

INTERACTION OF AMERICAN STUDENTS WITH WESTERN
EUROPEAN STUDENTS AT A MID-WESTERN UNIVERSITY

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Howard Edward Borck

1966

THESIS



3 1293 10337 5980

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

~~ROOM USE ONLY~~

~~_____~~

~~Aug 78~~

~~10-23-78~~
~~88-1-78~~ 250

~~88~~
~~88-23-78~~ R

~~72~~
~~61-9-78~~

~~10-25-78~~
~~88-1-78~~

~~10-13-78~~ 8
~~88-8350~~

~~11-20-78~~
~~52-26-78~~

~~7-11-78~~ 37

~~ROOM USE ONLY~~

~~_____~~
AUG 23 1978
~~88~~ 23 78 R
SEP 1 1978 250
88 23 78 R
72 12
OCT 9 1978
SEP 25 1978
OCT 1 1978
OCT 19 1978 8
OCT 26 1978

11 209
5 26 78
7 11 78 37

ABSTRACT

INTERACTION OF AMERICAN STUDENTS WITH WESTERN EUROPEAN STUDENTS AT A MID-WESTERN UNIVERSITY

by Howard Edward Borck

Twenty-eight Western-European informants named 10 American students whom they "knew best". From these lists of Americans, 30 students are sampled to be interviewed. This sample is carefully matched to a control group of 30 other Americans named by students from India. Comparable interview schedules tap the background of the Americans, their preferences and association patterns with foreigners, the type of relationships they experience with foreign acquaintances, and the changes that have occurred resulting from their contact with persons from other cultures.

Approximately one-third of the respondents in each sample indicate no preference in associating with foreign students of a particular nationality or group of nationalities. It is also found that a higher degree of a third culture and worldwide-ecumenical experience exists in the control group. Associations in the control group center more on person-to-person affinities, while in the European-American sample, group attachments appear to mark the interaction pattern. No deep-rooted changes in attitudes are reported by the Americans in either sample; on the contrary, many previous beliefs and attitudes are strengthened.

INTERACTION OF AMERICAN STUDENTS
WITH WESTERN EUROPEAN STUDENTS
AT A MID-WESTERN UNIVERSITY

By

Howard Edward Borck

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	3
Description of Population in the Sample	
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA	4
A. Family Background	
B. Past Foreign Experiences	
C. Attitudes Toward Foreign-American Interpersonal Relations	
D. General Association Patterns	
E. Differences Between Associations With Europeans and Indians	
F. Differences Between Associating With Foreign Students and Americans	
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA, INDIVIDUAL ACQUAINTANCES OF THE AMERICANS	10
V. EVIDENCE FOR A THIRD CULTURE	16
VI. RESULTS OR CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY FOREIGN CONTACTS .	18
VII. MAJOR RESEARCH FINDINGS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS STUDIES	18
VIII. IMPLICATIONS OF INTERACTION IN RELATION TO AN ECUMENICAL EXPERIENCE	19
IX. FUTURE STUDIES	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY	21
APPENDIX	22

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Perceived Distance from United States of Cultural Areas	2
2. National Identity of the Independent Sample	3
3. Americans in This Sample by Subject Areas	4
4. Attitudes Toward Cross-National Courtship or Marriage	6
5. Comparison of Preferences and Actual Associations with Foreign Students from Six Areas of the World . .	8
6. Expressed Closeness to a Foreign Student	11
7. Circumstances Where Americans First Met Foreign Students	12
8. Ways in Which Americans Act Differently When with Foreign Student	13
9. Areas of Conversation	14
10. Sensitive or Restrained Areas of Conversation	15
11. Distribution According to Integrated, Fringe or Deviant	15
12. Indicators Measuring the Extent of a Third Culture . .	17

I. Introduction

There exists throughout the world a network of universities which send and receive students among each other. As opportunities to study abroad have increased, the incidence of cross-cultural interaction has become more frequent. This is a study of one of the many educational institutions which serve as small-scale social structures, within which people from different countries come into contact. This study attempts to examine the American students engaged in interaction with Western European students at a mid-western university.

Studies such as those of Richard Morris,¹ Sellitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook² first suggested the possibility of not only studying the foreign students engaged in cross-cultural interaction within the United States, but the American students as well. By examining both parties involved in cross-cultural interaction, a broader scope is initiated which lessens the assumption being made of a dominate-subordinate relationship, where changes or active behavior stem from a predominate side.

Many studies before this one treated the category of "foreign students" as one entity, and as a result, ignored the possible variance

¹Richard Morris, The Two Way Mirror (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960).

²Sellitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook, Foreign Students in the United States (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963).

in interactionary patterns which might result from nationality or cultural distances between the interacting parties. This study not only insures a more homogeneous grouping of nationalities or cultures, but offers a contrast between two distinct association patterns: those of Western European students and American students, and Indian students and American students. To secure an idea of the perceived cultural differences between the areas of the world included under the term "foreign", Robert Hall³ had fifteen faculty members and graduate students at a Big Ten university rank order six parts of the world for degree of cultural difference from America; a low rank indicates a closer correspondence to American culture. These results are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--Perceived distance from United States of cultural areas

Area of the world	Rank Score
1. Canada	18
2. Scandinavia	39
3. Germany and Austria	39
4. Central and South America	60
5. India	78
6. China	81

This table indicates that large differences are perceived by this sample of Americans concerning the concept "foreign". A study

³Robert Hall, "Friendship Formation and Assimilation in a University Community (unpublished paper, University of Minnesota, 1964).

accounting for possible variance in cross-cultural interaction, due to cultural distance, offers different variables than a study clustering all foreign students under one heading.

II. Methodology

The method of this study consists of two researchers interviewing American students who had come into personal contact with foreign students at a Big-Ten university. One of the researchers sampled Americans who were named by students from India, and this researcher sampled students names by Western Europeans. Thus, both researchers use each other's data as a control group.

Each foreign student was asked to list the ten American students he knew best. From the lists given by the foreign students, a representative sample was taken by each researcher. This researcher used stratified-random sampling because of the need to represent the diversity of countries in the persons from Western Europe (see Table 2). Such a sampling effort helps encompass the full range of the general pattern.

TABLE 2.--National identity of the independent sample

Country of the respondent	Number of respondents from country
England	6
Ireland	6
France	4
Scotland	2
Belgium	2
Denmark	2
Germany	1
Finland	1
Total	24

Description of the Population in the Sample

From the lists given to the researchers by the foreign students, thirty American students were chosen to be interviewed. The same interview schedule was used by each researcher and every attempt was made to insure comparable data for each item. Twenty-five of the thirty respondents are males and the median age of the sample is 23 with two cases over thirty and none younger than 19. Table 3 indicates the number of Americans in the main subject areas at the university.

TABLE 3.--Americans in this sample by subject areas

Subject area	Number of students
Humanities	8
Sciences	7
Business	5
Social Sciences	4
Languages	4
Agriculture	1
Engineering	1
Total	30

III. Analysis of Data

A. Family Background

Based on an over-view of the cases, this researcher estimates that approximately fifty percent of the Americans names by the Western Europeans came from cosmopolitan households. By the term cosmopolitan is meant two items in reference to the respondent's earlier life histories:

1. While being raised by the parents, the student was exposed to worldwide, as opposed to local news and family conversation.
2. The parents of the student discouraged him from adopting any bias toward other people because of skin color, nationality, or foreign ways.

Directly related with such a cosmopolitan upbringing is the fact that almost all of the subjects in this sample currently express a desire to increase their life experiences by associating with different types of people: both foreign and American.

B. Past Foreign Experiences

Only one-third of the subjects in either sample had travelled outside the United States, Mexico, and Canada. Over three-fourths of these students had travelled abroad in the capacity of a tourist. Such travel experiences had relatively little influence on the student concerning possible future foreign contacts. There are three other determinants of greater importance: the foreign students met at undergraduate school; an interest in foreign persons resulting from family training; a curiosity developing because of the presence of foreign students at the university.

C. Attitudes Toward Foreign-American Interpersonal Relations

It was hypothesized that the European interactors would be more conservative in their viewpoints on cross-national interpersonal associations. On the contrary, no evidence is given to support this hypothesis. Among the indicators used, Table 4 represents the attitudes of the samples toward cross-national courtship or marriage.

The percents are given of the indifferent and unfavorable categories who express a more favorable attitude if the relationship were with a European.

TABLE 4.--Attitudes toward cross-national courtship or marriage

Attitude (in percents)		Percent of indifferent and unfavorable categories indicating a more favorable response toward Europeans
European interactors	Favorable	23%
	Indifferent	47
	Unfavorable	30
	Total	100%
Indian interactors	Favorable	26%
	Indifferent	30
	Unfavorable	43
	Total	100%

From Table 4, we see that thirteen percent more of the control group express a more unfavorable attitude toward cross-national courtship and marriage. One possible reason for this is the control group's familiarity with the problems of intimate associations between Americans and a culture not as "near" as the ones represented by the Europeans.

D. General Association Patterns

Whether the Americans had been named by an Indian or a European,

all of the subjects have come into contact at the University with a wide dispersion of foreign students. None of them have associated exclusively with a particular nationality. Ninety percent of the respondents who associate with Europeans insist that they welcome relationships with non-Europeans as well. Table 5 gives the relative ranking of various parts of the world, both in preference and actual association. These rankings are obtained from assessment of the number of times a particular area is mentioned by a subject.

Rank correlations indicate that rank preference and association are highly related in the sample of European interactors but the correlation figure in the control group is low. A possible explanation for this difference is that the Americans who interact with Indians may have a preference for a friendship with a person from a more similar culture, but find that the Europeans maintain a relationship on a more superficial level (considering interaction to be measured on a depth basis) and usually group association patterns mark the European-American affinities. Another possible reason for this correlation difference is an attempt by the Americans who interact with Indians to establish a relationship which isn't even present in their own American cultural patterns; in this case the European would represent the type of relationship they are accustomed to with Americans, and as a result, they go to peoples from other cultures to obtain the depth of interaction desired.

