

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

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JERRY NELSON JUDY

1967



ABSTRACT

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

By Jerry Nelson Judy

Thirty American students who were 'known best' by a selected sample of Indian students were compared to a control group of thirty American students who were 'known best' by a similarly selected sample of Western-European students. Using the same interview schedule, the backgrounds of the Americans, the extent and patterns of their interaction with foreign students, their attitudes towards various forms of association and the changes which have resulted from interaction with foreign students are examined.

The sample group was found to interact more extensively in structured situations which do not necessarily require social interaction which might result in uncomfortable conditions for either party. However the interaction between the Indians and Americans more often occurs on an individual basis rather than in group situations characteristic of the control group. The associations which

both the sample and control groups have with foreign students from many areas of the world indicate widespread cross-cultural experiences. However the sample indicates more shared interaction patterns characteristic of a third culture. (Neither group reports changes in basic beliefs and attitudes, although new ideas and knowledge were reported by most of the sample.)

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

By

Jerry Nelson Judy

A THESIS

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

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology

1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. DATA AND METHODS.....	3
Descriptions of the Populations in the Samples	
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	5
A. Backgrounds of the American Groups	
B. Attitudes Towards Foreign-American	
Interpersonal Relations	
C. Differences in Associations with Foreign	
and American Students	
D. General Association Patterns	
E. Differences Between Associations with	
Europeans and Indians	
IV. INDIVIDUAL ACQUAINTANCES OF THE AMERICANS.	19
V. THIRD CULTURE INTERACTION.....	28
VI. CHANGES RESULTING FROM FOREIGN CONTACTS..	31
VII. EVIDENCE FOR AN ECUMENICAL ORIENTATION	
AND EXPERIENCES.....	32
VIII. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES.....	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	38
APPENDIX.....	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Subject Areas of Study Among the Americans.....	5
2. Residential Patterns of the Americans Before Entering the University.....	6
3. Countries in Which There Has Always Been Strong Interest, and Present Interaction With Persons From Those Countries.....	9
4. Direct and Indirect Experiences with Foreign Countries and People which Created a Further Interest in Foreign People and Places.....	10
5. Attitudes Towards Interpersonal Cross-national Relationships.....	12
6. Responsibilities which Americans feel with Foreign Students which are not Felt Towards Other Americans.	15
7. Number of Times a Country was Mentioned, Arranged by Areas of the World.....	16
8. Expressed Closeness to the Best Known Foreign Student.....	19
9. Length of Time Foreign Student has been Known.....	20
10. Circumstances Where Foreign Students Were First Met	21
11. Intimate Personal Activities Which Americans Avoid with Foreign Students.....	23
12. Ways Americans Act Differently When With Foreign Students.....	24
13. Areas of Conversation.....	27
14. Sensitive or Restrained Areas of Conversation.....	28
15. Indicators Measuring the Domains of a Third Culture	29
16. Preferred and Least Preferred National Groups for Interaction.....	33

I. Introduction

The increasing interaction of persons from differing societies, as the world has reached a point where it can be viewed as one all-encompassing ecumenical system,¹ has led to attempts to explain the phenomena resulting from such interaction. The concept of a third culture has been used to describe the complex of "behavior patterns created, shared, and learned by men of different societies who are in the process of relating their societies, or sections thereof, to each other."² Such a third culture will supposedly develop when the representatives of two or more cultures come together in some common enterprise or program which can be described as bridging both cultures. Education is such an enterprise. One persistent influence on cultural changes throughout the world has been the exchange of scholars between institutions of learning. As the number of students

¹ A.L. Kroeber, "The Ancient Oikoumene as a Historical 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 1961, pp. 73-110.

² John Useem, Ruth Useem, and John Donoghue, "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture: The Roles of American and Non-Western People in Cross-Cultural Administration," Human Organization, Vol. 22, No. 3, Fall 1963, p. 169.

has increased, incidence of cross-cultural contacts has also increased. However many of the forms and consequences of this interaction have not been thoroughly explored.

The present investigation was designed, in part, to ascertain the existence and significance of such created, shared and learned patterns of behavior among two sets of American college students who were well known by representatives of two divergent foreign student groups, Indians and Europeans, on a Big Ten university campus. Previous studies of third cultural groups have concentrated primarily upon the Western residents in a non-Western setting.³ The patterns of behavior of these persons outside their parent culture environment has been recorded in greater detail than has been true for those persons who are living in their own society and also participating in a somewhat parallel third culture. This study concentrates upon a sample of American students interacting with foreign students within American society.

There has been a pervasive tradition of thought within the United States, especially since World War II, that understanding and peace can be facilitated by personalized contacts between peoples of the world. There also has been the accompanying assumption that having students and other persons visit the United States will result in their

³Ibid., pp. 169-179. See also John Useem, "The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture," The Centennial Review, Vol. VII, No. 4, 1963.

becoming more American or at least more sympathetic to Americans in attitudes and behavior. Only recently have studies been conducted which have included Americans as one of the active parties involved in cross-cultural interaction which includes exchanges in both directions. This study attempts to specify some of the changes in attitudes, behavior, and life styles in American university students as a result of interaction with foreign students.

