

THE OVERSEAS BEHAVIOR PATTERNS OF STUDENTS:  
A STUDY OF AN EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL  
LIVING SUMMER PROGRAM

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
EDWARD GEORGE DEFORREST  
1975



145309

## ABSTRACT

### THE OVERSEAS BEHAVIOR PATTERNS OF STUDENTS: A STUDY OF AN EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING SUMMER PROGRAM

By

Edward George DeForrest

This study describes the overseas behavior patterns of students placed with host families during an Experiment In International Living summer program.

This study is concerned with the characteristic differences noted in overseas student group behaviors as these differences relate to personality. The areas of personality explored are self-esteem and behavioral self-process. Self-esteem is assessed through the use of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, administered three times in approximation of psychological adjustment to the overseas environment. Behavioral self-process is explored through the use of a case study analysis of four sequential phases of personal adjustment: motivation and expectation, approach, integration, post experience assessment.

The intent of the study is to objectify and define the nature of a particular cross-cultural

interaction set, the student and the host family. The findings are relevant for use in a personal-developmental context by individuals who work with young people in The Experiment or other exchange of persons organizations.

The study indicates that self-esteem and behavioral self-process are interrelated factors of personality that limit the degree of personal satisfaction and cross-cultural learning achieved by students in the program.

Three characteristic behavior patterns are identified: positive-adaptive; negative-rejecting. The sources of differentiation noted among student sub-groups within the larger student population were: the development of trusting relationships with persons from the host culture; the expressed degree of receptiveness to elements within the host culture; the breadth of communication developed by the student with persons in the host community. Also it was noted that scores obtained in the assessment of self-esteem were related to the display of behaviors which were characteristic of one of the three patterns identified in the study.



THE OVERSEAS BEHAVIOR PATTERNS OF STUDENTS:  
A STUDY OF AN EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL  
LIVING SUMMER PROGRAM

By

Edward George DeForrest

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Education

1975

For

Ham  
Christie  
and  
Mr. Puddles

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the faculty, friends and family who were a continual source of encouragement in the completion of this research. Dr. Ruth Hill Useem, committee chairperson and dissertation advisor, was most helpful in the final stages of the project through her critical questioning and valuable suggestions. To her I owe a debt of gratitude that is both personal and professional. Dr. Harry Case has been a constant source of encouragement during my six years of study at Michigan State University. Dr. Homer Higbee as a committee member offered his support and guidance which was appreciated. Dr. Van Johnson has also been of assistance.

My mother in particular has been an unending source of motivation throughout my years of formal education. To her I am grateful.

Finally, my good friends Dennis and Deborah Grether are to be thanked for their hospitality during my commuting years, as well as for their encouragement in the final days of writing. Dr. Joseph and Nancy Paterno have also been helpful in their encouragement

and consultation. Also thanked are Dick Hodges, Barbara Noonan and Dori Card for their personal concern and unending favors which are also greatly appreciated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Purpose and Scope . . . . .	4
Organization and Design . . . . .	6
II. A BRIEF DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY AND AN OVERVIEW OF THE EXPERIMENT IN INTER- NATIONAL LIVING . . . . .	8
How it Began, the History of The Experiment In International Living . . . . .	10
An Overview of The Experiment and Its Operational Procedures . . . . .	17
The American Experiment Organization . . . . .	19
Group membership . . . . .	19
The overseas program . . . . .	20
Leadership assignments . . . . .	20
Leadership is a demanding role . . . . .	21
III. THE BICULTURAL EXCHANGE PROCESS . . . . .	23
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	23
Purpose of the Study and Aspects of the Problem to be Explored . . . . .	25
Changes in Self-Esteem by Program Period . . . . .	27
Sequential Phases of Self-Process by Program Period . . . . .	27
Need for the Study . . . . .	29
Methodology . . . . .	32
Data Collection . . . . .	33
Personal interpretations of the experience . . . . .	34
Personal observations . . . . .	35
The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale . . . . .	36
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	37

Chapter	Page
IV. THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS LITERATURE: A REVIEW OF THE FIELD AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS . . . . .	40
An Overview . . . . .	42
Americans Overseas . . . . .	42
Foreign Students in the United States . . . . .	43
Studies Immediately Related To This Investigation . . . . .	46
Recent Research: The Development of Three Study Questions . . . . .	46
Related Typological Studies: Three Additional Questions for Investigation . . . . .	51
Taba (1953) . . . . .	52
Lambert and Bressler (1956) . . . . .	53
Bailyn and Kelman (1962) . . . . .	55
A Theoretical Framework . . . . .	57
The development of trust . . . . .	60
Receptivity . . . . .	61
Communicative facility . . . . .	62
V. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	64
Part 1 -- A Typology of Student Behavior	
Behavioral Self-Process: Observed and Interpreted Behavior . . . . .	65
Organization of the Data . . . . .	66
Behavioral Types . . . . .	67
Type 1.--Positive-Receptive . . . . .	68
Type 2.--Positive-Adaptive . . . . .	70
Type 3.--Negative-Rejecting . . . . .	74
Measurement of Self-Esteem . . . . .	76
Idiographic Data . . . . .	77
Nomothetic Data . . . . .	79
Classification of Subjects . . . . .	80
Part 2 -- Examples of Typological Behavior: Case Studies and Analyses	
Case Study #1. JoAnne Subject (A-3) . . . . .	85
Case Study Analysis #1: JoAnne Subject (A-3) . . . . .	97

Chapter	Page
Case Study #2. Paul Subject (B-3) . . .	104
Case Study Analysis #2:	
Paul Subject (B-3) . . . . .	113
Case Study #3. Caroline Subject	
(C-1) . . . . .	122
Case Study Analysis #3:	
Caroline Subject (C-1) . . . . .	130
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .	136
Review of the Study . . . . .	136
Findings of the Study . . . . .	140
Type 1.--Positive-Receptive . . . . .	140
Type 2.--Positive-Adaptive . . . . .	141
Type 3.--Negative Rejecting . . . . .	142
Answers to Questions Posed in	
Study . . . . .	144
Factor #1.--Self-esteem . . . . .	144
Factor #2.--Behavioral Self-process .	145
Recommendations . . . . .	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	156

## CHAPTER I

### DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

In 1964 The Experiment in International Living placed a group of ten students, including the author, with Indian families in Jaipur and Poona. It was in that period of time before the counter-culture had developed; the American young were discovering India. Flying half-way around the globe to live in another land was part of a world-conscious migration that in the next few years would change the life process of families and of nations.

The group first heard of Viet Nam while playing billiards at Mt. Abu, a hill station in Rajasthan. Someone had seen the Hai Phong mining incident mentioned in an English newspaper; America was very far away. We visited temples, wore native dress and suffered from the traveler's curse. Our host families were kind and understanding. In the years that followed that first experience, the author became a group leader for The Experiment and lived with host families in five different countries.

Eleven years after that first experience, three of the students continue to exchange cards and letters



with their host families and occasionally visit each other. These three friends have traveled greatly, chosen international life styles and careers in international business or education. It is a different future; no one had anticipated the outcome.

By the mid 1960s student travel had become a significant part of college life. For the more idealistic and committed, the Peace Corps was an option. Other programs were also developed; academic, tourist and experiential. Most were based upon the assumption that other-culture contact would further the chances for world peace. The government, foundations and parents paid for young people to work in Brazil, attend classes in London or live with a family in Spain. Later, some of these travelers and their counterparts found their way to Africa and the Asian Sub-Continent. For them America had changed or their perception of America had changed.

Much social science research was conducted during those years. Overseas Americans, business persons, missionaries, technocrats and their families, as well as students, were the focus of study at a unique time in the history of their country. Researchers in exchange programs and in government and private technical assistance programs eventually concluded that cross-cultural

relations, if they were to be conducted on more than a verbal ritualistic level, were a complicated sharing between people.

It was found that the success of overseas ventures was limited and dependent upon the degree of understanding achieved between the persons and nations involved. Understanding was found to mean more than sheltered exposure or shared technical competence, it involved the exchange of respect, empathy and knowledge, accomplished through new forms of social interaction.

For the college student, being placed with a host family or an academic institution in another land was one way of increasing personal knowledge of other people, other ways of life. It was thought that the experience of living as your hosts lived would enhance the educational process.

The Experiment In International Living was one of the first organizations involved in student exchange that had a developed philosophy and purpose. Experiment group members become part of a vast global network of persons concerned with the need for international awareness and understanding. Each year groups of students with leaders, from sending and receiving nations, leave their homes to go abroad and become members of another family in a host community. The successful experiences gained from this annual process of transfer have become

part of the reason for the program to continue. The long term effects of The Experiment experience are difficult to predict. The two following quotations are somewhat typical of the diverse and lasting imprint of the program. Jim Moore, an Experiment student, wrote in his personal evaluation of an Austrian homestay:

During the final days of my homestay, my host family impressed upon me a fact with which I had not previously reckoned: at the same time that I was learning so much, I was also making a contribution to those new friends whose lives mine touched . . . We were learning about each other in subtle, quiet ways (The Experiment 1971).