Also illuminating is the perfect correlation which exists between the preferences of both samples. This may indicate the same

TABLE 5.--Comparison of preferences and actual associations with foreign students from six areas of the world⁴

	Rank Preference*	Rank Association
European interactors	1. Europe	1. Europe
	2. India-Pakistan	2. India-Pakistan
	3. Orient	3. Africa
	4. Latin America	4. Orient
	5. Africa	5. Latin America
	6. Middle East	6. Middle East
$r_s = .83$ (between preference and association ranks)		
range and distribution mean = 47		
*note: 12 subjects indicated no preferences		
Indian interactors	1. Europe	1. India
	2. India-Pakistan	2. Orient
	3. Orient	3. Middle East
	4. Latin America	4. Europe
	5. Africa	5. Latin America
	6. Middle East	6. Africa
$r_s = .33$ (between preference and association ranks)		
$r_s = 1.00$ (between rank preferences of two groups)		
range and distribution mean = 33		
*note: 8 subjects indicated no preferences		

⁴Hubert Blalock, Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960). For rank correlation method, see p. 317.

basic stereotype patterns existing in the belief and attitudinal structure of the Americans. Notice however that the range and distribution mean among ranks is greater in the preferences of the European interactors. This points to a greater sense of "ecumene"⁵ existing in the control group. This type of reasoning will be elaborated on later in this thesis where it will be pointed out that both samples display an ecumenical attitude (this is evident in the number of subjects refusing to give any national preferences).

E. Differences Between Associations With Europeans and Indians

One main difference in cross cultural associations is the preference of European interactors to avoid a relationship which requires "work". Thus, an attraction to Europeans is due to their similarity and the small amount of effort required to learn their ways and for the Europeans to adjust readily to the American way of life. Interacting with foreign students is only a small part of most of this sample's personal life and they do not want to use this time by going out of their way or going to any trouble to meet foreign students. The main factor for associating with Europeans is that they are a part of the American's circle of friends and times of relaxation are spent in this social group. Another difference in

⁵A. L. Kroeber, "The Ancient Oikoumene as a Historic Culture Aggregate," The Nature of Culture (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 379-395. See also Gordon Hewes, "The Ecumene as a Civilizational Multiplier System," reprint from The Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, No. 25, Fall 1965, pp. 88-89.

behavior between the two samples is the reluctance of the control group to discuss topics dealing with sex, dating, or marriage. While some problems concerning these variables exist between Americans and Europeans, most difficulties are eliminated because of physical and cultural similarity.

F. Differences Between Associating With Foreign Students and Americans

General differences between associations of Americans in both samples with foreign students and their American-American relationships center on some additional responsibilities felt by the Americans. Most of these responsibilities are felt only if the foreign student requests help, for example in asking for directions or advice on a personal problem. A wide array of activities are included between foreign students and Americans here, so no differences are included along these lines. Activities with foreign students range from any type of social activity (except the distinctions made on sex and dating in the control group) to taking the students home during a vacation period.

IV. Analysis of Data, Individual Acquaintances of the Americans

Each of the thirty respondents in both samples is asked to talk about a personalized relationship he had with one of the foreign students that "he knows best".

The higher percentage of very good or good friends in the control group (as indicated in Table 6) can be explained by referring

to the fact that many of the Americans in this sample have foreign contacts only because the Europeans are a part of their American social group. The control group expresses more individual foreign associations and displays a greater interest in "working" at an affinity or learning by means of a friendship, with a person from a different culture.

TABLE 6.--Expressed closeness to a foreign student

	American-European	American-Indian
Very good friend	20%	20%
Good friend	43	60
Acquaintance	26	16
Romantic interest	10	0
Total	99%	96%

Table 7 reveals the importance of availability and nearness of foreign students which the university provides. In both this sample and the control group, the graduate dormitory plays an important role in starting cross-cultural friendships and associations. As already pointed out, mutual friends proves to be a far more important method of meeting foreign students from Europe. Thus, while ecological similarities are evident between the foreign student and Americans, interaction does not rely on propinquity alone. Personal preferences and personality similarities are a more important factor, especially when explaining why a relationship lasts over a period of time.

TABLE 7.--Circumstances where Americans first met foreign students

	<u>Met Europeans</u>	<u>Met Indians</u>
Dormitory	43%	33%
Academic circumstances	26	36
Mutual friend	30	13
Total	99%	83%

Social grouping in this sample assumes the identity of clique formation. There are three main sets of students who form these cliques: the American-French-Belgium group, the American-Irish group, and the American-German group. Along with these groups, there are smaller sets of foreign students which the Americans joined, for example the Scottish clique. Isolated or person-to-person acquaintance patterns mark the English or Scandinavian relationships with Americans.