II. Data and Methods

The procedure followed in this study consists of two researchers interviewing two groups of 30 American students who were well known by selected groups of foreign students. These foreign students were selected from among the approximately 800 who were on a Big Ten campus during the winter term of the 1965-1966 school year. One researcher contacted all 27 of the male European students and obtained a list of the American students they know best. This researcher obtained a similar list of names of Americans from Indian students sampled to match the Europeans by sex, length of time at the university, marital status, and residence in either university married housing, dormitories, or off-campus.

Each of the matched Indian and European students was asked to list the ten American students he knew best. From these lists of Americans, each researcher selected a stratified random sample

which included 25 males and 5 females. The same interview schedule was used by both researchers and was administered so as to obtain comparable data from each item. One of the researchers interviewed Americans named by Europeans and this researcher interviewed Americans named by Indians. The data of each researcher were thus used as a comparison for the other.

Two distinct groups of foreign students were selected to provide the names of the Americans. This was done to explore interaction patterns occurring between Americans and foreign students who represent different culture areas of the world. Differentiating foreign students representing varying cultural distances from the United States offers a more complete survey of interaction patterns which develop than is possible when all foreign students are grouped under one heading.

Descriptions of the Populations in the Samples

For each group of Americans there were 25 males and 5 females.⁴ In this sample seven persons are married and among the control group known by the Europeans, five persons are married. With the

⁴It was hypothesized that males and females would provide examples of different styles and patterns of interaction with the all male foreign student populations. It was thought that the females would be more likely to supply data on such problems as dating relationships. However the expected differences between the male-male and male-female interaction patterns did not occur and therefore this distinction will not be considered throughout the remainder of this study.

exception of four undergraduates in the sample and six in the control group, all the Americans are graduate students. The median age of the sample is 24.5; 3 persons are over 30 years and none are less than twenty. Among the control group the median age is 23 with only two cases over 30 and none less than 19 years of age. The subject areas studied by each group is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. --Subject areas of study among the Americans

Subject area	Interactors with Indians	Interactors with Europeans
Sciences	9	7
Business	6	5
Social Sciences	5	4
Engineering	4	1
Humanities	3	8
Agriculture	2	1
Languages	1	4
Totals	<u>30</u>	<u>30</u>

III. Analysis of Data

A. Backgrounds of the American Groups

The social identity of the sample and control groups were explored to trace possible connections between past cross-cultural experiences and interests and present relationships with foreign students.

Table 2. --Residential patterns of the Americans before entering the university

	Interactors with Indians	Interactors with Europeans
Residence before entry into the univ.		
Rural	9	6
Suburb	5	10
City	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>
Totals	30	30
Previous visitor or resident overseas*		
Europe	9	4
India	1	1
Other	7	8
No overseas experience	18	18

*The number of persons who have visited or resided in the countries. Some individuals have visited or resided in more than one country. Europe is considered here as 'a country'.

Table 2 shows the sample and control groups do not differ substantially in the type of locality which they consider themselves as being from; about half of each group is from a city environment. The proportion of persons with rural backgrounds is somewhat larger among the sample group while the control group has more individuals from the suburbs. The kind of community which is considered home to these individuals is not important in influencing which foreign students they know.

Living overseas cannot be demonstrated to have an appreciable

influence upon the nationality of foreign students which an American will subsequently come to know. Also having never lived outside the United States does not appear to hinder the process of getting to know foreign students well. Exactly 18 persons in each group have had no experiences in living in other countries, with the possible exceptions of Canada and stays in Mexico of less than three days. Slightly more of the sample group have had travel experience in Europe than is true with the control group who are well known by the European students on campus. Only one person in each group has been to India and the number who have been to other parts of the world are essentially the same. Thus it appears that having foreign experiences, especially in the country of the foreign student with whom one associates, is not an important factor in getting to know foreign students well.

Although their places of residence are not significantly different, 22 in the sample consider themselves to be geographically mobile, compared to only 4 in the control group. Although it cannot be shown that they actually are more mobile, it appears that persons who consider themselves to be so, are more inclined to associate with other persons who are also mobile. This feeling of mobility may be indicative of a tolerance for those with highly divergent backgrounds, as might be expected with Indians in contrast to Europeans.

The background of the American students, in terms of the country from which they or their families had originally come, is not an

important influence in getting to know particular foreign students. Twenty-eight members of the control group, which were named by Europeans, are of European descent. However 26 of the sample are also entirely of European descent with no individuals being of Indian descent. Essentially the same number -- 9 in the sample, 10 in the control group -- consider their background to be of some importance to them by creating an interest in the countries from which they came, or the people from these countries. Thus both groups show a similar composition by national origin and similar amounts of interest in the countries from which they came. It would thus not appear foreign student friends are chosen on this basis.

However when asked about countries they have always had a strong interest in, 80% of the control group indicate a long time interest in Europe, in contrast to only 53% in the sample group. Only 16% of the sample group and 10% of the control group have long lasting interests in India. It would be incorrect to conclude from this that having an interest in a country is important in predicting if an American will associate with persons from the country in which he is interested. If we look at the 53% of the persons in the sample group who indicate a long time interest in Europe and also look at the foreign students they associate with most often, it can be seen that only half, or 8, actually do associate with Europeans. With the control group only one of the three with an interest in India actually associate with Indian

students. It cannot be concluded from this evidence that having an interest in a country is any indicator of a propensity to associate with persons from that country.