One of the early Experiment students to pre-World War II Germany, Sargent Shriver, wrote to Dr. Watt, the founder of The Experiment:

The Experiment fitted me well for the role I was to play in carrying out President Kennedy's then obviously startling proposal to form the Peace Corps. . . . I was convinced that volunteers must learn the language of the country to which they were assigned; must serve in but one country; must have no more than their counterparts. The Peace Corps' roots are set deep in Experiment philosophy and Experiment practice (Watt 1967:316).

The influence that The Experiment has had upon these persons and upon the author, created an interest in writing this dissertation.

### Purpose and Scope

This is an exploratory study. It is concerned with the characteristic differences noted in overseas

student group behaviors as these differences relate to personality. The areas of personality explored are self-esteem and behavioral self-process. The purpose of this study is to define the relationship between these factors and thereby gain an understanding of the nature of student and group behaviors that result from living with a host family in a foreign country.

The Experiment In International Living offers students a unique overseas program, the focus of which is bicultural interpersonal exchange. Young people, in their pre-adult formative years are placed with host families in an overseas community. The degree of personal satisfaction and cross-cultural learning achieved students in the program is considered to be dependent upon the personality factors explored in this study.

The Experiment program is different from other overseas programs where persons are placed in technical assistance, diplomatic, military, missionary or a variety of other prescribed roles. Such roles have limited patterns of interrelating that define the operational set within which overseas persons interact with their host-nation counterparts. The technical skill possessed by the sojourner is largely responsible for the degree of achievement experienced. Personality factors are not viewed as the primary determinant of

prescribed role achievement; rather, such factors tend to enhance role accomplishment.

The findings of this study are purposely limited in their applicability to bicultural interpersonal exchange programs. They are intended for use by persons who lead Experiment groups or those who work with young people in other international exchange of persons organizations. The typology of student behavior developed is considered appropriate for use as a perspective by persons in counseling or other facilitative roles. Specifically, the conclusions reached are not considered a panacea for selecting or deselecting persons who wish to join overseas student programs or who seek professional placement in other overseas roles.

### Organization and Design

The study contains six chapters. In order to gain an understanding of the problem investigated, it is necessary to define the context within which the characteristic differences noted in overseas student behavior occurred. Chapter II contains an historiographic treatment of The Experiment experience. A brief developmental history of the organization is presented as well as an overview of The Experiment program.

In chapters III, IV and V an experimental design is utilized in developing and analyzing data pertaining

to the overseas behavior patterns of an Experiment In International Living student group placed with Italian host families in 1970. A typology of sojourner response is developed from case studies which contain findings similar to those reported by Taba (1953), Lambert and Bressler (1956) and Bailyn and Kelman (1962). The typology interrelates the factors of self-esteem and behavioral self-process. Self-esteem is assessed through the use of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Behavioral self-process is explored through the use of a case study analysis of four sequential phases of personal adjustment: motivation and expectation; approach; integration; post experience assessment.

Further, the elements of trust, receptivity and communicative facility are defined in their behavioral expression as indicators of differing abilities among persons to become involved in the bicultural, interpersonal exchange process.

Chapter VI contains a summary of the study and commentary concerning The Experiment program as well as other similar exchange of persons programs.

## CHAPTER II

### A BRIEF DEVELOPMENTAL HISTORY AND AN OVERVIEW OF THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING

The Experiment In International Living is a unique form of cross-cultural interpersonal exchange, structured by an organizational philosophy and purpose. A reflection of the time in which it was created, between the World Wars, the purpose of The Experiment is to accomplish understanding and world peace as it was hoped for in the liberal America of the 1930s. This idea flourished again after World War II and in the early days of the Kennedy administration. A brief history of the organization, as written by its founder, Dr. Donald Watt, is included in order to provide an understanding of the purpose of The Experiment, as well as its idealistic intent. The style in which that history is written and the historical period in which the organization was created are a continuing influence on the form and direction of the program.

An early account of The Experiment, Passport To Friendship (Peters 1957), published before Dr. Watt's

history, contains a foreword by Pearl Buck. Her writing captured the zealous dedication of those who believed, contributed and unselfishly made The Experiment work in its early years.

Whether The Experiment can influence the world in time to save us from the disaster of war is problematic, for war is the ultimate result of a total lack of appreciative understanding between nations and persons. One thing is sure, however, and this is that the more widely The Experiment is practiced the more swift and the more powerful its influence will be. Since every good work depends upon the number of people who support it, let us good people, dedicate ourselves to the building and perfecting of this first essential to peace - an appreciative understanding between the peoples of the earth. Toward this and The Experiment In International Living offers a most practical means (Peters 1957).

An organization that counted in its ranks the established, their young and those who would lead America, The Experiment found nation wide support for two decades beginning in the early nineteen-fifties. In later years, from the Kennedy administration to the passage of the International Education Act of 1966, The Experiment flourished, as did other organizations of its kind (Scanlon and Shields 1968). During those years the American Experiment's outbound program placed fifteen hundred to two thousand students with overseas families every summer. Homestays were found in North and South America, Africa, Asia, Europe and India. An estimated three thousand families around the globe were affected annually by the



sending and receiving of Experiment students from the United States alone. American families, in turn, hosted in-coming groups from Japan, India, the Near East, Europe and South America. A global process of cross-cultural exchange had been established.

How it Began, the History of The Experiment  
In International Living

In the spring of 1931, the Payne Fund sent three members from the N.Y. YMCA to Geneva to evaluate the summer school program of the International Association of League of Nations Societies. Young people from India, Norway, and France lived separately by nationality in small lodgings throughout the city. Lectures were conducted daily in four languages by professors of international relations. Knowledge about The League was the only purpose of the school. The group recommended that the program be supplemented by having the students live together in an international context with additional means of socializing provided in the program. Their plan was rejected.

While in Geneva I saw clearly the need for a new kind of study; not of relations between individuals but of relations between cultures . . . to create a controlled situation which would produce understanding and friendliness between people of different cultures in a limited period of time (Watt 1947:85).

Dr. Watt sought support for a new concept in international youth group summer programs. Letters were sent to France and Switzerland, but only one reply was received. Captain Etienne Bach, the Swiss founder of Les Chevaliers de la Paix worked out a program with the Americans whereby fourteen American boys would join with fourteen European boys to spend the month of July, 1932 together using French, English, and German as their languages of exchange and study. The first Experiment group came into being.

Later this generalized structure took the form of a family homestay of one month, several weeks of travel in the host country with younger members of the host family and a few days in a major city in that part of the world.

Avoiding the grand tour and the influence of the enclaved American college experience abroad, the Experiment from its initial conception was a simple personal experience. The first group were selected and sailed for Europe on June 23, 1932.

Overall, the first program was not a success. By far its most important result was the abandoning of the camp idea in favor of placing students with a host family. Later years saw the size of the group reduced to ten.

The second Experiment reduced the number of languages to those of the host and the American student; girls were added to the program and the total time extended to eight weeks, one month in the home (the homestay) and one month hiking in the woods and mountains, (the informal trip).

The program which had been planned was carried out in a deeply disturbed country. From its war-like reputation, one would have expected Germany to have been most inhospitable toward a group interested in making peace. Just the opposite materialized. Our hosts in Freiburg, which we ourselves had picked out, were anti-Nazis even though they said little about it that summer.

Living first with the boys and girls of Furstenwalde and then with Austrian young people from the town of Waidhofen-an-der-Yebbs. . . . never for a moment did the group give a thought to the stay-at-homes who had predicted hostility and danger in Hitler's Germany (Watt 1967:112).

The Experiment continued after that summer and in 1934 the first group was sent to France; twenty-two students were placed with families in Bourg-en-Brasse by a Protestant Pastor, M. Angevan. Prior to that summer, the director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace replied in answer to the questioned feasibility of an Experiment:

There are two reasons why you cannot carry out your plan. In the first place, the French do not take strangers into their homes. They do not even entertain their friends there, usually taking them to a restaurant. In the second place, French families who have enough money to go on a holiday -

and there are not many - would go as a family group. Boys, and especially girls, would never be allowed to travel with a group of strangers (Watt 1967:135).

The director was right about some French families, but also very wrong about many others, for the next few years the French Experiment expanded to seventy-eight families. The Experiment continued to grow and included Austria, Italy, and Norway and when the Second World War made a European Experiment impossible, Mexico and a number of other South American countries were added to the family of host nations.

First published in 1932, Crossroads was the journal of The Experiment in International Living with its base of operations in Dr. Watt's Putney, Vermont home. The foreward read as follows:

In the long search for ways to one world, we have begun to find an open door. It is the door to your home and to every home on earth. The most important educational institution in existence is still the home without which our children can scarcely grow into civilized human beings.

The kind of broad maturity that will make us citizens fit for one world can be achieved only by changing the foreigners we suspect into the friends whom we trust. It can be done. During fifteen years two thousand homes in seventeen countries opened their doors to unknown foreign students to demonstrate that different peoples of the world could learn to live together by living together (Watt 1967:156).

Later in Crossroads Donald Watt developed more carefully his philosophical basis for The Experiment:

The paradox that education must be a happy experience is inherent in our educational method and cannot be avoided. Only by learning to enjoy living with others can we gain a feeling of community with them. In this paradox the Experiment believes that it has isolated a principle in education for understanding.

Questioning any originality in the Experiment's work, some educators have pointed out that students have gone abroad for centuries and that many of these have lived in homes. The Experiment replies that just as a university does not leave a student's education to chance by turning him loose in a library so the development of world-mindedness must be intelligently directed. The presence of an individual in another country is just as likely to turn him into an extreme nationalist as an internationalist.