The first fact that Table 8 points to is that 40% more Americans who interact with Indians state that they are more polite than with an American. This difference is understandable when considering that the Americans (in this sample) do not desire a relationship in which they will have to go to extra trouble. Thus, being polite or careful constitutes a certain amount of effort or labor for these Americans. The figures in which the subjects state no difference in a relationship are directly affected by the items above. Thus, while only 40% of the European interactors state no difference, 46% of this difference is in the form of explaining American usage of English and another 20% in speaking distinctly. The point here is that there exists less difference in American-European relationships than in

American-Indian affinities. The no difference category realistically should be higher for this sample. An explanation for why such discussions on language usage in this sample occur is that Europeans speak a special variety of English. Thus the English is not as perfect as the British-taught Indians, nor imperfect enough for discouragement from attempts to correct the foreign student. As a result, an atmosphere of friendly jest occurs between American and European students.

TABLE 8.--Ways in which Americans act differently when with foreign student

	With European	With Indian
Act more polite	13%	53%
Explain American usage of English language	46	3
Stay away from certain areas or topics	7	13
Speak distinctly	20	13
No difference	40	30

Seventy-six percent of the Americans in this sample and forty-three percent of the subjects in the control group state that some disagreements occur between themselves and the foreign student they know best. Thirty percent of the respondents in this sample express a liking for arguments with Europeans; among the Europeans named in such a context most frequently were the Irish. Topics of argument are usually politics, religion, and dating customs of each other's country. It is repeatedly pointed out that these disagreements are conducted

in a friendly atmosphere where "the issue is attacked and not the person". The Europeans are envisioned as persons who know how to argue intelligently and with tact.

From Table 9, we can see that the associations in this sample are more similar to American-American relationships than are the affinities represented in the control group. Academics are discussed more in the control group while dating appears to be a more restricted subject.

TABLE 9.--Areas of conversation

	With European	With Indian
Same as rest of Americans	80%	40%
Concerning academics	33	63
Country of foreign student	60	67
United States	43	40
Dating	80	36

Table 10 discloses that twenty-four percent more of this sample indicates no sensitive or restrained areas of conversation. The percentages illustrate a free ease of communication: an ease which might be greater than that which prevails in American-American affinities. To enhance this latter point, thirty-three percent (as opposed to thirteen percent in the control group) indicate that their relationships with Europeans are closer than those with other Americans. (These figures are not indicated in Table 10.) The main reason for such closeness given is the attraction toward the European way of life and a dissatisfaction of aspects of American culture.

TABLE 10.--Sensitive or restrained areas of conversation

	With European	With Indian
None	57%	33%
Personal areas	30	33
Criticisms of his country or the U.S.	13	33
Sex and dating	0	20

At the end of the interview, the respondents were asked to describe themselves so that the researcher could better understand them as total persons. Relying heavily on inferred data, the researchers classified the individuals as integrated, fringe, or deviant in relation to how they fit into the mainstream of American society. Definitions of the concepts are given below.

1. Integrated: applies to a person who indicates his general satisfaction with his own culture and its way of life, and takes an active part in segments of his society as evidenced by organizational activity.
2. Fringe or marginal: applies to a person who finds himself on the margin of two or more cultures without making a satisfactory adjustment to his home culture. This person finds himself on the outskirts of American culture, forming little attachments or loyalties to aspects of the home culture.
3. Deviant: applies to a person who rejects many aspects of his culture to the point of criticism and at the level of non-conforming, substantial overt behavior.

TABLE 11.--Distribution according to integrated, fringe or deviant

	This sample	Control group
Integrated in our society	36%	67%
Fringe or marginal	36	30
Deviant to our society	27	3

Directly related to the higher degree of alienation indicated by the larger percentage of deviants and marginals in this sample is the relative degree of patriotism. Students with high levels of alienation tend to discuss the weaknesses of America with the European students. It appears that the American engaging in interaction with a European must endure a greater amount of criticism concerning America. Also a more patriotic American is not able to laud superior merits of his native land in front of a European because of an awareness by both parties that the home countries are each developed and attractive places to live. As a result, an American with such patriotic tendencies will not feel as comfortable with a European as an Indian. This type of acquaintance reasoning could follow from studies such as Newcomb⁶ where he found that individuals come to agree with one another because of existing attraction, and they become attracted to one another because they see themselves as being in agreement. The two processes are interdependent.

V. Evidence for a Third Culture⁷

A theoretical question to be asked is, what form did the cross cultural interaction assume? Are the students interacting within the scheme of the American culture, the European culture, or does a new

⁶Theodore Newcomb, *The Acquaintance Process* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961).

⁷John Useem, "The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture," The Centennial Review, Vol. VII, No. 4, 1963.

manner of interaction occur, a third pattern? Table 12 graphs the four indicators used to measure the existence of a third cultural pattern. On each item the control group responds with a higher number of cases, thus indicating a greater likelihood or involvement in a third cultural form.