Table 3. --Countries in which there has always been strong interest, and present interaction with persons from those countries

	Interest in Europe	Number who asso- ciate with Europeans	Interest in India	Number who asso- ciate with Indians	Interest in other countries
Interactors with Europeans	24	30	3	1	8
Interactors with Indians	16	8	5	30	11

Table 4 reveals three important points. First, all the American students have had a wide range of exposures to foreign countries or people, either personally or through some intervening medium, before entering the Big-Ten university. Only two in the sample, and none in control group, report no previous contacts which they consider as having some appreciable influence in making them aware and interested in foreign people and places. Second, in all cases the sample selected each item more often than the control group, indicating a more varied and extensive exposure to foreign people and places before entering the

the university. Such an exposure may have made the sample more accepting of persons who represent cultures which have fewer characteristics in common with the American culture.

Table 4. --Direct and indirect experiences with foreign countries and people which created a further interest in foreign people and places

	Interactors with Indians	Times most important	Interactors with Europeans	Times most important
Books, movies, T.V.	26	5	16	10
School related activities	18	3	14	6
Personal contact with people from other countries who were in the USA	22	10	18	3
Persons in your family who have talked about foreign experi- ences	11	6	11	3
Americans outside your family who have talked about foreign experiences	16	1	15	2
Church related activities	8	1	7	0
Independent interests (curiosity)	19	1	11	1
No answer or unknown		3		5

Third, among the sample, personal contact with foreigners and indirect exposure to foreign experiences through family members are more often reported than in the control group as the most significant exposures to foreign experiences. The exposures of the control group are mainly through mass media and school related activities. The more personal and intimate contacts, made either directly or through family members, may account for a propensity on the part of the sample to associate with, and become better known by, foreign students who are 'more foreign' than the Europeans.

Despite the greater number of foreign contacts and more personal contacts with foreign people and places among the sample than the control group, it appears that the background and past experiences are of minor importance in predicting whether an American student will interact extensively with one or another nationality of foreign student and the extent to which he will interact. More decisive seems to be the opportunities for easy access to foreign students after entering the university. The widespread exposure, in all the various forms which have just been mentioned, do not motivate the American to 'search out' foreign students on the campus, but these exposures probably do facilitate interaction when it does occur.

B. Attitudes Towards Foreign-American Interpersonal Relations

The American students in both the sample and control groups see

themselves as playing a unique role in interpersonal relationships with the foreign students. They interpret their own feelings towards both casual and romantic relationships as being much more tolerant than they interpret the feelings of other Americans.

As revealed in Table 5, 83% of the sample, in contrast to only 17% of the interactors with Europeans, consider their attitudes towards friendships with foreign students in a favorable manner. However the figures are reversed when these groups expressed indifferent attitudes towards such friendships. This indicates that those persons who

Table 5. --Attitudes towards interpersonal cross-national relationships

	Personal Attitudes on Friendship	General Attitudes on Friendship	Personal Attitudes on Dating and Marriage	General Attitudes on Dating and Marriage
Interactors with Indians				
Favorable	83%	30%	27%	0%
Indifferent	17	43	30	7
Unfavorable	0	27	43	93
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Interactors with Europeans				
Favorable	17%	10%	27%	0%
Indifferent	80	60	53	30
Unfavorable	0	30	20	70
Total	97%	100%	100%	100%

interact with Indians see such friendships as being more unique and desirable than is the case of Americans interacting with Europeans. Relationships with Europeans can be interpreted as being similar to such relationships with Americans and thus interpreted in an indifferent light rather than as being a relationship about which there are strong feelings, either positive or negative.

It can also be derived in Table 5 that 23% more of the persons who interact with Indians have unfavorable attitudes towards relations with foreign students which involve courtship and possible marriage than is the case with those who interact with the Europeans. This greater number of unfavorable responses indicates an awareness of the problems associated with such intimate relations with Indians, rather than problems associated with all foreign students. Only one person in both the sample and control groups who indicated unfavorable attitudes towards courting relationships did not consider Europeans as an exception to this general attitude. This is one important instance where the term 'foreign student' when used to include students from all other countries is too broad, consequently supporting the distinction made in this research.

C. Differences in Associations With Foreign and American Students

The range of activities which Americans participate in with other Americans and foreign students is very similar. However there

are more activities that the Americans avoid with foreign students than they do with fellow Americans. This is especially true with the Americans who associate with the Indians. Fifty-six percent of the Indian interactors compared with only 20% of the European interactors, indicate there is something that they avoid doing with foreign students that they would do with Americans. Most of the things avoided center around unfavorable references to the foreign student's country and intimate social relationships which involve imputed interracial dating. Both of these patterns are more pronounced when the American is dealing with Indians rather than with Europeans.

Another major difference in American-foreign student and American-American relations centers about additional interpersonal responsibilities which the American feels with foreign students. Most of these responsibilities probably do not indicate an unwillingness to assist fellow Americans in these areas but rather an anticipation of the foreign student as an "outsider" without the resources to handle some of the societal patterns without assistance.