Since the development of attitudes is a less understood and more difficult branch of education than the teaching of facts and skills, education to achieve it must be organized more carefully. The fact that the teacher of emotional education has not been recognized by educators in general is strikingly apparent now when one notes that almost every international educational organization uses the words 'sympathetic understanding,' in its statement of purpose, but so far as we have seen, the programs of all of them are confined to the normal scholarly pursuits that may or may not result in sympathy.

The idea that people from many nations may learn to live together by living together has not yet received serious attention. To understand another people, the more knowledge of the language, the profounder the scholarship, the better; but what really determines whether one will appreciate a country and cooperate with its people is not one's information about it, but one's attitude toward it (Watt 1967:161).

Principles have resulted from the experiences of those people who have in the past years joined the Experiment. They are the Experiment's formula for developing an attitude effective for successful adjustment to the life of another country. They are always growing, but at present may be stated as follows:

1. In order to understand the people of another country, one must have the desire to do so.
2. To get and to keep this desire, a mutual enjoyment of one another's company must be the ultimate objective.
3. To achieve this objective, one must put himself in a position where he can learn and appreciate, rather than teach and criticize.
4. Respect is the necessary requirement for those wishing to learn. Experience has shown that to maintain one's attitude of respect one must bear in mind in living abroad, that trifles are all important, and that principles will be found to be much less so than one would suppose.
5. Adjustment to another country is difficult. Most people going abroad do not find themselves in an environment where a satisfactory adjustment to the new culture is possible.
6. The reward of making friends abroad is worth more than the great effort that it costs.
7. The final step in developing the correct attitude is to realize that one must strive always to understand others, but never expect to do so fully (Watt 1967: 163).

And so the Experiment grew, and became an international organization that involved not only the exchange of Americans, but the exchange of all member nations with others of the compact. New countries have been added over the years so that today it is not unusual to know of a Ugandan Experimenter living in the United States, a Japanese Experimenter living in Italy.

Once annually, there is a General International meeting of member nations at which the next exchange of persons is planned. Out of this gathering comes the re-evaluation of the Experiment; there is a constant need to redefine and experiment with persons and nations for change is a constant part of human existence.

In his closing chapter, I Believe This, Dr. Watt offers some thought for the future and the concepts that are The Experiment:

I believe that the world is on the edge of a great surge toward international understanding when the policies of many governments will be influenced by the feelings of respect and desire for cooperation on the part of their citizens.

The Experiment must supply in ever increasing quantities controlled human situations which will produce human understanding and friendliness between people of different cultures in a limited period of time.

I believe that the representatives of the United States and other governments will in the next ten years be trained to cooperate with the people in whose country they are working.

I believe that within 25 years the repetitive method of learning to speak a foreign language will develop to such an extent that educated people in most countries will command a second language and possibly three or four.

I believe that likewise in about a quarter of a century the science of human relations will bring nations to a point where spending billions to kill people will no longer seem necessary.

Dr. Watt noted further:

In this field of study there is a factor not well known which can be referred to as the 'individual reflexive study of international human relations.'

The word individual means from the point of view of education, that there is no such thing as a nation or a state. The only working relationship which exists in human society is that between one human unit and another.

The word reflexive is used to indicate that knowledge is of value only when the one who possesses it relates and applies its meanings to himself. Human relations between cultures . . . has become an interest of perhaps half a million people who were not interested in it before. Likewise a body of knowledge has been created which needs to be vastly increased. The Experiment has tried to show that it is not knowledge but emotions which determine whether the relationship between one individual and another will be hostile or friendly. In practicing the art of living abroad, the next step which is needed is the general realization that INTELLIGENCE IS NOT ENOUGH. (Watt 1967:324).

#### An Overview of The Experiment and Its Operational Procedures

Today, The Experiment In International Living is composed of approximately thirty-five autonomous member-nation organizations, each of which define within their



own national borders how the program shall operate. The essential elements of group membership and host family placement remain standard for all participating countries. National administrative offices are usually small and frequently staffed by volunteers. Local community representatives are also unpaid and serve as the primary link in a global network of communities and persons who establish and maintain host family memberships.

At the General International Meeting, the number of students to be sent from and received by member-nation communities is negotiated and the annual cycle of student selection and family placement begins again.

Participating communities may receive one or more groups of ten students who travel with a leader, all of whom live with a host family. The length of the homestay and the extent of binational group travel, the informal trip, vary from country to country by economic circumstance and national program design. However, the original concept of developing a simple interpersonal relationship between a host family and an Experiment student is rigorously maintained. Students are not allowed to carry large sums of personal spending money; host families are selected for their displayed interest in program goals and not their economic standing in the host community.

### The American Experiment Organization

The United States is the largest of the member-nation organizations. In most years the number of outbound students exceeds the number of inbound students from sending nations. In recent years, some fifteen hundred to two thousand students have been placed with overseas families by the American Experiment. For this reason, the American organization has developed its own administrative-organizational design. The national office employs a full time staff to process both outbound and inbound groups as well as to select and train leaders for American Experiment groups. Group orientation and leader training sites are located throughout the country on a regional basis. The central office is now located at Brattleboro, Vermont, at The Experiment School For International training.

Group membership is obtained through an application and screening process. Acceptance and assignment to a host community and group occur in the spring. A three day orientation is held for student groups either in the United States or abroad with language training available as an option. On occasion, language training is required by the host country, which then adds several weeks to the standard six week program. Program tuition fees range from several hundred to over one thousand dollars.

The overseas program consists of a four to five week homestay. Each member of the group, including the leader, live with a host family. An informal trip takes place in the second half of the homestay period. During that time a host family member becomes the guest of the American student during a hiking, hosteling or sight-seeing trip. At the end of the summer, the American group gives a simple farewell party, often a picnic with entertainment including skits, singing and local dances. After leaving the host community, the group spends a few final days alone in a major city of that world area, this is referred to as the city stay. The Experiment trip ends overseas with a return flight to the United States.

Leadership assignments in The American Experiment are based upon a two step screening and application process. If an applicant is accepted, following an invitational training weekend, an assignment is made to a particular country on the basis of previous overseas experience and technical skills, such as language fluency. Leadership is applied for annually, regardless of the number of times that one has led.

Persons applying for leadership assignments come from a variety of backgrounds. Most often they are teachers, graduate students or persons with previous overseas experience. It is not unusual to find among

this membership, persons who have led a number of times, some of whom serve as ad hoc advisors and trainers in the leadership selection process.

Leadership is a demanding role. The leader is responsible for each of the persons assigned to the group throughout the entire program. The orientation period serves as a time to build group identity and to make what few plans are optional in the program. Infrequently, a student is asked to leave the program before departure because of a personal-social or a psychological problem.

Overseas the group leader is responsible for getting the group to host community. Once there, the leader works with the local representative to assure the success of the program.

A week after arrival, the leader and the local representative visit each of the host families and discuss problems that may have arisen. The majority of the leader's time is spent working with American students: most have a few adjustment problems; some adapt immediately.

On occasion, one or two of the students cannot cope with the homestay experience or the rules of the program. In some cases students return to the United States. More frequently, they remain in the host community after being placed with a different family. Psychological as well as physical problems are usually

evidenced by these students. Often their needs draw greatly upon the resources of the group and the energy and time of the leader.

During the informal trip, the local representative and the leader share responsibility for maintaining a binational group relationship between the Americans and their host family peers. Critical interpersonal and intercultural realizations frequently occur which later add a great deal of meaning to the students' experience. Alternatively, splits within the binational group are not infrequent occurrences. It is during this time that the skills of the leader are tested while working at both the individual and group level.

Group finances are managed by the leader. These monies cover incidental expenses and group travel in addition to the costs of the farewell party. Responsibility for the passage and safety of the students during the informal trip, the city stay and the final trip home, also rests with the leader. The leader is in essence a banker, dictator, counselor, doctor, "father confessor" and international dilettante and diplomat in carrying out this role.

## CHAPTER III

### THE BICULTURAL EXCHANGE PROCESS

#### Statement of the Problem

During a six year period, first as an Experiment student and later as a group leader, the author lived with families in India (1964), Switzerland (1966), Great Britain (1967), Japan (1968), Finland-Russia (1969) and Italy (1970). From these experiences a need was identified to develop a theoretical perspective which would assist group leaders and group members to effectively participate in The Experiment program or other programs like it.

From 1964 on, student attitude nation-wide and world wide became counter-culture and common culture in dress, music, drugs, sexual expression and patterns of migration from campus to campus and country to country. International travel became an option for many who were no longer limited by financial constraints. Rejecting authority, the anti-establishment self-idealizing young in the broad campus population of middle class Americans and Black and white inner city kids, were different from the sons and daughters of the families who had joined Experiment groups even a few years earlier. The purpose of

The Experiment had grown old. It was one of many programs competing for students; for only a few the idealism of an earlier period remained.

The war in Viet Nam, along with the internal political and racial strife that emerged in the mid-1960's drastically affected student attitudes. Front page coverage and television broadcasts of assassinations, race riots and nepalm bombings created an awareness that the American public had never before experienced. The nation and the Experiment were in the midst a crisis of ideals. The threat of atomic holocaust had worn thin when it was realized that we had dropped the first and only atomic bombs. The outcry against the use of an Alaskan test site for further atomic research expressed that growing consciousness.

