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## ABSTRACT

SOCIAL SIMILARITY, THE AMERICAN MILIEU AND FOREIGN STUDENT SOCIAL INTERACTION

## by R. Satyanarayana

The general hypothesis to be tested is that similarity of background of foreign students with their American Milicu will make for greater interaction of these students with Americans than dissimilar backgrounds. Situational factors in the United States such as dormitory versus offcampus living, length of stay, degree of favorable attitudes, age, marital status, and the major field of study, are also manipulated and run against degrees of interaction. The total sample consisted of all the Indian students enrolled at Michigan State University in the spring quarter of 1966. (N. = 92). In all cases of testing the influence of various background and situational factors on the degree of interaction, the hypothesis was substantiated.
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The study of a foreign person's encounter with a cultural environment different from his own has a distinct and valuable place in suciological research. How a person (stranger) interacts when he encounters a different culture has been an issue which has held the curiosity and interest of sociologists ever since George Simmer. ${ }^{1}$

A glance at the research done on foreign students in America shows that there is no well-established body of theory on the cross-cultural interaction oi foreign students in a host society. Scientific understanding of cross -cultural interaction necessitates the development of such a theory. Yet, very little is known about the factors which have direct effect on foreign students' interaction in a host society. Among the various questions winch have emerged in the realm of cross -cultural interaction, the present research is limited to the study of several quesLions relevant to the interaction of Indian students within the American society.

Specifically, this study is primarily concerned with the relationship between the socio-economic and urban backgrounds of Indian students at home and their interaction within American society. A limited study such as this, however, cannot :nciertake the task of developing an elanborate theory of cross-cuitura! infraction. Instead, I am concerned with testing certain hypotheses. Nevertheless, the results cold give impetus for further research and thus right contribute to the formulation of such a theory.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Georg Simmer, "The Stranger" in The Sociology oi George. Simmer. Edited and translated by Kurt Wolf, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

In addition to social-scientific concerns, much of the importance of such a study lies in its pragmatic value. For instance, effective interaction between foreign students and Americans is crucial in appraising the success or failure of the exchange experience.

## RELATED EMPIRTCAL STLDIES

Previous studies which have dealt with questions similar to those considered in the present research have been inadequate in so far as they have nut focused on specific and relevant behavioral factors. In most uf the se studies the miin concerns were generaily of three kinds: (a) concontration on changes occurring in foreign stidents over a period of time as a resuit of their sojotern experience, (h) issues reiated to the prob1.ons and diffeultirs of foreign students while thev are in America, and (c) attitudinal dnd environental faciori affecting foriegn students' adjuctmeats in American socite $\mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{i}}$ In the last instanco, most studies have focused mity in a minor way on rivirmental and time factors found to influence the inaraction of foreign students with Anericans.

Murris' stady of foruizn students at the Eniversity on Caiforaia 1t Lus Angeies found that forem studnts develop incroasingiy intense socid relatians will Amerieses wer therend on thein stav in America. ${ }^{2}$


${ }^{1}$ Rohert H. Shefier and Teo R. Whwing, Foreig. Soudents and Their
 p. 22.

Tucwiy muzwas:
${ }^{2}$ Richard T. Moritin Nationo States in Foreign Students' Adjustment (Minneapulis: Linicersity of Manesota Pross, 1960), p. 215.
${ }^{3}$ Cited in dilutre Sulitiz. tit di. Altitude and Sucial Reiations of Foreign Students in the United States (Minneapolis: liniversity of Minnesota Press, 1963), pp. 65-66.
done on foriegn students at Cornell University, lends additional support to the foregoing hypothesis. In contrast to these findinys, in a study conducted by Lambert and Bressicr on Indian students, ${ }^{2}$ it was observed that the Indian students were more ager to meet Americans during their first year of stay. Moreover, after their first year, their social relations with Americans decreased as their length of stay increased. Ciearly, Lambert and Bressler's findings do not conform to the findings of Selltiz and Morris, and therefore, pose a problem in arriving at an empirical generalization in this regard.

Besides the foregning variable, "lemgth of stay," the researcin has also investigated the benavioral effects of varying environmentai conditions. Stlitiz found that type af living arrangements have a bearing on interaction as they provide opportmities which facilitate to varying degrees social ralations betwerifore:gin students and Americans. Specificaliy, she forbd that for, ign studonts have more social relations with Americans wion :her lire in a burst or resideoce where Americans alsu live. ${ }^{3}$ Goldsen states that the foreign stadents who stay in university domitories have more sociai reiations with Americans than do the stidents who live in off-campus housing.
${ }^{1}$ Ibid.
2Richard Lambor: sud Marvin feressier, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapulis: University , Minnesota Press, 1956).
${ }^{3}$ Selletiz, 当 al. op.cit., p. 103.
${ }^{4}$ Ibid., pre 103-003.