As indicated in Table 6 both the sample and control groups respond in essentially the same manner concerning responsibilities to assist in getting through the bureaucratic structure of the university system as well as the responsibility of introducing the foreign student to other Americans. However the responses to the remaining questions reflect, at a very general level, differences in the basic

Table 6. --Responsibilities which Americans feel with foreign students which are not felt towards other Americans

	Interactors with Indians	Interactors with Europeans
Explain different aspects of American life	73%	83%
Be a courteous host	60	43
Assist and help in personal matters	67	47
Explain language usage	63	80
Explain how to operate in the university system	50	47
Introduce them to other Americans	40	43

orientations towards foreign students which characterize the sample and control groups. Many of the relations of the sample group with foreign students occur on a person-to-person basis, in contrast to a group type of interaction which occurs between the control group and the foreign students they interact with. Thus the sample group feels a greater obligation to help the foreign students in personal matters and also to act as a courteous host. It is hypothesised these responsibilities are more personal in many ways than the responsibilities most often felt by the control group. It is further suggested that explaining various aspects of American life and explaining the language

usage, which are recorded more often by the control group, are responsibilities which in many respects prepare the foreign student to cope with American society more than they are responsibilities which will facilitate personal interaction.

D. General Association Patterns

As has been pointed out, the Americans selected for this study were well known by either one of two foreign student groups. However as recorded in Table 7 these Americans have extensive contacts with persons from many areas of the world. Every person in both samples interacts with foreign students from countries other than India or

Table 7.--Number of times a country was mentioned, arranged by areas of the world

Countries and Areas	<u>% of Americans who associate with persons from various countries and areas</u>	
	Interactors with Indians	Interactors with Europeans
India and Pakistan	100%	57%
Orient*	60	27
Middle East	60	7
Europe	47	87
Latin America	40	13
Africa	23	33

*The Orient refers here to all Asian countries east of India, including Pacific islands.

Europe.

Table 7 also discloses that the members of the sample associates with a larger number of cultural groups than is the case with the control group. The control group sees only one cultural group more often than the sample--the Europeans. Since the control group was named by Europeans, it is not surprising that the control group would in turn manifest that they associate with the Europeans more than with other national groups. It is interesting to note also that the Americans who were named by Indians are apt to regularly interact with Indians. This is not true with the persons who were named by Europeans. The control group did not reveal in all cases that the Europeans were among the foreign students with whom they most often interact. This indicates that the relationship with the Indians is a more recurrent and continuing part of the lives of the sample group than is the relationship with Europeans for the control group. The Indians are the foreign student group most often associated with by the sample; they are also selected from among more extensive contacts with other cultural groups.

E. Differences Between Associations With Europeans and Indians

One of the main differences in the types of associations which occur between the Americans in the sample group and those Americans who associate with Europeans is the types of situations which precipitate the interaction. In neither group do the individuals make any

special effort to meet and associate with the foreign students. In the control group, the interaction occurs because the Europeans are a part of the American's circle of friends which he meets in times of relaxation, especially within the graduate dormitory. This type of interaction also occurs among the sample group living in dormitories with Indian students. However most of the interaction between Indians and Americans occurs as the result of other common interests, which are in most cases academic. Common academic interests are the factor which initiate the interaction but they often lead to continuing social interaction which cannot be considered academically oriented. However it is the common academic interest which mainly sustains the continued interaction.

Neither the sample or control groups is interested in continued associations with foreign students which require extensive adaptations of the self on the part of the American. One factor which appears to facilitate interaction is for the foreign student to act 'just like an American'. This involves speaking in the American style, having interests similar to the American's, and not possessing acute sensitivities about his home country or culture which require the American to be highly cautious in his behavior lest he offend. This does not imply that the Americans expect the Indians to be the same as themselves as the conscious differences in their behavior towards foreign students testifies. Yet the Americans do not indicate a willingness to put great effort into

the relationship to overcome these types of differences.

IV. Individual Acquaintances of the Americans

Each respondent in the sample was asked to discuss a personal relationship which he had with the one Indian student whom he knew best; and each member in the control group discussed the best known European student.

Table 8 indicates how close the Americans consider their relationship with the foreign student that they know best. The slightly higher percentage of very good or good friends in the sample group can be explained by referring to Table 9 which shows the much longer time which the sample group has known the Indians than is true of the

Table 8. --Expressed closeness to the best known foreign student

	Indians with Interactors	Europeans with Interactors
Very good friend	20%	23%
Good friend	60	47
Acquaintance	17	30
Someone disliked	3	0
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table 9. --Length of time foreign student has been known

	Interactors with Indians	Interactors with Europeans
Under one year	40%	77%
1 - 2 years	30	23
Over 2 years	27	0
Unknown	3	0
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

control group. Fifty-seven percent of the sample have known the foreign student that they know best for over one year, while only 23% of the control group have known the foreign student for a similar length of time. This does suggest however that although the control group has known the Europeans for a shorter length of time, they know them well enough to indicate that they may become better friends in a shorter period of time than is true with the sample group. How well the American and the foreign student get to know each other depends largely upon the primary reasons for their interaction.

Many of the Americans in the control group have foreign contacts only because the European students are a part of their American social circle. This is the less important of two major relationships found among the sample group. Of greater importance in governing the interaction patterns among the Americans and the Indians is the presence of shared common interests which are non-social in nature, but which

are usually catalysts to some type of social activities.