Popular student culture made it increasingly difficult to lead student groups in the traditional Experiment group model. Unquestioned authority was no longer accepted. The developed standards and format of the program ran counter to "doing your own thing."

In response, leadership style changed from an authoritarian model to one that was facilitative and counseling in its relationship. Although those who selected, for whatever reason, a "safe" foreign experience were different from their more adventuresome or turned-off counterparts who traveled, they were not unlike college

students in general. Against this international background of commonality and change, student groups continued to display relatively similar behavior characteristics. The frequency of given modal tendencies changed by country and group but the composition by behavioral type seemed to remain constant.

It was possible to identify general patterns for each group: each group had those students who achieved a greater degree of satisfaction from their experience than did others in the same group; each group had at least one person who was generally unable to cope with the host family or some other aspect of the program; most Experiment students needed counseling assistance during the course of their homestay. It was felt that an objective consideration of these generalizations would lead to a further understanding of the nature of student behavior resulting from living with a host family in a foreign country during this period.

#### Purpose of the Study and Aspects of the Problem to be Explored

When college students are placed with host families in an overseas setting they are faced with new learning situations that often are not related to previous changes that occurred in their social environment. Their reactions to this experience are varied, their resultant behaviors



and personal interpretations unique. However, there also exist shared characteristic patterns of response among student sub-groups, who are members of a larger group.

This study explores the characteristic differences noted in overseas student group behavior as these differences relate to self-esteem and behavioral self-process. Self-esteem is viewed as a constant effector of behavior. Four behavioral self-processes are viewed as sequential expressions of individual differences, enacted in response to critical factors found in the new cultural environment. The four sequential self-processes are: motivation and expectation, approach, integration, assessment. They are enacted in four program periods, pre-program, orientation, homestay, post homestay experience.

The four behavior processes are a function of program schedule and personal adjustment. As such, they are not held to fixed points of initiation and termination but rather, are viewed as interrelated factors that overlap and are redefined within their period of operation.

A definition of the relationship between self-esteem and behavioral self-process as these factors affect overseas student behavior is the purpose of this section of the study. This is accomplished through the development of a typology of behavioral responses.

The following questions are posed in relation to self-esteem and behavioral self-process:

Changes in Self-Esteem  
by Program Period:

Orientation, homestay, post experience assessment

1. Self-esteem: Evidence suggests (DuBois 1956; Bailyn and Kelman 1962) that behavior in the overseas setting is in part determined by self-esteem, the degree of worth or value which is placed upon self and its component constructs. Does self-esteem change during the course of the experience? How is it related to overseas behavioral style?

Sequential Phases of Self-Process  
by Program Period:

Orientation and before.

2. Motivation and expectation: What are the student's reasons for participating in an international exchange program? Are they clear, purposeful, definite? What does the student expect to derive from the experience? Are expectations specific, required, open or unachievable? Are there factors in this set which are indicative of a particular behavioral style?

Orientation and homestay

3. Approach: How does the student prepare for the coming experience? How does the student engage the host culture prior to and during the family stay? Is the student apprehensive, accepting or hesitant? Are there commonalities of approach among persons?

Orientation, homestay, post experience assessment

4. Integration: While living with a host family how does the student deal with the wide array of issues and constraints with which persons are confronted? Are individuals active, withdrawn, attending, hostile? Are they overwhelmed or unaware? Do people share similar ways of dealing with physical, cognitive and affective issues in the overseas setting?

Post experience assessment

5. Assessment: In retrospect, how do students regard themselves, their hosts and their fellow group members during the homestay? How do they evaluate the meaning of the program for themselves? Are their assessments singular or shared and therefore indicative of characteristic behavioral style?

Given this format and definition of behavioral expression, it is possible to view the cross-cultural experience as a learning experience in which new information is received, compared to previous learning, processed, and then incorporated or rejected. Three sources of information in the new cultural environment contain critical factors, which are either consonant or dissonant with previous learning, and which affect the behavioral expression of self-process. These factors are:

1. Physical factors in the new cultural environment which affect the student's ability both psychologically and physiologically to relate effectively with other persons.
2. Affective factors and modes of adjustment and interaction which result from consonant, dissonant and neutral factors in the new cultural environment.
3. Cognitive experiences which the student must integrate and compare with his own cultural values and with the expectations that were held of the host culture.

Behavior in the cross-cultural setting is a complex interplay of many forces acting upon an individual student whose ability to interpret their meaning is quite limited. Without the knowledge requisite to understanding the specific cultural meaning of any given event, the student must fall back upon the meaning of the same event in the home culture or seek out the interpretation found in the host culture. The process of exploration described leaves much room for confusion. Three elements

and factors of varying personal ability are defined as necessary in the exploration of the new environment. These are: trust, receptivity and communicative facility. A conceptual reference is developed later in chapter IV, describing their operation in the behavior exhibited by persons in the overseas environment.

### Need for the Study

Beginning in the early 1950s research found in the exchange of persons literature focuses upon the bicultural exchange process, which is the general research topic developed in this study. A review of both the field and pertinent studies is found in chapter IV. Several authors have defined the need to further pursue investigations of this type.

Dove (1968) indicated that for persons who wish to have a cross-cultural experience, whatever their motivation, it is necessary that they be able to relate on more than a cursory level. Programs offering in-depth experiences must define processes that can effectively influence patterns of relating between persons. This need has not been actively pursued by The Experiment.

Earlier studies had defined this same need and in part outlined the parameters of the overseas experience. Bennett (1958) referred to intercultural-interpersonal experiences:

. . . The process of intercultural experience is unique for the national group undergoing it and to a large extent for the individual; the aspects of this experience which we wish to know most about are precisely those which refer to the differences between individuals and groups traceable to their particular social and cultural origins. We advocate more research into particular cases, into the configurations of individual experience in different cultural settings; and perhaps less research at the level of generalized attitudes and personality tests (Bennett 179:1958).

Lundstedt (1963) felt that there was an evident lag in the use of social science research which could help to reduce psychological stress on individuals, manpower losses from individual adjustment and inefficient management of human resources in exchange programs both in the United States and abroad.

Apparently this lag continues. The question of relevant application of knowledge, changing definitions in the field, unclear terminology and the need to fully consider what has been learned to date was addressed by Scanlon and Shields (1968) and Marshall (1972) in two comprehensive edited collections encompassing a variety of conference papers and published studies.

In 1955, Watson and Lippitt suggested that exchange programs should be considered in view of the anthropological knowledge about cross-cultural contact and culture change, as well as from knowledge about psychological principles and individual learning. Program impact they felt, was dependent upon the conditions within

each culture, but the relative importance of these factors varied from one situation to another, from one person to another. It is important to define the nature of these differences.

Hook (1962) noted that each society has unique patterns of organization which serve as the basis about which behaviors are developed and interpreted. When these patterns are confronted by persons of another culture, a degree of interpersonal-intercultural dissonance can occur. It is important to define the nature of this process.

Finally, Goffman (1956) noted that if persons are to gain an insightful interpretation of their host's culture beyond that which can be observed as a formal presentation of self in a specific context, then vehicles for extra-culture intake and interpretation must become a cognitive part of their overseas pattern of behavior.

Studies of this type conducted during recent years have been based upon the needs cited by these and other writers. However, there remain unanswered questions and inconclusive findings which point to the need for further clarification of the dynamics of human behavior in the overseas setting as they relate to bicultural interchange.

### Methodology

This study was undertaken in order to gain an objective understanding of the overseas behavior patterns of Experiment students. The intent in objectifying those patterns was to assist group leaders and group members in gaining an understanding of themselves and the process of adjustment that affected their perceptions of their host families and the host community. The results of this study are intended for use in a behavioral-developmental context.

Three studies were identified that addressed purposes similar to those defined in this investigation. They served as the basis of organization for this research project and are discussed in the following chapter. Two of the studies cited contained typologies of overseas behavior; a third considered the effect of an extended overseas stay upon self-esteem.

The findings of this investigation were to be compared to the conceptualizations developed by Taba (1953); Lambert and Bressler (1956) and Bailyn and Kelman (1962). This placed two requirements upon the design of the study to assure a valid comparison. First, data would be obtained in a format similar to that used in the earlier research; second, the topics of study and treatment of data should also be similar.

### Data collection

To meet the requirements stated, a case study format was chosen which included personal interpretations of the overseas experience, behavioral observations and a standardized assessment of self-esteem. Personal interpretations were gathered from two sources: diaries kept by the students and interviews conducted with each student by the author. Behavioral observations were recorded by the author at both the group and individual student level. Self-esteem was assessed through an analysis of scores obtained on The Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

The group to be studied was composed by the Vermont office of The Experiment. It was one of ten groups that were sent to Italy that summer. Leadership assignment to the study group was random. The group was assembled on the basis of age, sex and geographical dispersion. They first met at the orientation site three days before departure for Milan. The subjects ranged in age from eighteen to twenty-one years. Six females, one of whom was Black, and four males, one from the Dominican Republic studying in the United States, became members of the group. The students were asked for their cooperation in the conduct of the study; all of the group members agreed to participate.