TABLE 12.--Indicators measuring the extent of a third culture

	With European	With Indian
1. Some responsibilities felt by Americans	93%	100%
2. Restrained areas	40%	73%
3. Areas of conversation not the same as with Americans	17%	57%
4. Act differently	60%	77%

The evidence from this study does not substantiate a conclusion of a separate and integrated third culture existing. Instead, third cultural elements are a part of the mixture of the two cultures coming into contact. The respondents in this sample reveal that either they or the foreign student conform to one another's culture. Complete identification with the European culture is stated by five of the students in this sample who admire and copy the European style. Another three respondents describe their European friend as acting exactly the same as an American; this phenomena has been labeled "going native".⁸

⁸Watson and Lippitt, Learning Across Cultures, Research Center for Group Dynamics: Social Research, 1955, chapter six.

VI. Results or Changes Brought About by Foreign Contacts

It was hypothesized that encounters with foreign students change a person's attitudes and ways of thinking. Nearly all cases in both samples report a change in attitudes but the direction of these changes is in strengthening previous ideas or beliefs. There is little evidence to show that any changes have occurred in deeply entrenched attitudes. Thus, instead of viewing the respondents as suddenly broadening themselves because of foreign contacts, these persons should be observed as being "pre-disposed" toward cross-cultural contacts and desiring a cosmopolitan-international style of life.

VII. Major Research Findings Compared to Previous Studies

The findings of this study may relate to those of Newcomb⁹ in "that while close proximity is an important variable in the starting of a relationship, interpersonal attraction tends to be maximized when values and orientations are not in conflict. To achieve this balanced state, persons will select others who share their own values and orientations." Also confirmed is the finding of both Newcomb and the Indiana study¹⁰ that most personal attributes of sufficient

⁹Newcomb, op. cit.

¹⁰Roberta Shearer, "A Comparative Study of American Graduate Student Friends of Foreign Students," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Indiana, June, 1965).

importance have already achieved stability within the individual by the time of any associations in graduate school, so that very few changes of any significance can be expected from the student as a result of foreign contacts.

VIII. Implications of Interaction in Relation to an Ecumenical Experience

One way of looking at the Americans in the two samples is that they comprise one minute part of a series of network of international groups and contacts with people from other countries. These communication networks within the university are but one of the settings of the many new "ecumenical" channels in the world. Almost all of the respondents find their relationships free from disadvantages and all subjects welcome future contacts.

Because of these interactions, the American students have become participants in one of the ecumenical institutions. Many of the respondents look at mankind as a community of men who are individuals first, rather than a nationality or part of a particular nation state. This form of response is evident in Table 5 where many of the students in both samples stated no preferences. Also, most of the students feel that their friendships with foreign students overrides any barriers which could be built by different governments. This type of perspective does not necessarily imply a utopian world community or model of man. These Americans may be involved in but one of the many sub-channels of the ecumene. Thus, as evident in Tables 4 and 5,

there is differential or selective preferences for particular nationality groupings and not a total commitment to a world community.

IX. Future Studies

There is a need for additional studies in the area of interpersonal aspects of cross cultural relations. Instead of worrying about an increase in N, it is suggested that studies should narrow their focus to a specific theoretical concern. Procedures in future studies also might tap other populations which are involved in cross cultural activities. Much of the research in this field is done within the university setting, and the educational institution is but one of the newer structures which are evolving across cultures.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this pilot study paves the way for future studies which might focus on a specific theoretical concern which occurs in interpersonal, cross cultural interaction. Thus, a main theoretical issue could be examined in depth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Elalock, Hubert. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
- Hall, Robert. "Friendship Formation and Assimilation in a University Community," Unpublished paper, University of Minnesota, 1964.
- Hewes, Gordon. "The Ecumene as a Civilizational Multiplier System," The Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers, No. 25, (Fall, 1965), 88-89.
- Kroeber, A. L. "The Ancient Oikoumene as a Historic Culture Aggregate," in The Nature of Culture (University of Chicago Press), 1960, 379-395.
- Morris, Richard. The Two Way Mirror. University of Minnesota Press, 1960.
- Newcomb, Theodore. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.
- Sellitz, Christ, Havel, and Cook. Foreign Students in the United States. University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- Shearer, Roberta. "A Comparative Study of American Graduate Student Friends of Foreign Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Indiana, June, 1965.
- Useem, John. "The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture," The Centennial Review, Vol. VII, No. 4, 1963.
- Watson and Lippitt, Learning Across Cultures, Research Center for Group Dynamics: Social Research, Chapter VI, 1955.

APPENDIX

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

CODE: (x, y)

x = # of respondents answering
this sample

y = # of respondents answering
in control group

I. General Information

Let us first look at some general background information about yourself.