Forty-seven percent of the Americans in the sample group have the same academic major as the Indian that they know best. Common academic majors are reported by only thirty percent of the control group who interact with Europeans. More crucial, 57% of the sample indicate that a shared activity between themselves and their Indian friend involves academic activities. Academic activities do not constitute the total relationship, but this is the common basis for continuing the relationship over extended periods of time. Social activities are an important part of the interaction but are an outgrowth of the common academic interests rather than an activity in themselves which draw individuals into groups, as in the case with the control group. Having the same jobs and belonging to public organizations also serve

Table 10.--Circumstances where foreign students were first met

	<u>Indian Interactors</u>	<u>European Interactors</u>
Academic	36%	27%
Dormitory	33	43
Mutual friend	17	30
Accidental	7	0
Unknown	7	0
Totals	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>

the same function in bringing Indians and Americans into close contact from which social activities develop.

The nearness and availability of foreign students in the university graduate dormitory contributes to the second type of interaction pattern found in the sample group. In the dormitory situation there are many opportunities for social interaction between the American and Indian students. Whether this interaction will continue does not rely solely upon the ecological propinquity. More salient for intensive interaction over a period of time are the personalities and mutual interests of the individuals involved. Usually for this type of interaction to last the Indian student must be very similar to the American students in interests, speech, and personal habits. Very few of the Americans who interact with the foreign students they meet in the dormitories are willing to go to much trouble in the relationships. If the interaction places demands on the American which would not occur with other Americans in the same situations the interaction is usually terminated or kept on a level with minimal involvement. The interaction between the control group and Europeans is very similar. The Americans involved avoid relationships which require work on their part.

The smaller number of individuals in the sample group who met Indians through mutual friends is also due to the greater emphasis upon relationships which were instigated and which continued because of mutual interest in a particular area. With the control group there

is more emphasis upon entering a group of friends which also includes an European. The American is introduced into the group by a person who is already a part of that group in more instances than is true in the sample group.

As expected, the sample group of Americans registers a much greater desire to avoid various social activities with Indians than is true of those Americans who interact with Europeans. As Table 11 discloses, the sample manifests a hesitation to become involved in relationships which encompass intimate personal interaction. The

Table 11. --Intimate personal activities which Americans avoid with foreign students

	Indian Interactors	European Interactors
Taking this person to a party if Americans	17%	0%
Dating or double dating with this person	37	0

sample group does not desire to become committed to personalized relationships which will be uncomfortable to either party involved. Such problems are not seen as important or likely to arise with the control group as they interact with Europeans. The sample group is not willing to pay the extra cost inherent in such relations with foreign students, and thus avoid them.

Table 12. --Ways Americans act differently when with foreign students

	Indian Interactors	European Interactors
Act more polite	47%	13%
Explain American usage of the English language	3	47
Stay away from certain areas of conversation or topics	13	7
Speak distinctly	13	20
No difference	30	40

Table 12 contrasts the type of relationships between the sample and control groups. The sample group usually meets the Indians in a situation which entails academics, common jobs, or dormitories where the individuals share ecologically similar situations. In all of these cases the relationships can remain on a semi-formal basis with a minimum of intimate personal contact between the parties involved. In contrast the control group often meet through mutual friends who introduce the Americans into a social group where the foreign student is a visible member. Here the interaction is on a more purely social basis from the beginning of the relationship.

This is reflected in the fact that 47% of the sample group is more polite when interacting with the Indians than is the case with the control

group in their relationships. More of the sample group relationships remain on a level which involves friendship but which often does not include the multidimensional social activities which are associated with friendship between Americans, and which is also found in the American-European interaction. For example, an American and an Indian will share a common graduate office, participate together in departmental activities, meet daily with academic problems, and consider each other good friends. However there may be no effort by either person to involve the other in social activities away from the office. The interaction is thus just one segmentalized portion of the total activities for both the American and Indian.

Another reason for the more polite relations with Indians involves the insecurity which many in the sample group feel in dealing with persons from another culture where the codes for interpersonal conduct are not known. There appears to be a sincere desire on the part of most persons in the sample group to be a courteous and non-offensive host. Without knowing what are acceptable norms for interpersonal conduct with the Indians, the Americans assume a formal stance which they feel will be acceptable. In interacting with the Europeans, the control group may experience fewer cross-cultural insecurities and assume a freer attitude in such relations.

The number of persons who correct the English language usage of the foreign students varies greatly between the sample and the

control groups. This difference is also related to the desire of the members of the sample group to be more circumspect. The Indian interactors are more likely to be concerned about avoidance of embarrassing the foreign student with corrections unless the foreign student specifically asks for assistance with learning the American modes of speech. Also the major portion of the education of the Indian students has been carried on in English and is therefore likely to be more polished than the English spoken by some of the Europeans.

Disagreements are reported to occur between forty-four percent of this sample and Indians and between sixty-six percent of the control group and Europeans. Avoiding unnecessary disagreements is one means the sample group has of proving themselves good hosts and of being polite with the foreign students. The Indian interactors do not argue about such topics as politics, religion, dating customs, or other topics which vary between the two cultures. There may be discussion of these topics but arguments are avoided. A jesting and joking pattern has not arisen between the sample and Indians as is the case with the control group and thus there is the possibility that such arguments would be more likely to terminate a relationship if pursued.