Other variables have also been investigated. For example, Sowell and Davidson ${ }^{1}$ studied 40 Scandinuvian students and found that the Scandinavians who have more conthit with Americans scored high on an index comprising the following items: (a) leess foreign looking, (b) higher English speaking ability, (c) hisher socio-economic status at home, (d) more urban residential background, (e) more prior contact with Americans, and (f) more likely to be in liberal arts than in the phyical and biological sciences. Also in other research, previous foreign experience, willingness to become acquainted with Americans, English speaking ability, dad world arta from which the student cane, have heen considered as infitemets on foreign student interaction with Americans. Most findings, howere, have been socia! psochoiogical. They have been generully concirned with the relationship butween attitudinal characteristies of forrign students toward Anerica and the foreign experiences and attitudes of Americans interucting with hreisn students as they hoth affect intensity of interation. Mais research, however, diffors from most prior stadies in that focuses primarily on the social background of the foreign studenes rathor than ni morica:s, lowing at the behavioral outUn. of this.

THOM: AND HYpOHESES
The fundinnatal wempition of this research is that in so far as two or more social milicus ar, simiar, an individual moving 1 rom one milien to anther wif tend thenterat within the wer more frequatly

[^0]than if the milieux in question were dissimilar. The problem of concern nere will involve the testing of this hypothesis with a sample Indian students studying at Michism State University. It will determine the oxtent to which their interaction wilh Americans increases as a function of the similarity of their Indian hacliground with that of their Amerjoan situation.

To determine the similarity of the social background of Indiar students to that of American "society," the following American model, constructed for the purpose of comparisun, will be postulated. The American sitration is viewed as a highly urbanized culture in which mosi orcupations are of an urban rather than rural type. Most ot the families in this culture belong to middle income groups, and the majority of people are reiativeiy will educated. Thus, if an Indian student comes from a larife city, if his Eather has a relatively substantial education, a good income, and an uixan faller inan rural wecupation, the student is considered as having bachermend simildy to the American comempart.

The sample of lndians wi:l he divided into two groups: thase who (in their backgrounds) art most Iikn and those who are least like Americans. ${ }^{1}$ On the hatis af this, the hop ithesis will be tested as to whether there is higher jateraction ai andian students as a function of degree of similarity of hatckramd with that wimericans. Each ont of the four hackground factors (parents' woupation, parents' income, parents' educotion, and the sizu of the (own from which the respondent came) is aiso

[^1]tested independently in order to determine how much influenco each factor relatively has on Indian students' interaction with Americans.

Based on the review of those studies which have investigated environmental factors and their impact on foreign students' interaction, certain diypotheses have boer developed to be tested. These are: (i) Eureign stadents who inve a more favorable attilude toward Anericans wiil tend io interact more with them, (2) ioreign students who liv: in dormjtories intoract mor: with Americans than the students whu live in off-campus residences, (i) Life axtent of foruisit students' intoraction with Anericans incrobes with the longth of stiy in Ameice, and (4) social soienor stur dunts interate more with Americans than natural seience studeats. Asicte
 status might buve some inflame wh inturaction within an alien society.
 with Ameribans then wuid lint married sudents, and (b) the younger in


BESLCN

The sutfects ut this star rowsistod of all the Indi me studente en-




 EAst Lansing, ,itmer in miversity residences, university marriod housing, or off-cimpus rooms and aparments.

The questionatires were administered to each individual directly, in my presence. Alter the questionnaite had bean answered, 1 verified that every item was properly completed. Help was limited to clarirying ine wording and meaning of various questions.

About 18 students did not answer the questionnaire. Among the 18 , cight of them did not wish to answer it, two of them had gone back to Indid for a short visit, one of them was in England, four of them coujd not otherwist be reached, in spite of every effort, and the addresses of the remaining three students could not be traced as they were living in other cities.

Information on both sucio-economic background at home, and interution with Americans was elicited ds responses to clused-tadrd questions (S.et questionnaire in Appendix). In forstions referring tu participation "r interaction with Amuricans, the stadents were asked how olten they ungaged in edah actirity with Antricats. In order to get specific estimates to frequency of interaction with imericans, the studtint was asked (i) answer for ach activity whether la had taken part in it every day, more than once a weok, ran a week, owe a month, or never. For certain quesieions, the respondent wits askud wrother he had participated very
 \& Mpiled from severil itoms at partioipation in American life. Soures were given on wery isen iquestion) ranging from 0 upwards. By conputing tine mean of all scores, the total number ir students was divided into two graps, thase havim high am those having low interaction.

Questions win ote required preleruatial ordering and ranking of items given wer: asked to examine the Indians' desire for participaiing in
various activitios :ither witi Anericans, ion-Americans, Indians from own stace, Indians in general, or other foreign students. Degret of preference Lor interaction with Americins was indicated by scoring from one to seven, seven being the groatest prefuence. Various activities such as preference 1.. study with, to spend free time, to date, to discuss problems, and preferences for a roommate, wert asked of the students. One point was riven for each time an American was the first choice. On the basis of total scores for each persun an all the questions of preference, every respondent was placed either as having a high, moderate, or low prefereme. With regard $u$ sucio-economic background of subjects to separate cuses similar and dissimilar to that of American milieu, scores were givan on each al four backgromad factors (father's income, father's education, father's occupation and the sizu of the town wf subject's youth). The scoring progressed on tad item from one point upwards for each degre $n f$ similarity oi Indian hackground to that of the American militu. Ihe higher the sene, the more simibar their backeround is to that imp:ted for Americans with whon thre are likoly to interact. When considering these catogories in combination, those who scored high on this unit are truated as highly similar to dmericans: the remainder comprise the ieast similar group.