Personal interpretations of the experience:

Diaries were kept by each of the study group members from the first day of orientation until the final day of the overseas experience. Small easily carried notebooks were provided for each student. The notebooks were collected overseas and later returned to the students. Many of the subjects were not accustomed to recording their day to day experiences. For some it became a bothersome chore; for most an intimate expression of their deepest feelings.

Three non-structured interviews were conducted with each student during the program: one during orientation; a second during the homestay; and a final session after leaving the host family. The focus of each interview was adapted to and developed around the experiences of the particular individual with whom it was conducted. A topical outline was developed for each session. The exploration of issues varied according to the ease with which the interview was conducted and the richness of the content gained from the students' responses.

Interview schedule and self-process assessed:

1. Orientation period: motivation, expectation and approach

What were your reasons for joining The Experiment?  
 What do you hope to gain from the experience?  
 Have you heard from your host family?  
 Projecting ahead, can you describe the experience, the community, the family?  
 Are there some special interests that you hope to explore this summer?

2. Homestay period: approach and integration

How are you getting along with your host family?  
Tell me about them. Are they a traditional  
Italian family?

Are you having any health problems?

Any problems with particular persons in the host  
family or the group?

Who is your favorite person in the host family?  
Why?

Are you satisfied with the program to date?

Is it what you had expected?

Are there enough group activities?

What is the best experience that you have had  
with someone from your host family or the  
community?

3. Post-experience: evaluation, integration and  
assessment

Looking back over the summer, what was the  
nicest thing that happened to you?

What was the most difficult experience?

How would you evaluate the relationship that you  
had with your host family?

With the group?

Would you join another Experiment group?

Do you have any future plans for traveling over-  
seas?

The topics pursued and the questions outlined varied in  
their sequence and structure of expression as well as  
the depth to which they were explored. For some of the  
students emotional blocking occurred or personal problems  
had to be explored, thus altering the format of the  
interview.

Personal observations: Two categories of observed  
behavior were recorded by the author. Those behaviors  
which were observed in an interpersonal relationship  
between the author and the student were considered as

primary observations. Behaviors observed in group situations or gained from other observers were considered as secondary observations. The nature of the leadership role and the student-leader patterns of contact precluded structuring this aspect of the study. The data obtained in this manner were used to supplement the information gained from the diaries and interviews.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale: The instrument was administered three times during the program: at orientation; early in the homestay experience; after leaving the host community. Two types of data were derived from the testing schedule. For individuals, the total score reported provided information for comparative and correlative behavior assessment. At the group level, changes in self-esteem reflected the several adjustment phases described by the Gullahorns (1963), Heider (1958) and Shank (1961). A discussion of their research is found in the following chapter.

The instrument was recommended for use by the university counseling center where it had been used for a number of research purposes. The Tennessee Scale, according to Fitts (1965), measures self-esteem in terms of identity, self-satisfaction and behavior. The counseling form, which consists of one hundred forced choice questions, is easily administered and scored. It

is particularly appropriate for use in comparative research where the population studied is normal rather than disturbed.

### Limitations of the Study

This is an exploratory descriptive study which employs several methods of data collection. By intent, data were collected during the active, overseas experience. The purpose of the investigation was to gain a greater understanding of that experience as it occurred rather than assessing its meaning at a later date. These three factors placed limits on the type, quality and amount of data collected as well as the degree to which the findings should be generalized.

In selecting the sources of data for this research a decision was made not to include the perceptions of host families regarding individual students or the group. There was a realization that the host family played a role in influencing student behavior and that their observations would be of great value in delineating a typology of behavioral response. Two factors influenced the decision.

The leadership role placed restrictions on the amount of time that was available for gathering data. The study as designed was demanding on both the leadership role and the research role. Further, the problem

of collecting data from the host families was formidable. Language skills, availability and cooperation were problematical considerations that could not easily be resolved.

Secondly, an assumption was made that host families provided a potentially enhancing cross-cultural environment for their Experiment students. This assumption was borne out by several studies discussed in the review of the literature. In addition, it is the student who is charged with "living as your hosts live." Students are selected on the assumption that it is they who will be adaptive in the process of exchange.

Given these considerations, the study was developed on the premise that the student, by and large, was the major effector of behavioral response and that host families provide similar environments for students. Differences noted in student behavior were, therefore, not the result of disparate family influences. Future studies of host family programs should develop a methodology whereby the assumption made in this study could be tested.

In addition to the limits placed on the study by the assumptions that were made, the quality and quantity of data gathered varied. Not all of the students were skilled in recording their observations; some did not keep diaries as planned. However, they did provide

written accounts of their generalized experience. Not all of the interviews conducted were taped as had been planned. Group travel and the location of given interview sessions disallowed a reasonable taping procedure. Further, the leadership role precluded the exploration of a number of issues that were sources of conflict between two of the students and the leader. Again, the data gained were of value and did provide information relative to the purpose of the study. In part, the obstacles that existed were inherent in the project because of the program schedule and the dual role filled by the author.

Finally, because the study group consisted of ten subjects, it was difficult to generalize the findings to the twelve to fifteen hundred students that joined The Experiment program that summer. However, broad generalizations were not the intend of this exploratory study. Rather, the findings of this investigation were meant for use in developing a perspective that would need further research for its delineation.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS LITERATURE: A REVIEW OF THE FIELD AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

#### An Overview

During the previous two decades a national sense of economic well being fostered a feeling of global affiliation and Americans became extensively involved with overseas programs. International student exchange was one of the major patterns of transfer that occurred during that period. Universities opened their doors to Indians, Black Africans, Scandinavians and other national groups (Dubois 1956). Later, Saudi Arabians and Vietnamese joined in the exchange process as American overseas commitments were expanded. In return our young went abroad to study, to live with families and to gain an understanding of life in other countries (Garrity and Adams 1959). In the later part of that period the counter-culture developed and a different group of young sojourners found world companions in Marakesh and Nepal.

Concurrent with student exchange programs were technical assistance programs to aid in agricultural and industrial development. Personnel in Africa, India and

Asia found themselves at a loss when dealing with new nations that had been the former colonies of Great Britain, France, Belgium or other European countries. The supposition that world peoples were both democratic in their political philosophy and modern in their cultural orientation was met with confusion. Exchange students, Peace Corps volunteers and other overseas Americans in varying roles were challenged in their perceptions of life organization. Neither colonial nor traditional in their relationships with host nationals, they were an enigma. Persons representing both the host nation and the sending nation found that interfacing between cultures in the post-colonial era required new interpretations and a redefinition of that exchange process.

Overseas student organizations, institutions of higher education, the business community, government agencies and private foundations identified a need for social science research when their well planned programs of exchange and assistance foundered. The complexity of cross-cultural communication required more than the pre-war perspectives found in the writings of earlier investigators. From the early 1950s on a theoretical body of knowledge was developed. Overseas Americans and foreign students in the United States were two general areas investigated. Studies centered upon the several bicultural themes of adjustment, adaptation and language



learning. Later, with increased and multiple overseas assignments for persons in technical assistance roles, or a variety of other roles, a universal culture of interrelating was identified. This new pattern of relating between societies reflected the changing order and was a product of the process of modernization.

### Americans Overseas

The three following citations were important landmarks in the development of knowledge in the exchange of persons literature.

Heider (1958) and Shank (1961) developed a phase adjustment theory. They noted that structural imbalance resulted during the initial period of overseas involvement when a sojourner was confronted with values, events and interpretations which did not match the priority, sequence or interpretation of these same events that might have occurred in the home culture. In later sequential phases, adjustment and cross-cultural learning occurred, as the individual developed and incorporated new interpretations of the exchange process.

The Gullahorns (1963) further developed the theory of adjustment in alien social systems. They interpreted the acculturation process as a cycle of adult socialization occurring under conditions where previous socialization offered varying degrees of facilitation and interference in a new learning context.

An Extension of The U Curve Theory of Adjustment helped greatly in understanding the phenomenon of culture shock. The initial confusion of overseas placement was defined as the cause of a depressed state of emotion with later learning resulting in a rise in general satisfaction with the cross-cultural environment. Also posited was the notion that changing states of preparedness would account for the stress which some experienced persons felt upon return to the home culture.

Prior to their study Festinger (1957) wrote extensively about a theory of cognitive dissonance. Persons who had expected to like or feel at home with their overseas counterparts often found themselves at odds or uncomfortable with these same people. The development of avoidance behaviors and the maximization of the negative components in their ambivalent feelings were often counterproductive to their purpose for overseas placement. Often the problem centered upon a difference in cultural values. One means of coping with this imbalance was to modify one's beliefs, role behavior or expectations in order to better communicate with persons from the host society.

#### Foreign Students in the United States

Generally it was found that foreign student behavior and experience interpretation was affected by

the same dynamic processes that influenced the behavior and experience interpretation of overseas Americans. The three following studies added further to the growing body of knowledge.

Cook and Selltiz (1955) identified acquaintance potential as a critical factor in the enhancement of foreign student communication in the host culture. In concert with social acceptance and the extension of equal status, a broad exploration of interpersonal relationships was made possible between sojourners and host culture representatives, if the context in which they met allowed for more than limited, cursory contact. The extent of contact possible within a given context was defined as acquaintance potential. Additionally, they felt that the most productive overseas experience, one that enhanced the image of the host culture, was brief in duration. Such stays were just long enough to challenge old and suggest new assumptions about the host nation without having to be fully explored while overseas or objectively scrutinized upon return. In such instances value confrontations seemed to be minimized.