Table 13.--Areas of conversation

	Indian Interactors	European Interactors
Same as rest of Americans	30%	80%
Concerning academics	63	33
Country of foreign student	67	60
United States	40	43
Dating	37	80

Table 13 discloses that the control group associations in conversations which are more similar to those of American-American relations than is the case with the sample group. As we have noted, the sample group is more concerned with academic relations than is true of the control group. Several of the sample group indicate that sex and dating topics are something they avoid with Indians due to the perceived biracial problems involved. Also dating with an Indian was indicated as an area of embarrassment for both parties concerned, even though the American might be involved only in arranging the date and not actually dating the Indian personally.

Table 14. --Sensitive or restrained areas of conversation

	Indian Interactors	European Interactors
None	30%	57%
Personal areas	40	30
Criticisms of his country or the United States	33	13
Sex and dating	20	0

Table 14 records that the sample group is much more restrained and find more sensitive areas in their conversations with Indians than is true of the control group. Many of the topics which the sample group cite as sensitive or restrained areas of conversation are topics which have never arisen in actual conversations but are seen by this group as topics which they perceived as potentially uncomfortable for one of the parties involved. As has been indicated, the topics of conversation dealing with intimate personal concerns are more often avoided by the sample group who are more likely to be associating with the Indians in a task-oriented situation rather than in more social situations.

V. Third Cultural Interaction

The question of the possible existence of a third culture, different

from either the American culture or the foreign culture, which directed the form the cross-cultural interaction would assume, was explored. To measure the existence of new patterns of interaction which would be part of a third culture, three indicators were used, as shown in Table 15. In all of the indicators the sample group reveals greater variation in their behavior with foreign students than the control group, thereby suggesting a slightly more pronounced third cultural pattern form of involvement.

Table 15.--Indicators measuring the domains of a Third Culture

	Interactors with Indians	Interactors with Europeans
Responsibilities not the same as with American students	97%	90%
Areas of conversation not the same as with American students	70	43
Behavior not the same as with American students	70	60

Despite large percentages of Americans--especially among the sample group--who express different forms of behavior with foreign students in the areas sampled, there is little evidence of these third cultural patterns being more than a small part in the total life styles of these Americans. The third cultural patterns are segmentalistic,

rather than holistic, and thus employed in relatively limited circumstances. For example, 70% of the sample expressed different areas of conversation with the foreign students. This does not imply that this group has an extensively different range of topics which are used with the foreign students; instead, there may be only a very few topics which are raised, or avoided, with the foreign student which are different. Various aspects of India may be a topic which is discussed with the Indian student but never covered with other Americans. The American may also avoid topics (American football) in which he feels the Indian has no interest, or which may be embarrassing (the caste system in India).

The Americans do change their behavior with the foreign students, but there is little evidence that this becomes substantially different from their behavior with other Americans. However there often arises a pattern of avoidance of certain areas with the foreign student. This segmentalization is most noticable between academic activities--in which the foreign student is an active participant--and social activities where the foreign student is not systematically rejected but where he is not actively recruited as a participant. This is often the result of expectations the American has of the foreign student's behavior. The sample group indicates they do not expect the Indians to act exactly the same as Americans, but the Indian who is most 'Americanized' and who 'knows his way around' in American life is most

likely to be better known and to be a participant in more activities with the American than is his countryman who has adopted fewer of the American customs. The American would like for the Indian to be just like an American, but he does not really expect such behavior. But to the extent that such behavior is anticipated of a particular individual, the more likely he is to be included in a wider variety of activities, both academic and social, with the American. Thus there is an ambivalence on the part of the Americans who want the foreign student to be an American, but at the same time, want the foreign student to be foreign and exciting.

Although forty-three percent of the sample indicate the type of relationship which they have with the Indian was different than a similar relationship with an American, most of these differences are considered to be of a minor nature. When major adjustments in their behavior are required to continue a relationship with a foreign student, the American is more likely to avoid this situation than to make the adjustment. This may not necessitate a cessation of all relations with the foreign student; only those situations which require special effort will be avoided.

VI. Changes Resulting From Foreign Contacts

Almost every person in both the sample and control groups reported changes in attitudes and ways of thinking as a result of foreign

contacts. However the types of changes which have occurred in the sample and control groups are different.

The control group can be characterized as changing its attitudes in the direction of strengthening pre-existing ideas and beliefs. These persons have not become extensively broadened through international contacts, but rather, they have been predisposed towards such a life style.

However among the sample group the interaction with Indians, if not with other nationalities, has been a more novel experience in the sense that preconceptions of Indians and India have been less complete and rigidly formed than were the conceptions of the better known European countries and people. Thus several of the changes are in the direction of greater knowledge and awareness. This increased knowledge has been a broadening experience but cannot be thought of as greatly influencing fundamental beliefs and attitudes.

VII. Evidence for an Ecumenical Orientation and Experience

It has been assumed that the university is one small part in a network of universities which encourage student movements among the various institutions. Thus the Americans in the samples also constitute a small segment in the interaction patterns and networks which constitute this ecumenical pattern. As such it was hypothesised that these persons would have orientations of a worldwide or cosmopolite

nature in contrast to more localite orientations.