The data emerging fron the tabulation of the questionnatere responses were analyzed only with respect to consistency in the direction of and relationship between the variables concerned. Hence, when findings are said to be significant, a statistical meaning is not intended but rather unitorm consistercy. The general hypothesis is rejected if greather consistency is not found between similarity ni socio-economic background of

Indian students with imputed typical American background and higher interaction. The same is the cast with all the subordinate hyputheses involved.

## OESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

The following seven tahies describe pertinent background characteristies of the subjects of this stidy, all of whom are graduate students with the exception of two undergraduates. A detailed examination of the diruct retevance of some of thest characteristics to the main thesis (ar interaction) is presented in the stetion on findings.

The tabies preseated below describe the distrit ion of respordents according $\mathfrak{G}$ soin-tconomic backsround of parents, the size of the place where respondent spent his youth, the major fields ot study, age, and the Pacr of rusidenco at Michinan State University.

TABLE : - Nimber dma per Cent by Income Levels of the Fathers of Indian Strderts at M.S.i.

| [ncorme | Number | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| i. Under tooor Rupees | (22) | 23.9 |
| $\therefore$ : $0000-8000$ Ruperes | (24) | 26.1 |
| 3. inpoj-10,000 Rupues | (12) | 13.0 |
| 4. 10, 000-12. Un Rupees | ( 8) | 8.7 |
| 3. j2,000-14,000 Rıpeos | ( 8) | 8.7 |
| $\therefore$ (ryer $1+000$ Ritpeci | (18) | 19.6 |
| Tintal | (92) | 100.0 |

In this sump. hal: iol the familios art within some portion of the :roup whose Eatiers' income falis somewhere between 4000 to 8000 Rupees.

The remiander falls in middle income group (80()0-12,000) and upper income group (12,000 and over).

TABLE 2 - Number aid Per Cent ri Indian Students at M.S.l. by Occupationai Levels of the Fathers

| Type of Occupation | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1. Proftssional | $(28)$ | 30.4 |
| 2. Management (executive, business owner) | $(24)$ | 26.1 |
| 3. Clerical or Ofíce Worker (government) | $(17)$ | 18.5 |
| 4. Sales | $(3)$ | 3.3 |
| 5. Services | $(2)$ | 2.2 |
| 6. Farming | $(18)$ | 19.6 |

The majurity oi fachers of the Indians at Michignn State University Are professionals. Second, third, and fourth in rank are mandgerial, tarming, ciurical, and govermant of ice workers, respectively. As Table 2 shows. perentages aro wery small in either sales or service occupstiond catubories.

The largest number of students come laom the largost oitios, that is, of over 500 , un population (sea Table 3). However, thare are abarly omethird when com, from smat toms. cisied villages, in India. The snal lest number ai students cone from cowis having a popalation of 10,000 to 20,000. Onthe whoic. the majority of the students cin he said to have come from urban areas.

Kegarding socio-economic hackground (fathor's income), the results Aisclose that ad for students can be said to have come from midde-class families. Acoording to standacds oi ii $\because$ ing in lndid those who earn from

3000 to 14,000 Rupees would fall within some portion of tho middle-class (lower-middle, middie-middle, upper-middle). In this study no fathers or Indian students were making iess tian 3000 rupere. With respect to the education and occupation of parents, the data shows that the majority of fathers have relatively good educai ions and aiso are mostly engaged in some kind of urban occupation.

PABLE 3 - Number and Per Cent of the Indian Students at M. S.U. by Size of Town in Whish They Spent Their Youth

| Size of the Town (Popuiation) | Nutiober | Perceintage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Inder 5000 | (15) | 15. 3 |
| 2. 5000 to 10,000 | (10) | 10.9 |
| 3. i0,000 to 20,000 | ( 3) | 3.3 |
| 4. 20,000 te 50,000 | ( 8) | 3.7 |
| 5. 50,000 to 100,000 | (i!) | 12.0 |
| 6. 100.000 t: 300,000 | (15) | 16.3 |
| 7. (rvar 500,000 | (30) | 32.6 |
| Total | (92) | 100.0 |

As fable + indicatos, aboat four wo ot ten of the fathers of the subjects of this sampie aje coilear oi unjversity graduates. About one thifd have had some high school ducation or have a high achooi certifi-
 mentary sclood.

There ar: mor: anginetina stubanls in the sample (see Table 5) than studants in any ather field of stady. India's urgent necd for specialists of this kind is reflected in the predominance of applied science students wer the number of Lidians studyine mon-applied subjects.

TABLE 4 - Number and Per Cent of Indian Students at M.S.U. by Educational Levels of Fathers

| Level of Education | Number | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Elementary school | (10) | 10.9 |
| 2. Sume high schuol | (15) | 16.3 |
| 3. High school graduate | (15) | 16.3 |
| 4. Some college | (13) | 14.1 |
| 5. College or miniversity graduate | (39) | 42.4 |
| Total | (92) | 100.0 |

TABLE 5 - Number and Per Cent of Indian Students at M. S.U. by Major Field of Study

| Fiuld ot Study | Number | Purcentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Sucial Sciuncos | ( 9) | 9.8 |
| 2. Business Administration | (21) | 22.8 |
| 3. Edracation | ( 3) | 3.3 |
| + Lancuages | ( 1) | 1.1 |
| j. Matheratics; Paysical, Natural or Voterinam Sciences | (26) | 28.3 |
| 6. Ensinuerims | (23) | 25.0 |
| 7. Asricuiture | ( 6) | 6.5 |
| *. Food Scionce | ( 3) | 3.3 |
| [0: 11 | (42) | 100.0 |

Nearly half of the student: are between the ages or 25-29. The seeond largest age er a!p is wompisci ot those $20-24$ vears aíage. Only two students are above the are of 40 . Table 6 also shows that 90 per cent of the sample ar. ahove the age of 24 years. Almost twothirds of the stradents are bejow the are of 29. Twenty-nine students are above the dge or 29.