In a study of Norwegian students in the United States, Lysgaard (1955) developed the generalization principle which accounted for the effect of cumulative experience interpretation in a limited interaction set upon the broader purview of the host culture. Limited

exposure to a small number of satisfactory experiences with host culture representatives often led to a broad acceptance of the entire culture. Satisfactory adjustment seemed to serve as a "push forward" in the exploration of new experiences in the cross cultural setting. Alternatively, unsatisfactory experiences led to a rejection of the total host culture.

Watson and Lippitt (1955) identified five problem areas that affected the outcome of cross cultural education programs in their study of German students at an American university. The satisfactory resolution of each of these areas of concern markedly enhanced the value of such programs. The problem areas defined were:

1. Achieving personal security and a positive sense of self in relation to the host culture and its representatives.
2. Decreasing ambivalence about responsibility, authority and autonomy in the activities of the program.
3. Transforming differences between home culture and host culture into learning experiences rather than alienation or withdrawal experiences.
4. Maintaining appropriate cognitive and affective relationships with home country while in the host country.
5. Maintaining and using new learning in the home country after return.

The authors suggested that each of these problematic constructs does not operate in isolation but rather that each has an interrelated effect upon the other, thus creating an all or nothing tendency in the adjustment process for given individuals.

#### Studies Immediately Related To This Investigation

The previous citations were presented for their general coverage of and developmental importance in the exchange of persons literature. In this section recent research is reviewed followed by a discussion of three related studies that served as the basis for the behavioral typology developed in this investigation.

#### Recent Research: the Development of Three Study Questions

Kafka (1968) in his study of Justin Morrill students on a Michigan State University foreign study tour, hypothesized that student attitudes could be influenced by overseas exposure and that personality type was related to cultural receptivity and adjustment. Although the data proved inconclusive with regard to changed attitudes in worldmindedness, within two clusters of variables it was found that residential involvement and affiliation with host nationals tended to have an enhancing effect on student assessment of the overseas experience.

A pre-post test experimental design was employed with a control group selected from within the same college population. Data were not collected during overseas participation at the three campus sites. Kafka suggested that the inconclusive findings resulted from the selection of instruments that were not sensitive to the characteristics that needed to be defined nor to the intricate nature of the population studied; secondly the expectations held of brief overseas study programs were unrealistic.

Another investigation of this type was undertaken by Correa (1970) with University of Washington students. The study was conducted on the campus and assessed the effect of intercultural interaction upon the attitude of worldmindedness when considered in the home nation. The findings were inconclusive but suggested the differing personality characteristics were associated with the experimental construct.

Both investigations point to the inadequacy of an experimental methodology, utilizing a pre-post test design, when attempting to define particular characteristics related to or expected from cross-cultural involvement. The inconclusive nature of the findings cited was representative of the findings of other similar studies. However, a continuing theme does exist. Receptivity to and immersion in a cross-cultural interaction set varies on the basis of individual personality characteristics.

Generally a homestay increases the student's acquaintance potential (Cook and Selltiz 1955); host families seem to exert what might be defined as a positive pull within the interaction set. A study by VanDeWater (1970) defined the influence of the host family. Syracuse University students were placed with host families in Italy, France and The Netherlands while enrolled in an overseas study program. Data were gathered overseas and affirmed the earlier but less conclusive findings of Kafka concerning residential involvement and affiliation with host nationals. It was found that: in most cases host families enjoyed the experience of having a foreign student live with them; if the family positively engaged the student during the homestay, this factor positively influenced the student's interpretation of the overseas study experience. From these observations it was concluded that there was a high correlation between the family's motivation in the exchange process and the student's evaluation of the experience. In most cases it was noted that the host family experience also enhanced the student's interpretation of the host nation. This would seem to support Lysgaard's (1955) generalization principle.

Because Experiment host families are selected on the basis of their motivation to positively engage Experiment students it would seem the VanDeWater's (1970) conclusions could be generalized to The Experiment homestay

experience. The affirmation of the applicability of these findings would lend credence to the assumption made earlier in this study concerning host families.

When considering the behavioral dynamics of this particular interpersonal, intercultural set - the student and the host family - three questions occur.

1. If host families do exert a positive pull in regard to their foreign student, what part does the student play in the relationship?

A dissertation by Akutsu (1969) considered language deficiency patterns in relation to the positive self-evaluation of skills and non-ambiguous commitment to language learning as these two constructs affected foreign student interactions with Americans in potentially dissonance-increasing situations. The positive alignment of both variables tended to favor higher rates of interaction than was the case with other patterns of alignment among the variables studied. While the study was particular to language skills in an academic setting, could it be generalized to an overseas homestay which was designed to enhance interpersonal, intercultural communication. This study assumes that the positive alignment of self-esteem and commitment to program goals serve as a positive thrust in the relationship.

2. Are there limits to the number of possible approaches that the student could have to this relationship?



Smith (1955) concluded, from research with students in various programs from several colleges, that attitudes established before an overseas experience largely determine the degree of attitude change possible in this experience. Some persons are more prone and receptive to the consequences of exchange than are other persons. This fact could account for the lack of conclusive findings noted when broad populations are studied, based upon the assumption that all persons are equally available to the influences of cross-cultural programs, even though participants do self-select to join such programs. Starr (1970) developed a case study assessment of 23 Peace Corps volunteers and also concluded that prior interpersonal orientation largely determined the influence of the overseas experience. He also noted that the overseas experience was in turn determined by the institution or program to which the person belonged; participants were not to be viewed as free agents. Additionally, the effects of cross-cultural experiences on personality structure were relatively superficial and not enduring. This study assumes that these factors, personality and program, do determine the limits and nature of the overseas program for students. Further, personality is seen as the major effector in relationships between pre-adults and host families in the bicultural, interpersonal exchange process.

3. What effect does self-esteem play in the enactment of the exchange process?

The literature contains a number of answers to the question. Lambert and Bressler (1956) and Bailyn and Kelman (1962) underscore the importance of a healthy personality structure when undergoing cultural assault. Marshall (1973) in part relates self-esteem to a stable personal identity and its essential importance in functioning adequately in intercultural exchange processes. DuBois (1950:39) summarized other writers in her statement. "A healthy self-esteem, characterized by positive feelings toward the host, objectivity and expansion of goals are necessary to achieve positive adjustment in cross-cultural exchange programs." This study assumes that self-esteem, as a measure of a healthy personality structure, is a critical determining factor in the nature and development of bicultural interpersonal relationships.

Related Typological Studies: Three  
Additional Questions for Investigation

Three studies were identified in the exchange of persons literature that relate to this investigation. The first was developed from data gathered during an American overseas study tour. The second two studies concerned Indian and Scandinavian students in the United States.

Taba (1953:63) developed a typology of sojourner response on the basis of a factor analysis of data gathered from an American overseas study tour. She hypothesized that three behavior types existed among participants in the cross-cultural program studied.

Type 1. - had the ability and inclination to internalize new learning into an intellectual and attitudinal framework and . . . this type tended to use specific learning to modify general concepts, feelings and viewpoints, consciously and systematically.

Type 2. and 3. - were different in that their main basis for culture orientation was strongly emotional and therefore tended to be irrational. In type 2 this is manifested by their tendency to define one culture by projecting into it either negative or positive characteristics of another, the choice depending on their generalized attitude toward the other. This type of orientation prevented rational and cautious change. Lacking intellectual control over their cultural concepts, experiences with a foreign culture produced illogical shifts and sometimes irrational reversals without a correction in reasoning . . .

Type 3. - was handicapped mainly by a crystallized ethnocentrism. This tended to inhibit full use of new experience, because it introduced selectivity of response and imposed on its content an interpretation in terms of the value standards of the home culture.

Type 2. and 3. - displayed weakness in their ability to use general principles as an aid in developing perspective, as well as emotional fixations of one sort or another. Because their strong feelings blocked free use of new facts and experiences, they tended to resist change. These fixations also caused a variety of irrational mechanisms to control the formation of cultural orientations.

Taba's behavioral types seemed to closely align with the initial perspective held of Experiment student behavior in the host family setting. However, the nature of the study tour differed from that of the Experiment family stay. Experiment students have but one programmatic goal; bicultural, interpersonal exchange with their host family. Study tour members have required academic experiences with less extensive interpersonal contact incorporated in the program. A question for investigation became: How closely did the findings of Taba's study describe the behavior sub-groups that could be observed during an Experiment tour?

Lambert and Bressler (1956:81) in their case study analysis of Indian students in the United States also identified three types of behavioral reactions to cultural assault.

Type 1. Minimum Ego Assault -

Students in this category were at an early age aware of their future educational patterns and were oriented to a Western commitment in future life style. At times irritated, they were not overwhelmed by their reactions to American cultural assault.

It would be possible to assume that a congruency existed between expectation and enactment of life style and value structures for these students.

Type 2. - High Initial Ego Assault With  
Gradual Diminution -

Students in this category tended to focus upon a future life style that was Indian nationalistic with an adjustment described as 'coming to terms with the West.' Their diminishing hostile reactions to the American experience might, on assumption, reflect that orientation.

The overseas environment created for them a lesser congruent enactment of life style and value orientation.