Only one person in both the sample and control groups does not report something which has been gained from the interaction with foreign students. Also, almost every respondent in both groups indicates the interaction has produced no disadvantages and consequently all respondents desire further contacts with foreign individuals in the future. However since thirty-three percent of this sample and twenty-seven percent of the control group say they would not like to have known more foreign students during their past university experiences, there is evidence the Americans do not desire to isolate themselves from the American community and develop only international relationships.

Table 16. --Preferred and least preferred national groups for interaction*

National Groups	Interactors with Indians		Interactors with Europeans	
	Preferred groups	Least-preferred groups	Preferred groups	Least-preferred groups
Europe	40%	10%	50%	3%
India-Pakistan	30	10	10	3
Orient	30	10	10	10
Latin America	10	27	13	13
Africa	10	37	7	20
Middle East	3	27	3	20
No preference	30	23	47	33

*Some individuals indicated they would prefer or prefer not to interact with persons from more than one country or area of the world.

The respondents in both groups look at mankind as a community of men in which individuals are a more important unit than nationalities. Almost all feel they would like to remain friends with the foreign students they know best, although their own governments may become antagonists. However only thirty percent of the sample and forty-seven percent of the control group express no preferences in the nationalities of individuals with whom they would prefer to interact, as is shown in Table 16. Not all national groupings are accepted equally and there are distinct preferences in preferred and least preferred national groupings. There is thus not total commitment to an undifferentiated community of men with no distinctions along nationality lines. ✓

The sample group differentiates more between people from various parts of the world than is true with the control group. Thus they are more selective in both the national groups with whom they prefer to associate, as well as the groups they prefer not to encounter. The sample has become more knowledgeable about different parts of the world and the characteristics of the persons from these areas. In many instances the sample is more critical than the control group in evaluating various aspects of foreign cultures and thus more selective in those ecumenical patterns in which they are willing to participate and accept as valid for themselves.

VIII. Implications for Future Studies

There is a need for further studies which explore the development of new cultural forms. Observing the cultural patterns which arise from the interaction of representatives from two or more cultures is possibly the most fruitful means of studying the more general phenomena of culture change. Not only can various traits be traced as they are transferred in some form between the cultures involved, but, as this study has attempted to demonstrate, new cultural patterns can emerge which are not drawn intact from either culture but which represent entirely new forms of interaction which develop from the association.

However when one looks at the forms of interaction which occur between Americans and persons from other countries and notices differences in the behavior of the Americans, it should not immediately be concluded that this represents newly developed cultural patterns. This form of behavior may actually represent American cultural norms, particularly in the beginning stages of the interaction.

The college students have grown up in a world where an awareness of contacts between different countries has become a very real part of their lives. Every citizen is aware to some extent of the involvement of the United States in the affairs of other countries. Along with this increasing involvement has been a debate on how to treat the people in these countries. Even the television news coverage of the

present war often deals with means of dealing with peasants rather than coverage of actual battles.

The students may thus have notions of the proper way to act with foreigners even before he actually associates with them. It is the way that these pre-existing notions of behavior change through interaction which should be of interest for those studying the development of new cultural patterns, rather than simply the recording of different forms of behavior by the Americans when dealing with fellow countrymen and with others. This implies a comparison between those who have associated cross-culturally extensively and those who have not.

This type of study might best be accomplished by working with fewer theoretical issues than were touched upon in the present study. For example, a study of conflict and conflict resolution using Americans who have had prolonged contacts in cross cultural situations may point out that these persons are less restrained in expressing conflict and that the conflict is resolved less often by avoidance of the issues, than is the case with fewer cross-cultural experiences. Such hypotheses need to be tested.

This study indicates that ecological factors are probably the main reason for the initiation of interaction between a foreign student and an American. However such factors certainly do not explain continued association, over extensive periods of time. The long term nature of many of these relationships could be more thoroughly explained by

comparing high and low interactors in similar ecological positions with the foreign students. This essentially requires a control group of persons with similar opportunities to interact but who have not done so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Hewes, Gordon. "The Ecumene as a Civilizational Multiplier System," The Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers. No. 25, (Fall, 1965), 73-110.
- Kroeber, A. L. "The Ancient Oikoumene as a Historical Culture Aggregate," The Nature of Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960, 379-395.
- Useem, John. "The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture," The Centennial Review, Vol. VII, No. 4, 1963.
- _____, Useem, R., and Donoghue, J. "Men in the Middle of the Third Culture: The Roles of American and Non-Western People in Cross-Cultural Administration," Human Organization, Vol. 22, No. 3, Fall, 1963, 169.

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 look first at some general background information about yourself.

1. Sex: Male (25, 25) Female (5, 5)
2. How old are you? Range 21-35
3. Are you married? Yes (7, 5)
If no, are you engaged or pinned? Yes (4, 5)
4. What is your academic standing?
Graduate (24, 24) Undergraduate (6, 6)
5. What is your major? (See Table 1 in the 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 (9, 6)
 - b. suburb (5, 10)
 - c. small city (4, 5)
 - d. large city (12, 9)
9. What is the ethnic background of your family?
European (28, 27)
10. Has your ethnic background created an interest in these countries you have just mentioned or the people from them?
 - a. very important interest, and b. moderate interest (8, 10)
 - c. very little or no interest (21, 20)
 - d. rejection of background (1, 0)

II. Experiences 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	(9, 4)
India	(1, 1)
Other	(7, 8)

b. Why were you there?

mainly as tourists in both samples.

c. How long did you stay?