TAKLE 6 - Number and Per Cent of Indian Students at M.S.U. According to Age

| Age | Number | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1. 20-24 years | $(20)$ | 21.7 |
| $2.25-29$ years | $(43)$ | 46.7 |
| $3.30-34$ years | $(16)$ | 17.4 |
| $4.35-39$ years | $(11)$ | 12.0 |
| 5.40 years or more | $(2)$ | 2.2 |

The majority of the students reside either in apartments in towa or in the graduate residence hall (see Table 7) Roums in private homes A:ad university married housing are also larg. caterorius. As would be -xpected among students prodominantly of graduate status, oniy three stodents live in an moderaruduate domitory. Thert is almost an equal
 respectively.

TABLE 7 - Number and Pur Cunt of Indian Students at M.S.U. by Various Types of Residerice

| Residence | Nimber | Percentage |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1. Graduate rusidence hall | $(26)$ | 28.3 |
| 2. Undergradrate datmitury | $(2)$ | 3.3 |
| 3. Apartment in town | $(26)$ | 28.3 |
| 4. Room in private hame | $(19)$ | 20.7 |
| 5. University married housing | $(18)$ | 19.6 |

Having the distribution of the subjects with respect to particuiar background varables, it is now possible to examine the relationship of these variables to degee of interaction.

In Table 8 the students who sored high on an index made on four background factors (father's income, father's occupational status. father's -ducation, and the size of the town of subject's youth) art considered di having a backgroma highiy similar to the Antrican milicu and the reverse is true of students who scored low. ${ }^{1}$
table 8 - Interaction with Americans by Simjlarity oi Backsromd

| Stmidarity | Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hi ふろ! |  | Low |  | Total |  |
|  | No. | $\because$ | Ni. | $\%$ | No. | \% |
| High | (31) | 63 | (18) | 37 | (49) | 100 |
| Lew | (15) | 35 | (28) | 65 | (4) | 100 |
| Total | (46) | 30 | (46) | 50 | (42) | 100 |

In this table (Table 8 ) nearly twice as many lndian students with backgrounds highly similar to the impeted American background ad higher interaction as dici those students who wore less similar. This would indicate that there is a strong reationship between similarity of hackground
${ }^{1}$ In order to detrmiat the socibeconomic hackeround or subjects,
 cion, father's income father's xamption, and the size of the town of respondent's youth. The soming increases as the leved of tather's eduation, leval of fathor's income arian character of tather's occupation, and the size of tix town rimponden's youth incrases. The higher the composite scovi, the more similar they are sadd to be to American ifite.
of Indian students to that of their Amerisan social milieu and their interactions with Americans. Thus the major: hypothesis that the extent of foreign students' interaction with Ancricans increases as a function of the similarity of their bickground with that of their American situation, is substantiated here.

Having presentud evidence which shows a strong relationsinip between background factors in total, and interaction within the host society (American), let us now examine to what extent each one of the se four components (factors) of background independently alfects interution of Indian students with Americans. Then we can determine which factors have the greater effect on interaction.

Each of thest following four factors (father's edacation, father's income Cather's occupation and the size of the town of subject's youth) is considered in a mianr ur sub-proposition tested to ind out the degree of relationsh!pto interactuon within Arurican society. These minor propositions aro: (1) the extent of forcigr stodent's interaction with Americans increases as the lather's iovel of education increases, (2) the degret of foreign students' interactinn increases as a function of increasing income of his father, (3) the interaction ut ladian students incroases il they come irm larger cilies in India, and (4) foreign students' interaction with Ancrians incroases if their fathers are engaged in urban rather: that ruril secupation.

Table 9 indicates that the highee the father's educational level, the larger is the perembabe of Indian studnnts who have greater interaretion with Allericans. Oniy 28 per cent of those students whose fathers had elementary or some high schooi tducation interacted highly, while
roper cent of those students wone fathers had a hifh schoni certiaicate wr some coliegu education, and b't per cent of those students whose tathers had a college degrev, interiotedhighly. This supports the minor proposition that the extent of iatroaction increases as lather's levol of i Jucation advances.

Jable 9 - Interaction with Amulicans by Father's Education

| Edicational Background | Interaction |  |  |  | Tulat |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hich |  | Low |  |  |  |
|  | No. | \% | No | \% | N:. | i |
| Elem+ntary scimol or somet high sohood | ( 7) | 29 | (18) | 72 | (25) | 1010 |
| it:ath school and some coilree | (14) | 50 | (14) | 30 | (28) | 100 |
| Colleut graduate | (25) | 6.4 | (14) | 35 | (39) | 100 |
| Lotal | $(1+n)$ | 50 | $(26)$ | 50 | ( 42 ) | 100 |

The direct bearine wisic: the dwree af education has upan the degree
 pothesis. Aise compatilnte with unt hypuliosis are thores:i:s of the

 whose fathers had a riataveiv high inoume (above k, uou Ruperes) interacted more highty than did thost stadents whose fathers' incomes were

 per cent of thons students whos: fabers heinng co the lawer income
category, incurdeced highiy. Thas it is seen that there is a relationslip between father's coonomic backgromd and ladian students interacian with Americans.