1. Sex: Male (25, 25) Female (5, 5)
2. How old are you? Range 21-36.
3. Are you married? Yes (5, 7)
If no, are you engaged or pinned? Yes (5, 4)
4. What is your academic standing?
Graduate (24, 24) Undergraduate (6, 6)
5. What is your major? (See Table 1 in thesis)
6. Do you have a minor or other areas of special interest? No ()
If yes, specify_____
7. Would you consider yourself a geographically mobile person? No ()
If yes, Have you always lived in one state ()
or Lived in more than one state ()
8. Which of the following types of communities would you consider yourself as chiefly being from?
 - a. rural or small town (6, 9)
 - b. suburb (10, 5)
 - c. small city (5, 4)
 - d. large city (9, 12)
9. What is the ethnic background of your family?
European (27, 28) Jewish (6, 4)
10. Has your ethnic background created an interest in these countries you have just mentioned or the people from them?
 - a. very important interest & b. moderate interest (10, 8)
 - c. very little or no interest (20, 21)
 - d. rejection of background (0, 1)

II. Experience Before MSU

Let us now look at your experiences before coming to MSU. With this as a frame of reference, we will want to explore anything in your background which may have encouraged or discouraged you from taking a greater interest in foreign students after you came here. I will ask a few things first and then you can add to these anything we have not considered.

1. Have you been outside the United States? No (18, 18)

If yes, a. What countries have you visited or lived in?

Europe (4, 9)
India (1, 1)
Mexico (8, 7)

- b. Why were you there?

Mainly as tourists in both samples.

- c. How long did you stay?

Average time either 2 weeks or 1 year.

2. Here is a list of some other possible direct or indirect contacts which you may have had with foreign countries or people from them before coming to MSU. Will you tell me which of these were important in making you aware and interested in foreign people and places. GIVE CARD.

Some Appreciable Influence

- | | |
|--|----------|
| a. Books, movies, T.V. | (26, 16) |
| b. School related activities | (18, 14) |
| c. Personal contact with people from other countries who were in USA | (22, 18) |
| d. Persons in your family who have talked about foreign experiences | (11, 11) |
| e. Americans outside your family who have talked about foreign experiences | (16, 15) |
| f. Church related activities | (8, 7) |
| g. Independent interests (curiosity) | (19, 11) |
| h. Other _____ | |

3. Which of these do you regard as the most significant and when did it happen?

"C" in both samples.

Tell me a little about this.

Usually at undergraduate school.

4. Are there any particular countries you've always had a strong interest in?

a. Which ones?	Northern Europe (21, 14)	India (3, 5)
	Europe (14, 8)	Other (8, 11)

b. Why do you feel this way?

5. We have just looked over your experiences with foreign countries and people before coming to MSU. Now that you are at MSU, what effect did these previous experiences or interests have upon the process of getting to know foreign students?

a. Little or none	(8, 13)
b. More knowledge	(4, 8)
c. More tolerant toward others	(8, 6)
d. Interest	(16, 9)
e. More at ease with others	(5, 7)

6. Have you been outside the United States since coming to MSU? No ()

a. If yes, what countries have you visited or lived in?

b. Why were you there?

c. How long did you stay?

III. General Interaction at MSU

We are now going to explore the personal contacts you have had with foreign students while you have been at MSU. The focus here will be on general contacts with students from all countries of the world.

1. What activities do you engage in with students from other countries?

Have you lived with a foreign student? Yes () No ()

- a. Social (29, 26)
- b. Academic (12, 24)
- c. Living (5, 20)

2. What things do you avoid doing with students from other countries that you would do with Americans? (Are there any countries you would feel more free in doing some things with? Which ones? What?)

- a. Nothing avoided (24, 13)
- b. Something avoided (6, 17)

Why do you avoid these things? (Why do you feel less free doing these things with students from these countries?)

Do these things apply to people from all countries?

3. Here is a list of responsibilities which some American students feel towards students from other countries. Will you tell me which of these responsibilities you feel with foreign students that you don't feel with American students?

Do you feel a greater sense of responsibility to:

- a. explain different aspects of American life . . (25, 22)
- b. be a courteous host. (13, 18)
- c. assist and help in personal matters. (14, 20)
- d. explain language usage (24, 19)
- e. explain how to operate in the university system (14, 15)
- f. introduce them to other Americans. (13, 12)
- g. other _____

4. What countries do the foreign students that you associate with most often at MSU come from?

Europe (26, 14)
 India (17, 30)
 Orient (8, 18)
 Middle East (2, 18)
 Africa (10, 7)
 Latin America (4, 12)

Why do you associate with the people from these countries more than people from other countries?

Academic (13, 17)
 Nearness of them (23, 19)
 Interest (5, 8)
 Positive feelings (6, 7)

5. If you had your choice, which national groups would you prefer to associate with most often?

No preference (14, 9)
 Europe (15, 12)
 India-Pakistan (3, 9)
 Orient (3, 9)
 Middle East (1, 1)
 Africa (2, 3)
 Latin-South America (4, 3)

Why would you prefer to associate with the people from these countries? (Do you (physically-emotionally) feel more comfortable with these people than with people from other national groups?)

Academic (2, 0)
 Physically comfortable (7, 5)
 Emotionally comfortable (11, 7)
 Desire to learn (8, 13)
 Past experiences (3, 9)

6. If you had your choice, which national groups would you least like to associate with?

Europe (1, 3)
 India-Pakistan (1, 3)
 Orient (3, 3)
 Middle East (6, 8)
 Africa (6, 11)
 Latin America (4, 8)
 No answer (10, 7)

Why would you prefer not to associate with the people from these countries? (Do you (physically-emotionally) feel less comfortable with these people than with people from other national groups?)