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.	(16, 26)
b. School related activities	(14, 18)
c. Personal contact with people from other countries who were in USA	(18, 22)
d. Persons in your family who have talked about foreign experiences	(11, 11)
e. Americans outside your family who have talked about foreign experiences	(15, 16)
f. Church related activities	(7, 8)

g. Independent interests (curiosity) (11, 19)

h. Other _____

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

"C" and "A"

Tell me a little about this

Usually in undergraduate school.

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

a. Which ones?	Northern Europe	(14, 21)	India	(5, 3)
	Europe	(8, 14)	Other	(11, 8)
	Total Europe	(16, 24)		

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	(13, 8)
b. More knowledge	(8, 4)
c. More tolerant toward others	(6, 8)
d. Interest	(9, 16)
e. More at ease with others	(7, 5)

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 (26, 29)
- b. Academic (24, 12)
- c. living (20, 5)

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 (13, 24)
- b. Something avoided (17, 6)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

() ()

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why?

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

.	.)
:	.)
.	.)
.	.)
.	.)
.	.)

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

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

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

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

Why?

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

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

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

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

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

Why?

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

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

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

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

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

Why?

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

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 Indian 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. Religion_____

e. Caste_____

f. Academic major_____ Same as the American (14, 9)

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

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

Yes (0, 3)

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

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

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

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

Would you avoid:

- a. taking him to your parents home (2, 1)
- b. inviting him to your home here on campus (1, 0)
- c. participating in or watching sports (0, 0)
- d. movies (1, 0)
- e. eating out (1, 0)
- f. taking him to a party of Americans (5, 1)
- g. dating or double dating (11, 0)

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 (4, 0)

Uncomfortable (9, 0)

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

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

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 (6, 11)

Cold, stoic (0, 2)

Politics (2, 4)

Cultural differences (6, 6)

Nothing (17, 7)

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

Yes (3, 5)

How do you avoid it?

No talking about it (0, 9)

12. Is there anything about yourself that bothers him?

Yes (13, 13)

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

Argued (13, 7)

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

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

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	(14, 24)
Criticisms of his culture	(7, 3)
Criticisms of USA	(3, 1)
Personal problems	(5, 0)
Religion	(4, 2)

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

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

1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2538, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2631, 2632, 2633, 2634, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2639, 2640, 2641, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2649, 2650, 2651, 2652, 2653, 2654, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2659, 2660, 2661, 2662, 2663, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 2668, 2669, 2670, 2671, 2672, 2673, 2674, 2675, 2676, 2677, 2678, 2679, 26

1

Circumstance	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Self-defense	85
To protect others	75
To protect property	65
To protect the community	55
To protect the environment	45

1

1000

100

1000

How do you avoid it?

No talking about it (0, 9)

12. Is there anything about yourself that bothers him?

Yes (13, 13)

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

Argued (13, 7)

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

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

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	(14, 24)
Criticisms of his culture	(7, 3)
Criticisms of USA	(3, 1)
Personal problems	(5, 0)
Religion	(4, 2)

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

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

How do you avoid it?

No talking about it (0, 9)

12. Is there anything about yourself that bothers him?

Yes (13, 13)

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

Argued (13, 7)

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

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

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	(14, 24)
Criticisms of his culture	(7, 3)
Criticisms of USA	(3, 1)
Personal problems	(5, 0)
Religion	(4, 2)

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

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

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

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

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

Yes (8, 13)

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

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

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

Never (21, 23)

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

Yes (19, 20)

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

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

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

Yes	(12, 10)
No	(10, 13)
Possibly	(7, 2)

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 (17, 27)

Cognitive level (25, 18)

Gives credit to person (11, 19)

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

Close friend (22, 19)

Not a close friend (3, 8)

Academic relationship (12, 4)

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

a. None, no difference (17, 16)

b. Not as close (2, 4)

c. Closer (4, 10)

d. More formal (3, 5)

e. Do different things (7, 1)

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 (26, 27)

In what ways?

Have more knowledge about the countries. Strengthened previous views.

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

Yes (19, 23)

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

Yes (18, 17)

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

Understanding	(23, 26)
Friends	(10, 12)
Knowledge	(24, 18)

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

None	(22, 26)
Less content with USA	(0, 4)
Peer criticism	(5, 0)

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

The rewards are much greater then the disadvantages

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	(5, 13)
b. Your own religious views	(4, 2)
c. U.S. values and policies	(19, 22)
d. Economic systems	(6, 16)
e. Kinship and family	(9, 9)
f. Dating and marriage	(8, 7)
g. Your own personal views	(11, 4)
h. Other _____	

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

a. Travel	(16, 15)
b. Study abroad	(4, 8)
c. Peace corps	(1, 2)
d. Courses	(8, 6)
e. Learn language	(11, 11)
f. Vocation	(4, 3)
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 (19, 21)

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?

No - all respondents.

9. How would you describe yourself?

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

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