TABLE 10 - Intoraction with Ancricans is Father's Income

| Income | Interaction |  |  |  | Tota! |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High |  | Low |  |  |  |
|  | No. | \% | No. | $\%$ | No. | $?$ |
| Less than 8,000 Rupees | (15) | 33 | (31) | 67 | (46) | (i0 |
| $8.000-12.000$ | (15) | 75 | ( 5) | 25 | (20) | 100 |
| 12,000-14,000 and over | (16) | $6 i$ | (10) | 38 | (26) | 100 |
| T.ial | (46) | 50 | (46) | 30 | (92) | 100 |

The impact of the sise of home town (Table ll) is in a similar direction with a signiiicant derie ot retations!if.

TABLE $1:$ - Interaction with dmericon Students hepolation of Home Town

| Population | Inturaction |  |  |  | Totdi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hight |  | Low |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Nu. | ! | No. | $\%$ |
| 0.000 or less | (2) | (i) | (37) | 60 | (62) | 100 |
| Over 50,000 | (こ) | $i$ | ( 9) | 30 | (30) | 100 |
| Futal | (4) | 31 | (46) | ; 0 | (92) | 100 |

Indian stadent from cilies of over jo,000 population interacted with dmericans to a considerably higner degree than those students who
came from towns of 30,000 or less. Seventy per cent of thase studunts Who came from towns or over 50,000, as oppesed to 40 per cent of those students who came from the towns of 50,000 or 1 ess pupulation, iateracted hiuhly. The results in Table 11 sagetst a strong relationship between the size of the home cown of ladian students and degree of their interaction with Anericans.

A similar oulcome is seen in Table 12; here a strung relationship between types of occupations of fathers of Indian students and their interaction with Anericans is revealed. The Indian students whose fathers ielonged to clerical, sales and service professions had greater interaction to pro[essinal and mandeement jobs and those whose lathers belong Lo famine ncoupdtions. The students whose lathers are tarmers had the brast inturaction.

TABLE 12 - Interaction by Fathers' Occupational Status

| Occupatinad Status | Interaction |  |  |  | Tulal |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hish |  | Lいい |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ |
| Professional and Mandsement | (25) | $\therefore 8$ | (27) | $\because$ | ( 52 ) | $: 00$ |
| Giuridai, Sales and Sereiu. | (1+) | 64 | ( 8 ) | 37 | ( $\because 2$ ) | 100 |
| Firming | ( 7 ) | 39 | (il) | 61 | (i8) | 100 |
| [utal | ( $4+6$ ) | 50 | (46) | 50 | (92) | 100 |

The clerical and sates catwory (highly urban in India) and the idmang categnry reidenced apousite degrees of interaction with Anericans, farmers' sons haviag considerably low interaction. The profossional and
mandgement catogory falis hetwern these two categories in degree of interaction. Sixty-on per went of those students whosu fathers belonerd to either clerical, sulus amd service or professinnal, and managament professions, as compared t. 39 per cent of those students whose tathers betonged to farming professiwns, interacted high; consequentiy, this proposition has proved to bu independently influtntial on interaction.

Concluding, fron the above ovidence, it appears that there is a We ifnite relationsinip betwern the Indian students' social background fhow similar to that of the American) and their interaction in a host soriety (American). This pattern merged from the responses given in iotal as woll as in each individual component factor of the backeround of indian students.

Thus, havins tustec fhe validity of the general hyputhesis, we will now turn $i 6$ the hypothases which concern several sitational dad otion factors such as the reiationships becweon ladian studtats desired interaction and their actas intaraction.

As wo assmeri, ine hyputhesis wheh duals with the extent ot ladian students' preturence for Autrisd: life and their derte of interac:ion lias been suppritred. Taid. is malicates a positive relalionsisip between Indian studene: dugre oi proference for American ifo and the degree いt stated inturaction. Suvant-right per cent ut Lhe students af high preferince as mposed to 37 frr cent of the luw preference aromp, interacted highly.

In previons stacies the efiect of the interaction potentiai of living arrangements an the develop: nt ol social relations hetwern foreign students and Americrans was investiguted. Mer resujt ol this researeh with
regard to typu of residence and its effects on interaction is in the same direction as provious studies. Sulltiz, et al. ${ }^{1}$ found that tiou dormitory is one of the most conducive piaces for creating social reiations between foreign and Amrican students. The dormitory situation had either high or mediam inluraction-potential. Goldsen ${ }^{2}$ (1955) in. her study of [oreign students at Cornell, reported that thost who live in dormitories had higher interaction with Americans than thost students who live otf campus. The Indian students (Table lit) who live in domitories have greater interation with Americans than those students wino iive in olf-campus housin; and university married housing. Seventy-two per cent of the Indian students who live in durmiturites des opposed to +u per cent of the Indian students living in ofi-campus or university married housing, interatted !nghiv. Anner thuse who live in oti-campus housing and university mariixd student housing, the former interacted nore than the stidents wlon lived in married housing.