Physically uncomfortable (4, 5)
Emotionally uncomfortable (4, 12)
Bad experience (12, 11)
Criticism of USA (2, 4)

7. What percent of your free time do you spend with foreign students?

Very little

8. How do your American friends feel about your associating with foreign students?

Indifferent (21, 22)
Approve (5, 9)
Disapprove (2, 0)
Varies with nationality (3, 0)

9. How do your parents feel about your associating with foreign students?

Approve (7, 16)
Indifferent (18, 9)
Disapprove (4, 0)
Varies with nationality (3, 2)
Okay, if no marriage (0, 3)

10. How do you think Americans outside MSU react to American students having foreign friends here?

Favorably (3, 10)
Indifferently (18, 14)
Unfavorably (9, 9)

Would there be any countries which would be exceptions to this?

Northern Europe (12, 7)
Europe (3, 8)
India-Pakistan (6, 0)
Orient (6, 2)
Middle East (5, 0)
Africa (11, 4)
Latin America (3, 1)

Why?

Racial reasons (24, 12)
Cultural reasons (10, 4)

11. How do you personally feel about American students having foreign friends here?

Favorably (23, 25)
 Indifferently (7, 5)
 Unfavorably (0, 0)

Would there be any countries which would be exceptions to this?

Middle East (0, 1)
 Africa (0, 2)
 Latin America (0, 1)

Why?

Racial (0, 2)
 Cultural (0, 2)

12. How do you think Americans outside MSU react to American students dating foreign students in a romantic way, possibly thinking of marriage?

Favorably (0, 1)
 Indifferently (9, 2)
 Unfavorably (21, 29)

Would there be any countries which would be an exception to this?

Northern Europe (21, 28)
 Europe (4, 28)
 India-Pakistan (7, 0)
 Orient (7, 0)
 Middle East (7, 0)
 Africa (9, 0)
 Latin America (2, 0)

Why?

Racial (27, 29)
 Cultural (13, 9)

13. How do you personally feel about American students dating foreign students in a romantic way, possibly thinking of marriage?

Favorably (18, 9)
 Indifferently (16, 9)
 Unfavorably (6, 13)

Would there be any countries which would be an exception to this?

Northern Europe (7, 12)
 Europe (2, 11)
 India-Pakistan (3, 0)
 Orient (3, 0)
 Middle East (3, 0)
 Africa (6, 2)
 Latin America (0, 2)

Why?

Racial (13, 14)
 Cultural (6, 8)

IV. Personal Interaction With One Foreign Student

Let us now shift our interest from foreign students in general to one particular foreign student. Think of the European student that you know best so we can talk about the relationship between the two of you. Don't mention his or her name but keep this particular person in mind as we go along.

1. How would you describe this person?
 - a. Country_____
 - b. Sex: male (29, 29) female (1, 1)
 - c. Age____
 - d. Region_____
 - e. Caste_____
 - f. Academic major Same as American (9, 14)
 - g. How long have you known him?
 - h. Personality
 - i. How did you meet him?

2. How close do you feel toward this person?

- a. One of your very best friends (7, 6)
- b. A good friend (14, 18)
- c. An acquaintance (9, 5)
- d. Someone you're stuck with (0, 0)
- e. Someone you dislike (0, 1)
- f. Other _____

If this person is of the opposite sex, is there any romantic interest?

Yes (3, 0)

3. What do you know about this person's family?

- a. Intimate ()
- b. Some ()
- c. Very little
or nothing ()
- d. Other _____

4. What have you told this person about your family?

- a. Intimate details ()
- b. Some ()
- c. Very little
or nothing ()
- d. Other _____

5. What do the two of you do apart from others?

Social activities (26, 25)
Academic activities (8, 14)
Living experience (3, 6)
Labor related (3, 1)
Dating (4, 0)

6. What do the two of you do along with others?

Social activities (29, 25)
Academic activities (5, 14)
Living experience (0, 5)
Labor related (4, 1)
Dating (4, 1)

7. Which of the following activities would you avoid doing with this person?

Would you avoid:

- a. taking him to your parents' home (1, 2)
- b. inviting him to your home here on campus (0, 1)
- c. participating or watching sports (0, 0)
- d. movies (0, 1)
- e. eating out (0, 1)
- f. taking him to a party of Americans (1, 5)
- g. dating or double-dating (0, 11)
- h. Is there anything else that you would avoid doing with this person?

8. Why would you avoid these activities with this person?

Racial reasons (0, 4)

Uncomfortable (0, 9)

9. In what ways do you act differently when you are with this person than when you are with American students?

- a. More polite (4, 16)
- b. Explaining the English language (14, 1)
- c. Staying away from certain areas or topics (2, 4)
- d. Speak distinctly (6, 4)
- e. No difference (12, 9)

10. One of the things I am interested in is what sort of disagreements occur between foreign students and American students. Therefore I want to ask you are there things which frustrate or bother you about this person?

