 상황을 개선하려고 사과 혹은 노력했다.

당시 상황이 사라지거나 끝나기를 바랐다.

내가 처한 상황에 대해서 활동 계획을 세우고 그것을 따랐다.

문제 해결을 위해 몇 가지 해결책을 세웠다.

대체로 사람들과 어울리기를 피했다.

기타 ____________________
VI. 다음은 한국 고유 문화와 미국 문화에 관한 질문입니다.

14. 아래의 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으신 정도를 해당 란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이 다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>나는 한국어 보다 영어로 글을 더 잘 쓸 수 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 집에 있을 때, 주로 영어로 말한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>만약 내게 시를 쓰라고 한다면, 나는 영어로 쓰기를 더 선호할 것이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 한국인보다 미국인과 더 잘 지낸다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 한국인보다 미국인이 나를 더 잘 이해한다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 한국인보다 미국인에게 내 감정을 이야기하는 것이 더 쉽다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 한국인보다 미국인과 교제하는 것이 더 편하다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>직장/학교에 있는 나의 친구들은 대부분 미국인이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. 아래의 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으시는 정도를 해당 란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이 다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>내가 듣는 대부분의 음악은 한국 음악이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나의 가장 친한 친구들은 한국인이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 대부분의 사람들이 한국인인 사교 모임에 가는 것을 더 선호한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 한국인들이 미국인들보다 나를 더 동등하게 대한다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 미국인보다 한국인과 헤이트하는 것을 선호한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 미국인과 함께 있을 때보다 한국인과 함께 있을 때 더 편안하다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한국인은 한국인과 연애해야 한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. 아래의 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으시는 정도를 해당 란에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이 다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>나는 농담할 때 한국어와 영어를 둘 다 사용한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
나는 한국어로 생각하는 만큼 영어로도 잘 생각할 수 있다.

나는 한국인 친구와 미국인 친구가 모두 있다.

나는 한국인과 미국인 모두 나를 귀중히 여긴다고 느낀다.

나는 미국인이든 한국인이든 상관없이 누구와 함께 있어도 매우 편안하다.

17. 아래의 각 문항에 대하여 동의 혹은 동의하지 않으시는 정도를 해당 랜에 표시해 주시기 바랍니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 그렇지 않다</th>
<th>그렇지 않다</th>
<th>보통이 다</th>
<th>그렇다</th>
<th>매우 그렇다</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>대체로 나는 한국인이든 미국인이든 누구와도 어울리기가 어렵다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 때때로 미국인도 한국인도 나를 좋아하지 않는다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>아무도 나를 이해하지 못한다고 생각할 때가 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 때때로 사람들과 의사 소통하는 것이 어렵다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>나는 때때로 친구들 사귀기가 어렵다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
나는 때때로 한국인이나 미국인이나 누구도 나를 받아들이지 않는다고 느낀다.

나는 때때로 한국인이나 미국인 모두 신뢰하기가 어렵다고 생각한다.

나는 종종 한국인이나 미국인 모두 나를 이해하는데 어려움을 느낀다고 생각한다.

나는 다른 사람들과 함께 있을 때 편안하지 않다고 느낀다.

VII. 다음은 귀하의 일반적인 사항에 대한 질문입니다. 본 정보는 철저히 비밀이 보장됩니다.

18. 귀하는 몇 년도에 미국으로 이민하셨습니까?
   _____ 년도

19. 귀하의 우편번호는?
   __________

20. 귀하의 출생연도는?
   19____ 년도

21. 귀하의 성별은?
   □ 남성
   □ 여성
   □ 제 3의 성 (년 바이너리)
   □ 기타 ________
22. 귀하의 최종 학력은?
☐ 중졸 이하
☐ 비인가 고등학교
☐ 고등학교 졸업
☐ 비인가 대학교
☐ 전문대학 졸업
☐ 4 년제 대학 졸업
☐ 대학원 이상

23. 귀하가 속한 가구 전체의 연소득은?
☐ $25,000 미만
☐ $25,000-$49,999
☐ $50,000-$74,999
☐ $75,000-$99,999
☐ $100,000-$149,999
☐ $150,000 이상
☐ 알 수 없음
☐ 응답을 원하지 않음

24. 최근에 다녀오신 여행 경험과 관련하여 덧붙이고 싶으신 말씀이 있습니까?
_______________________________________________________

설문이 모두 끝났습니다. 설문에 응해주셔서 진심으로 감사드립니다.
본 연구와 관련된 질문은 아래 이메일 주소로 문의주세요.
최아미 (choi667@umn.edu)
## Appendix C: Table 3.1. Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations Among Observed Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. PA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. PA2</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>3. PA3</td>
<td>.56** .43**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>4. PA4</td>
<td>.48** .44** .69**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>5. SA1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>6. SA2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-1.7**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>7. SA3</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</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>8. SA4</td>
<td>.36** .30** .38** .35**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>9. COP1</td>
<td>.21** .22** .23** .25**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>10. COP2</td>
<td>.28** .15</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. COP3</td>
<td>.26** .19** .26**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. RI1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. RI2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. RI3</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. RI4</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. AGE</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. STAY</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ENG</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 249. SD = standard deviation. PA1-4 = Primary stress appraisal (threat, anxious, negative outcome, bad impression); SA1-4 = Secondary stress appraisal (change, accept, know, hold); COP1-3 = coping parcels 1 to 3 (COP1 = Planful problem-solving, COP2 = Distancing, COP 3 = Accepting responsibility); RI1-4 = revisit intention scales; AGE = age of arrival to the U.S.; STAY = length of residence in the U.S.; ENG = English proficiency. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.