TABLE 13 - Interaction by Destee $\quad 1$ Prificrence

| Deyret of Preferemer | lateraction |  |  |  | Fintai |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hi $\mathrm{L}_{2}$ |  | L. ${ }^{\text {W }}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Nu. | $\%$ | Nu. | $\%$ | $\therefore$ 碞 | \% |
| High | (i5) | 79 | ( i ) | $\therefore 1$ | (i9) | 100 |
| Moderite | (1: ) | 57 | (9) | 43 | (21) | 100 |
| Luw | ( $L^{\circ}$ ) | 37 | (33) | 63 | (52) | 100 |
| Totai | (46) | 50 | (4, ${ }^{\text {) }}$ | 50 | (92) | 100 |
| ${ }^{1}$ SulItiz, etal | , p | 03. |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 14 - Interaction with Americans by the Type of Residence

| Residence | Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High |  | Low |  | Total |  |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| Dormitory | (21) | 72 | ( 8) | 28 | (29) | 100 |
| Off-campus | (19) | 42 | (26) | 58 | (45) | 100 |
| University married housing | ( 6) | 33 | (12) | 67 | (18) | 100 |
| Total | (46) | 50 | (46) | 50 | (92) | 100 |

Probably the reason for this is that the Indian students who live in married student housing spend most of their free time with their families. Off-campus students do not have the dormitory conditions of "mixed" and "forced" student interaction which would have a tendency to further interaction.

Table 15 shows that those students who stayed in America one year or more interacted more highiy than those students who have been in the U.S. less than a year. Morris ${ }^{1}$ and Selltiz, et al..$^{2}$ also found, in their studies of foreign students in America, that the longer the foreign student stays in America, the more he interacts with Anericans. These [indings are consistent with our results.

In order to discover the relationship between academic major and interaction, all academic majors were classified into two groups. The group of social science included social science, business administration,

[^2]${ }^{2}$ Ibid.
education and language majors. The group of natural science included mathematics, statistics, physicai science, natural sciences, veterinary science, engineering, agriculture, and food science.

TABLE 15 - Interaction with Americans by Duration of Stay

| Duration of Stay | Interaction |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High |  | Low |  |  |  |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| Less than year | (10) | 25 | (30) | 75 | (40) | 100 |
| One year or more | (36) | 69 | (16) | 31 | (52) | 100 |
| Total | (46) | 50 | (46) | 50 | (92) | 100 |

More social science majors interacted highly than did natural science majors. Sixty-twn per cent (Table 16) as compared to 43 per cent of sucial science students interacted higlily, while 57 per cont of the natural science studeats, as opposed to 38 pur cent oi social science students interacted low. Morris ${ }^{1}$ alsu found that his resuarci on foreign studunts at U.C.L.A. that foreign students who are in social sciences made more friends than the students who are in natural sciences. Tios difference in the degre of interaci io: letween these two catemories of students might be due to the differences in the nature of their fields oi specialization or to other variables which caniot be controlied in this study such as length of stay.
${ }^{1}$ Murris, op.cit., F. 118.

TABLE 16 - Interaction with Americans by Major Field of Study

| Major Field of Study | Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High |  | Low |  | Total |  |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| Social Science | (21) | 62 | (13) | 38 | (34) | 100 |
| Natural Science | (25) | 43 | (33) | 57 | (58) | 100 |
| Total | (46) | 50 | (46) | 50 | (92) | 100 |

As might be expected, more unmarried students interacted highiy than did the married students. This is probably due to the fact that married students generally have less free time to spend with others outside of the family.

Table 17 shows that 59 per cent of those who were single had high interaction, and only 39 per cent of those who were married interacted highly, substantiating the hypothesis that the single students interact more than the married ones.

TABLE 17 - Interaction with Americans by Marital Status

| Marital Status | Interaction |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High |  | Low |  |  |  |
|  | No. | \% | No. | \% | No. | \% |
| Married | (16) | 39 | (25) | 61 | (41) | 100 |
| Single | (30) | 59 | (21) | 41 | (51) | 100 |
| Total | (46) | 50 | (46) | 50 | (92) | 100 |

With regard to age and interaction, our guess would be that younger Indian students have higher interaction than those who are older. Fiftysix per cent (Table 18) of those who were 29 years or age or less as compared to 38 per cent of those who were 30 years or less interacted hishly. This would indicate that the lower the age of an Indian student, the more he tends to interact with Americans. However, age, in most cases, is related to nther variables which indirectly have contributed to the resuits of Table 18. For instance, younger students are more likely to not be married and thus, in a sense, are forced to interact more (see Table 17). Moreover, unmaried students have a greater likelihood of living in a domitury, a factor which has already been indicated as making for greater inceraction.

TABLE 18 - Interaction with Americans by Age uf Respondent

| Age | Interaction |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High |  | Low |  |  |  |
|  | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ | No. | $\%$ |
| 29 years or less | (3) ) | 56 | (28) | 44 | (63) | 100 |
| 30 years or more | (1i) | 38 | ( 18 ) | 62 | (29) | 100 |
| Total | (46) | ju | (46) | 50 | (92) | 100 |

## IMPLICATIONS

As previously stated, the general hypothesis relating to social similarity and interaction was tested in its totality (of social simiiarjty) as well ds in its individual components (father's income, fatior's occupational status, father's education, and the size of the home town).