Type 3. - Continued High Ego Assault -

Few in number, students in this category were highly insecure and aggressive in personality type. Their life styles and backgrounds varied. In common, however, they did discern and deeply felt an impingement upon their identity and national sense of self by the American cultural environment.

A complete lack of congruency existed for these persons in their expected educational pattern, life style and value orientation.

The authors used a case study analysis of their subjects in developing the typology. They felt that the observed behaviors resulted from two pre-disposing factors: varying tolerance levels for the perceived subordinate national status held by the host culture of the home culture and prior orientation to host nation educational placement gained in the home nation. The interplay of these factors diminished or enhanced the effect of cultural assault upon the students. While the Experiment

is not concerned with education in a formal sense, the descriptions developed by Lambert and Bressler also seem to describe the behavior of students placed with host families. This study explores the effect of prior orientation as a congruency factor between personal and program goals in the several areas of behavioral self-process.

A question for study: To what degree does the factor of congruency between personal expectations and program goals affect the overseas behavior of Experiment students?

The question of national status is not explored in this study. However, it might be possible to assume that this issue would not weigh heavily upon American students being placed in Western Europe.

Bailyn and Kelman (1962:30) through the use of an interview format studied the effects of an extended overseas study program upon the self-image of Scandinavian students on an American study tour. The subjects varied in age and professional development; they were generally older than the students considered in this study. Four reaction patterns were defined on the basis of two dimensions of self-image: change versus maintenance; internal (self-referent) versus external (group referent; described as social anchorage) structuring of self image.

#### Type 1. - Internalization Reaction -

These persons held an internal self-referent and changed in self-image. The change was described

as permanent and based upon a strong sense of self.

Type 2. - Identification Reaction -

These persons held an external self-referent and also changed in self-image. The change was described as possibly temporary and based upon some minor ambivalent feelings in regard to self.

Type 3. - Confirmation Reaction -

These persons did not change in self image but rather confirmed their sense of personal stability and internal structuring.

Type 4. - Resistance Reaction -

These persons also did not change in self-image, held an external self-referent that was described as highly ambivalent.

The authors concluded that self-image did play a role in overseas behavior to the extent that persons who were more secure in their sense of self were able to become more involved in their program of study as well as develop personal relationships with persons in the host culture. They tended to actively seek out opportunities to explore a number of different aspects in their sojourn: travel, professional contacts, personal friendships. For others with less secure feelings of self, this generalization diminished in its applicability. A few persons were identified who were not able to fully participate in even the minimum requirements of the study program. A question for consideration in this study is: Can the behavioral reaction patterns observed by Bailyn

and Kelman (1962), which were based upon change versus maintenance and internal versus external structuring of self-image, also be observed among members of an Experiment overseas group?

These three studies served as the basis for organizing this research project and designing the methodology employed. In this investigation the applicability of their findings are considered in relation to a different population of persons involved in a cross-cultural program.

#### A Theoretical Framework

A further conceptualization of the impact of the overseas environment upon persons is necessary in order to describe and analyze sojourner behavior. In this study we are dealing with the varying ability among persons to separate from their native culture with its supportive patterns and values and to become immersed in a host culture with differing patterns and values. What are the characteristic behaviors of persons living with host families in a new cultural environment? How do these differ among persons? What traits are evident that facilitate and/or hinder relating to persons from other cultures?

Festinger (1957) noted that the cross-cultural environment presented to the sojourner in varying degrees



challenges to physical, affective and cognitive life organization as it was known in the home culture. Cultures of common heritage tended to provide less discrepant patterns and configurations and, therefore, lower levels of personal displacement upon entry than cultures of uncommon heritage which tend to favor greater personal displacement. Beyond this assumption it would seem that other processes are involved in the cross-cultural experience.

The following definitions and functions of culture establish sojourner behavioral response:

"A frustration tolerance level be defined in relation to expectations of possible accomplishments within the host culture rather than the culture of reference.

Life orientation adjustment and presuppositions come about so that a total approach to the host culture becomes more secure and predictable.

Cultural values be defined and codified within an operational scheme that limits value encounters to non-polarizing processes of coping."

Failure to establish these psychological processes is largely responsible for culture shock. Culture shock is defined as diminished and minimized contact with and psychological withdrawal from, the host culture. The host

culture becomes overpowering in its assault upon the individual; to protect the integrity of self, withdrawal is necessary. Withdrawal in a physical sense can only be partial; in a psychological sense it is more easily attained. The physical manifestation of this process is seen as exhaustion, illness and low levels of productive and personal interaction. It results from an inability to meet one's needs for security, health, affiliation, and accomplishment. Feelings of loneliness, isolation and loss of self-worth become the psychological expression of this process.

Each of these processes of self-reordering is not to be considered as a single and isolated factor of personal adjustment, but rather as an integral part of a total approach to the cross-cultural experience. The failure of an individual to reorder self in one area of personal adjustment is perhaps less drastic in effect than when compounded by a failure to reorder self in several areas of personal adjustment. That is to say, failure to change in life orientation alone is not as traumatic in effect as when it is compounded by a loss of stable self-identity.

The successful establishment of new self-perceptions with the resultant development of coping behavior patterns would in theory counter the effects of culture

shock. According to Klineberg (1964) it is the nomothetic dimension of personality that orients one's perceptions of and ability to adapt within another culture but it is the idiographic dimension of self that ultimately determines the degree and threshold at which cultural assault becomes an overwhelming and debilitating experience.

Given the validity of the findings from three related studies (Taba 1953; Lambert and Bressler 1956; Bailyn and Kelman 1962) it is possible to theorize that shared characteristic patterns of behavioral response also exist for individuals who are placed with host families by The Experiment. Three interpersonal, intercultural attributes are suggested as the major operational, relating elements that must be established if a reordering of self is to occur. These elements are seen as the expressions of the dynamic self-processes that establish the behaviors outlined in this study as well as those described in the studies cited. These three elements are trust, receptivity and communicative facility; they are indicative in their varied enactment, as coping behaviors, of individual differences among persons.

The development of trust: is the most important relating element and factor in the cross-cultural process. Without the development of trust there cannot be a stabilization of identity, nor the reorienting of life

interpretation that provides for the essential human needs of self-worth and security in the new environment. The placement of trust in the person of a host culture representative will allow one to overcome, set aside or withhold attitudes and value defenses. This process is brought about by the removal in varying degrees, depending upon the ability of the participant, of cultural referents. These may be as exclusive as national identity or as broad as Western culture. This process further allows the exchange of affective stimulation, a requirement for the normal and adequate functioning of persons within any human grouping.

Receptivity: to experiential factors in the host culture is a second relating element and factor of varying ability within the cross-cultural process. Receptivity implies that native culture distinctions and choices of action or evaluation of patterns and situations are set aside by the visitor in order that one may learn new approaches to life as it is lived by those who are their hosts. Persons learn by observing, doing and speaking. It is the extension of "other culture credibility" (Benedict 1934), that allows persons to broadly engage their new environment in a positive way and experience a different pattern of life organization. Without the occurrence of this dynamic, persons cannot consider nor

understand the indigenous consequences of life as it is lived by thier hosts.

Communicative facility: is the third relating element and factor of varying ability affecting the process of cross-cultural exchange. Communicative facility is defined as more than a verbal exchange of meaning, values and mental sets as these determine daily patterns of behavior and orientation to living. Although language fluency is an important ability in the exchange process, one need not be fluent in the language of a host culture to be aware of its organization. One can communicate through proactive behavior: participation, exploration, sharing and affective involvement. Language fluency adds greatly to the exchange process. It is an important vehicle in gaining specificity through the use of the subtle and non-translatable components of language. This element is viewed as being operant at the micro-cultural level. That is to say, personal experiences in the host family setting or other such cultural unit are more readily explored through this interpersonal process than are more abstract and broadly encompassing definitions of culture.

Within these conceptual processes are a number of psychological impingements that affect self-identity. Not all persons have an equal ability to deal with the

psychological changes that are implied by the concepts of trust, receptivity and communicative facility. It is questionable as to how many assaults upon self-identity one can withstand at any one time or over a period of time. Alternatively, it is not always desirable that such a degree of involvement should occur for there are other considerations in foreign placement. More importantly, some significant threats to psychological integrity are involved in this perspective of the dynamics which affect relating across cultures.

The elements of trust, receptivity and communicative facility were employed as organizational perspectives when reviewing the case study material that was gathered in this research project. Their expression in observed behavior and personal interpretation of the overseas experience is considered one of the primary sources of differentiation among persons.

## CHAPTER V

### FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

#### Part 1

#### A Typology of Student Behavior

During a six week overseas summer program sponsored by The Experiment In International Living, case study material was collected and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was administered to ten students who were the subject group for this study. Two investigations related to overseas behavior and one concerning the effect of overseas placement upon self-esteem were utilized in developing the methodology employed. The data were gathered and organized around four sequential areas of self-process and three sequential assessments of self-esteem. A typology of behavioral response was created. The typology consists of three behavioral styles which were found to be related to self-esteem. In the first part of this chapter the characteristic patterns of self-process, expressed as behavior, are described and outlined; the data obtained from the three testings is presented followed by a classification





of subjects within the typology created. The second part of this chapter contains three representative case studies with an analysis of each study. The data derived from the analyses were the basis for the descriptions of self-process.