- Petty ones (11, 6)
- Cold, stoic (2, 0)
- Politics (4, 2)
- Cultural differences (6, 6)
- Nothing (7, 17)

If you haven't had friction or disagreement, do you purposely avoid areas of friction or frustration with this person?

Yes (5, 3)

How do you avoid it?

No talking about it (9, 0)

12. Is there anything about yourself that bothers him?

Yes (13, 13)

13. How are these differences handled? Are they ignored?

Argued (7, 13)

14. What do you usually talk about with this person? (Probe themes or conversation and conversation patterns as to length or relationship: Are things routine?)

Same as rest of Americans	(24, 12)
Academic	(10, 19)
His country	(18, 20)
USA	(13, 12)
Dating	(24, 11)
Personal things	(15, 14)

15. Sometimes there are sensitive subjects which people avoid raising. What topics can't you talk about openly and freely with this person which you could talk about with an American? (Are there any criticisms of your society or his society which cannot or aren't brought out?)

Nothing	(24, 14)
Criticism of his culture	(3, 7)
Criticisms of USA	(1, 3)
Personal problems	(2, 6)
Sex and dating	(0, 5)
Religion	(2, 4)

16. Are there any topics which you feel he is restrained in talking to you about?

None	(21, 17)
Personal items	(9, 7)
Customs of his country	(0, 4)

17. Which topics would you rather he didn't talk to you about?

None (22, 21)
 Personal problems (6, 4)
 Sex (0, 3)

18. Are there times when this person says something or does something in a way that makes you or others uncomfortable?

Yes (13, 8)

If so, why do you or others feel uncomfortable in these situations?

- a. His personality (11, 5)
 b. Culturally out of place (2, 3)

19. Under what circumstances have you told this person that his behavior does not fit into American customs?

Never (23, 21)

20. Do you think this person has really gotten to know you?

Yes (20, 19)

21. To what extent do you feel that this person is typical of all persons from his homeland?

Respondent thinks so (14, 7)
 Probably (13, 10)
 Not typical--Americanized (2, 7)

22. Do you expect to maintain contact with this person after he goes home?

Yes (10, 12)
 No (14, 10)
 Possibly (6, 7)

23. Would you like to hold on to this person's friendship irrespective of what might happen between your two countries?

Yes (28, 28)

Why do you feel this way? (This is a check to see if the relationship is on a personable basis.)

24. If you were to summarize what this person is like, what would you say?

Affective level (27, 17)
 Cognitive level (18, 25)
 Gives credit to person (19, 11)

25. How would you characterize your relationship with this person?

Close friend (19, 22)
 Not a close friend (8, 3)
 Academic relationship (4, 12)

26. Is there any difference in having this type of relationship with an American? Can you feel as close?

a. None, no difference (16, 17)
 b. Not as close (4, 2)
 c. Closer (10, 4)
 d. More formal (5, 3)
 e. Do different things (1, 7)

V. Changes

There has been a great deal of speculation about what it means for Americans to have contacts with foreign students. You can help by telling what it means to you to have this experience.

1. Have you changed your outlook in any way about the countries represented by the foreign students that you know here at MSU?

Yes (27, 26)

In what ways?

Strengthening previous views.

2. Can you see any difference in your world view? For example, do you look on the world as more a community of men, from interacting with foreign students?

Yes (23, 19)

Or do you see a bigger difference between peoples of different countries?

Yes (17, 18)

3. What have you gained from your interaction with foreign students?

Understanding (26, 23)

Friends (12, 10)

Knowledge (18, 24)

4. What have been the disadvantages resulting from your association with foreign students?

None (26, 22)

Less content with USA (4, 0)

Peer criticism (0, 5)

If there have been some, why do you continue to associate?

"It's worth it."

5. Have you changed your attitudes on any of these aspects of American life because of the students from other countries that you have met?

a. Race (13, 5)

b. Your own religious views (2, 4)

c. U.S. values and policies (22, 19)

d. Economic systems (16, 6)

e. Kinship and family (9, 9)

f. Dating and marriage (7, 8)

g. Your own personal views (4, 11)

h. Other _____

6. Have you changed your plans for the future because of your interaction?

a. Travel (15, 16)

b. Study abroad (8, 4)

c. Peace Corps (2, 1)

d. Courses (6, 8)

e. Learn language (11, 11)

f. Vocation (3, 4)

g. Other _____

7. Looking back over your years at MSU, do you feel you would like to have had more contact with students from other countries?

Yes (21, 19)

Are there any countries which would be exceptions to this?

None

8. Do you feel in general that it is worthwhile for American students to associate with students from other countries?

Yes (30, 30)

Are there any countries which would be exceptions to this?

None - all respondents.

9. How would you describe yourself?

Integrated	(11, 20)
Fringe or marginal	(11, 9)
Deviant	(8, 1)
Isolated	(0, 0)

10. Is there anything else you would like to tell me that we haven't covered?

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293103375980