The division into such components, i.e. substructuring of the general hypothesis intu subordinate propositions, made feasible the possibility of testing the general hypothesis in more specific terms.

The approach used to test the overall validity of our general hypothesis involved a reverse procedure, a working backward from the results through each of the minor propositions. This more or less additive process leads to positive conclusions about the general hypothesis. Consequently, the proposition of social similarity enhancing interaction, as it reiates to findings stated in the above section, is upheld.

Also, the investigation regarding the situational and environmental factors (place of residence, marital status, degree of preference for American lift, academic :ajor, duration of stay, and age) consistently tanered as being consistent with the expected results.

Among the situationai idctors, duration of stay and place of residence had a considerablu etbet on iomjon students' interaction in this study as well as previotis studies. These two idctors, occurring after the student has urrived in Lhe l's., may be operating to change the relationsinip betwern the independent variable (social backgrome of lndian student) and the dependent wariabie (iateraction), i.e., factors that between the arrival of the shlert and the administration of the questionnaire nay have inureased or decereased the process of interaction. These should have been used as controis when running the background variables against interaction. However, the number of cases in our sample was too small to mak. possible such an operation. Further research of this kind should tak into consideration this problem of size of sample and the use of control variables.
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The following is a questionnaire designed to study some aspects of the behavior uf foreign studentes--particularly those from India--with respeci to important social characteristics of their background. The information collected will be kept in confidence and used solely for the purpose of restarch.

Part I: Please answer the following questions according to the response choices at the right.
i. How often would you estimate that you visited American homes in tine last six munchs?

$$
\text { No. } \%
$$

a. (3) 3 More than unce per week
b. (11) 12 Once at wetik
c. $(25) \quad 27$ Once a moath
d. (41) its Karuly
e. (12) i3 Never
2. How many tines would jou estinate that you normally visit American students' rooms or apartientis per month?
a. (7) 8 Over 20 times
b. (6) 6 10-20 titus
c. (i6) 17 5-10 times
d. $\quad 420 \quad 46 \quad 1-5$ timus
e. (21) 23 Din mot visit at ail
3. In a usual week, how often would you estimate that American students visit your room or apartment?
a. (9) 10 Over 10 times
b. (7) 8 5-10 times
c. (50) 54 1-5 times
d. (26) 28 None
4. How often would you estimate that you have had dinner or lunch with American students in the last month?
a. (20) 22 Very often
b. (12) 13 Often
c. (34) 37 Sometimes
d. (12) 13 Rarely
e. (14) 15 Never
5. How often would you estimate that you have dated American girls?
a. (5) 5 Very often
b. (9) 10 Often
c. (7) 8 Sometimes
d. (13) 14 Rarely
e. (54) 59 Never
6. How often do you gn to dances with American friends?
a. (3) 3 Very often
b. (4) 4 Often
c. (16) 17 Sometimes
d. (15) 16 Rarely
e. (52) 56 Nev.r
7. How often do you normally go to movies with American friends?
a. (2) 2 Very often
b. (10) 11 Often
c. (21) 23 Sometimes
d. (30) 33 Rarely
e. (27) 29 Never
8. In problems or questions involving your school work, whom do you usually consult?
a. (24) 26 Anericans
b. (10) 11 Indians
c. (1) 1 Other foreign students
d. (31) 34 Both Ancricans and Indians
e. (26) 28 Americans, Indians and other foreign students
9. How often do you estimate that you converse with American students in your classes?
a. (45) 49 Very often
b. (30) 33 Often
c. (15) 16 Somotimes
d. (1) 1 Rarely
e. (1) 1 Never
10. What part of your frec time (approximately) do you spend with Americans? (ln dining ball, iounges, social events, in conversation after dances, on dites, talking about the problems in your schoo! wirk, talking about politics, etc.)
a. (16) 17 Most of the time
b. (13) 14 More than hali
c. (20) 22 to $t$ time
d. (36) 39 Less thin 交 time.

ध. (7) 8 None
11. a) Do you sometimes go to bars to have a drink?
(53) 58 Yes (39) 42 No
b) If yes, do you generally go:
a. (16) 17 Mostly with Americans
b. (17) 18 Equally with Americans and Indians
c. (17) 18 Mostly with Indians
d. (3) 3 Mostly with other foreign students
12. a) While in the United States, have you been to church?
(61) 66 Yes (3i) $3{ }^{\prime}$ No
b) If yes, how often have you gone to church?
a. (5) 5 Very often
b. (3) 3 oft:n
c. (19) 21 Sonetimes
d. (34) 37 Rarely

## Part II

ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AT THE RIGHT

1. Rank the following from 1 to 3 according to which you would preier doing. (1 being the most preferred)
a) Attending a foreign stident party
b) American students social gathering
c) Indian students social gathering
2. If you had an opportunity to invite someone to visit your home in India, would you prefer to invite someone from:
a) United States
b) Your own country
c) Persons from another foreign country
3. If you were given an upportunity, would you choose to remain in the United States alter your studies or return to India?
a) Remain in the U.S.
b) Return to India
4. In doing the following things, do you prefer to do them with feilow Indians from your own state in India, Indians in general, other foreign stadonts, or Ambricans. Check your preference-number in order of peeference fro: 1 to 4 ( 1 heing the most preferred).
a) To study wi.th:
a. Indian students from your own state $\qquad$
b. Indians in general $\qquad$
c. Other foreign studerits $\qquad$
d. Anerican students
b) To spend your iree time with:
a. Indian students from your own state $\qquad$
b. Indians in general
c. Other [oreigin stadents
d. American studeats
c) To discuss your problems with:
a. Indiar students from your own state
b. Indians in general
c. Other foreign students
d. American students
d) For roomates:
a. Indian students from your own state
b. Indians in general
c. Other foreign students
d. American students
e. Dating:
a. Indian students from your own state $\qquad$
b. Indians in general
c. Other foreign students
d. American students

Purt III

## RESPONDENT'S PERSONAL BACKGROUND

i. Where do you live? (check one)
a. Graduate rusidence hall (Owen Hail)
b. Apartment in town
c. Undergradiale dormitory
d. Koum in a private home
e. University marriud housing
2. a) Do you have a rommate? yes $\qquad$ no $\qquad$
b) If you have a rommate, what is his nationality? $\qquad$
3. What is your age: $\qquad$
4. Sex: mat, $\qquad$ Feale $\qquad$
S. From whict: state in India did you come? $\qquad$
6. Whit is your mother tiongue? $\qquad$
7. Other than your nother tonght, whut other Indian languages can vou sp.al:?

1. $\qquad$
2. $\qquad$
3. $\qquad$
4. Previous to your preseriu residen is ricorded ahove, what other places buve vor !ive! in'

b. Apartment in town
c. Undergeduate darmitory
d. Room in: private home
\&. Universit: married housing
i. Other (siocity)
5. Are you married? yus $\qquad$ no $\qquad$
a. If you are marritd, are you married to an American $\qquad$ , Indian $\qquad$ , or nthur forvign student $\qquad$ ?
b. If you are married, is そour husband or wift in the l'S. with you? yes $\qquad$ 70 $\qquad$
6. What is your religion?
a. Hindu
b. Musilin

$\qquad$
c. Christian

d. Sikh

e. Jain
7. Other (specify) $\qquad$
1i. If you went tor college in lndia, what degree did you obtain? $\qquad$
!2. a) Did yon work in India belire you came to the linited States? yes_ no $\qquad$
b) If you worked, what kind wf job was it?
c) How 1 ong did you work on this job? $\qquad$
d) Did yout work at this joh in a city $\qquad$ , bi $\because$ town_ smail rown $\qquad$ , ar village $\qquad$ ?
e) If it is a big city, write the name of the city. $\qquad$
i3. Toward which degree are ion warking now:
a. Bacheior's degree
$-$
b. Master's de:ree $\qquad$
c. Doctor's degrec $\qquad$
d. Non-degree pr gram $\qquad$
E. Other (specify)

1'. What is your ma jor ifeid of study? $\qquad$
15. How long have you been in the linited States? $\qquad$
16. Have you ever visited the United States before this visit? yes___ no
a. If yes, how many previous visits? $\qquad$
b. Previous to this visit, when was the last visit to the United States?
c. How long did the last visit last? $\qquad$
i7. a. Have you been in any other foreign countries for more than one month? yes $\qquad$ no $\qquad$
b. If yes, what are those countries? $\qquad$
$\qquad$
18. Do you have any difficulty in understanding or speaking Eng ish with Americans: yes_ no
i9. Do you find that Americatis have difficulty in materstanding your Enelisin? yes $\qquad$ no $\qquad$
20. Indicate the size of the villagu, town or city in India from which you came. (check one)
a. Under 5,000 $\qquad$
b. 5,000-10,000 $\qquad$
(.) 10,000)-20,000
d. 20,000-50,000 $\qquad$
e. 50,000-100,000 $\qquad$
f. 100,000 -500,000 $\qquad$
g. Over 300.000
21. What is your father's edication:: background?
a. Elementary schori
b. Somu high schorl
c. High schmoi certificat.
d. Some college
e. College gradiate
f. University graduate
22. State the degrecs otiadied by your father.
23. What is your father's occupation? $\qquad$
24. How much money does yorir fither make a year? (check one)
a. Under 4,000 Rupers $\underline{-}$
b. 4,000-8,000 Rupees $\qquad$
c. 8,000-10,000 Kupets

d. 10,000-12,000 Rupees $\qquad$
c. 12,000-14,000 Rupets
f. Over 1'f,000 Rupees
25. a. Are you presently employed while attending Michigan State

L'niversity? yes_ no $\qquad$
b. If yes, whert do you work? $\qquad$
c. If employed by tine linversity, are you a:

Teaching assistant

Resuarch assistant

Werkint on an hourly fasis

Oriber (specif $\because$ )


[^0]:    $1_{\text {William H. Siwil and Olal M. Dividsen, "The Adjustment of Scan- }}$ dinavian Students," jurnal of Social Issucs. vol. 12, 非, 1956. pp. 9-19.

[^1]:    iAmerical: $i:$ let ined witl reference to the general background of native stadents ateroding Michigan State University.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ibid., pp. 64-67.