Behavioral Self-process: Observed  
and Interpreted Behavior

Much of the data gathered was idiographic in reference but lent itself to clustering when considered in the context of group interaction in a cross-cultural environment. Three descriptive typological patterns were created in the review, analysis and categorization of that material.

While each of the ten students, at times, displayed behaviors and attitudes that were characteristic of any one or all of the patterns within the typology, each student in general tended to act from a central perspective that was markedly characteristic and about which was organized their interpretation of the overseas experience. The commonality of enacted self-process and the shared perspectives of individuals led to the definition of subgroup patterns and the development of a system of classification. Because there were only ten subjects in this study, it is perhaps best to consider these findings from a perspective that is tentative rather than conclusive.

These behavioral groupings are, therefore, to be thought of as outlines of adaptational styles in need of further definition.

### Organization of the Data

The differentiation of the characteristic attitudes and behaviors exhibited by students in each of the three sub-groups were initially noted in the post-assessment material. Later, when material from all periods was comparatively analyzed, further patterns of commonality were found and delineated. These patterns were then organized by reviewing each case study and considering it in relation to all of the subjects' records gathered in this research. Finally, case studies which contained similar patterns of enactment were grouped and considered for specific shared attitudes, patterns of enactment and expressed values.

The personal qualities and characteristic attitudes used to organize and analyze the four phases of self-process were:

#### 1. Motivation and expectation:

Were the student's motives for joining the program:

ambiguous	personal and internalized
clear	popular and externalized

Were the student's expectations of the program:

general	specific	non-specific
open ended	required	non-programmatic
accomplishable	task oriented	unrealistic
	possible/adaptable	not accomplishable

## 2. Approach:

Did the student approach the experience in a way that was:

receptive	adaptive	rejecting
holistic	selective	fragmented

## 3. Was the student's personal orientation toward:

host family      other group members      self concerns

Was the student's manner of coping:

constant	enduring	avoiding
outreaching	extending	attacking
energetic	withdrawing	escaping

Did the student's behavior contain evidence of:

a trusting relationship  
broad communication with the host culture

## 4. Post-experience assessment:

Did the student display an attitude that was:

positive              neutral              negative

Did the student describe the experience in terms that were:

self-responsible              not self-responsible

Did the student have an interpretation of the experience that was:

objective              subjective              blocked

Behavioral Types

Three behavioral types were identified from the characteristics outlined. The descriptions developed contain the full array of behavioral enactment and interpretation found within a particular type.

Type 1.--Positive-Receptive: The students in this behavioral category had motivations that were personal and internalized in their description. Their reasons for joining The Experiment program varied but were largely centered around: language learning, living with a host family and experiencing life as it was lived in another culture. These expressions of interest, while aligned with program goals were, in a sense, only partial descriptions of a less easily defined psychological tendency. That tendency was to participate in activities which would lead them to a broader perception of life than had been known previously. Their motivation was clear; it was programmatic. The reasons behind that motivation were not always apparent, even to the student. It was difficult for these students to explain why they felt as they did; but they were certain that they, themselves, wanted to live with a host family; each for different reasons. Distinctly, they had chosen on their own to join a cross-cultural program.

In expectation, these students were able to express again, the three general goals of The Experiment. Beyond that, they were definite in not holding specific and required criteria by which to define the success or failure of the program. Receptive to whatever the home-stay and host community offered their personal goals were accomplishable.

During orientation and while overseas these students approached the cross-cultural environment in a manner that was relaxed and anticipatory. They had attitudes that were open, trusting, accepting and receptive. Often, they were able to delay or withhold judgment about issues of concern until a holistic definition of the entire experience was obtained.

In the area of integration, these students displayed little or no psychological blocking in receiving and processing information in the new cultural environment. While living with their host families, they actively sought out new experiences that were host cultural or bicultural in orientation. Their focus of attention was the host family and observing and sharing that experience within the family.

These students disengaged from the group as a means of interpreting the host culture and the family experience. Their perspectives were singular. Interpretations were held to the context within which a given event occurred. In an energetic manner, these students were outreaching and communicated broadly with their new surroundings. Thus, they gained a greater degree of understanding of themselves and the community than did other students. Not all of their interpersonal intercultural explorations led to easily understood interpretations of similarities and differences. However, in

self-responsible terms, they could objectively define elements within a given problematic set, and often left questions unresolved. Closure and generalizations concerning these same problems, other observations or a particular event were not present in their rhetoric.

In reviewing their summer's experience, these students were positive in their assessment of its meaning. Objective and confident, they were able to cite both the enjoyable and the not so enjoyable aspects of living with a host family and traveling with a group. Many of them felt that they had accomplished personal goals which were still in part undefined. For most of these students the program had been a vehicle in that process of accomplishment. Most would not travel with The Experiment again, at least not to Europe. However, they had become further oriented to and motivated for other cross-cultural experiences.

Type 2.--Positive-Adaptive: The students who displayed the behavioral characteristics of this grouping were at times similar in their expressed outlook to those who comprised the positive-receptive category.

In motivation, they expressed programmatic goals as their reasons for travel: language, living with a host family and experiencing life as it was lived in another culture. However this expression was "popular"

rather than personal. Their reasons for travel were reasons that others had suggested, not their own. The Experiment was held as an appropriate "in thing" to do either at their college or among their friends. In essence the motivation expressed was external and not incorporated as was the case with students who displayed positive - receptive behavior. However, as time passed, these students were able to develop and express more personal and meaningful reasons for Experimenting. This was often displayed with clear and confident goal statements followed by ambiguous and questioning expressions of motivation.

These students held specific and required expectations of the program. At times their desired plans were unrealistic and unaccomplishable; schemes for additional travel were frequent. Program schedule disallowed these expectations which were given up grudgingly by the student. "Coming to terms" was a difficult task for these persons. Alternatively, other plans that they made were possible within the program schedule. These became task oriented behavioral expressions. Students in this category had very distinct needs for structure; planned schedules, sequential advancement toward a goal and closure. The indefinite nature of the host family stay caused them to be anxious and hesitant. They,

therefore, tended to develop a fantasized structure concerning the overseas experience.

In the area of integration, these students displayed psychological blocking. It was difficult for them to establish trusting relationships with their host families. Because their needs for structure were often unmet, the unpredictable nature of the cross-cultural environment caused them to withdraw. In a self-fulfilling pattern, because they were not, they could not become, broadly communicative with their hosts. This cycle led to a further sense of discomfort with their already ambiguous perception of the host community and culture. However, these students were enduring in their search for meaning and accomplishment. A slight degree of success, accomplishment or communication led to further pursuit of these same factors. In a sense these students spent their summer in an unstable equilibrium, balanced between their need to accomplish a given set of required expectations and their inability to fully achieve those expectations.

For these students, the group, especially others in the group like themselves, played a vital role in filtering, screening and interpreting the cross-cultural experience. They shared among themselves much of what happened to them within their families, as well as in the host community. They found security and courage in



each other. The processes of extending and withdrawing, exploring and retreating were enhanced or diminished by the group. They maintained a dual focus on the overseas experience; the group and the host family. This dual relationship seemed to prevent the development of trust and communication with the host culture until late in the experience. Their behavior in this dynamic process was adaptive, not receptive. Frequently, these students were bothered by the physical environment and became emotionally upset. In response, they were judgmental about their hosts and did not assume responsibility for their own disappointments.

In reviewing the meaning of the experience for themselves these students were generally positive about what had happened. This sense of satisfaction was achieved through comparison, within the group. On a more personal level, they were disappointed over given issues and troubled as to why. Occasionally, the frustration of being uncertain was displaced upon the host family or culture in its expression. Most tried to achieve a sense of closure and found positive generalizations a satisfactory means of explaining their summer experience. The "popular" myth of living with a host family reasserted itself; these students seldom discussed the unpleasant aspects of their sojourn. The unpleasant became the unremembered; the happy experiences and achieved goals

gradually filled their descriptions, again. However, as a group these students did not perceive themselves as having future careers in a cross-cultural program.

Type 3.--Negative Rejecting: The two students who enacted the behavior characteristics that were distinctive of this grouping were clearly different from students placed in either of the other categories of enactment.

In motivation one of these students had specific and clear reasons for participating in the program. These reasons were personal and internalized. However, they could not be adapted to the programmatic context in which they were to be enacted. The second student was able to verbalize the intent of the program as his own. However, that intent had no meaning for him. He was being forced to participate in another of a series of summer programs.

In expectation, these students were similar. Neither held goals that were achievable within the context of the program. In one case, required expectations were held that could not be fulfilled because they were grounded in a fantasized ethnic return. In the second case, the student held fragmented expectations that were passing and not within the operational limits of the program. In both cases their wishes and desires were not negotiable and became more rigid in their expression as time passed.

In approach, these students were random and illogical in their selection of interest areas. Rigid expectations blocked the exploration of possible alternatives that could be adapted to meet their needs in the overseas environment. They expressed fear and excitement, joy and anger when discussing the program schedule or the homestay. Their emotional expressions were inconsistent and not related to a logical progression of feelings and ideas.

In the area of integration:

The host culture environment was rejected upon arrival by these students. They found their host families to be unsatisfactory; the host community, not meeting their expectations. There was little evidence of communication with persons within their families or the community. Trusting relationships were not evidenced. They found it difficult to describe what they were feeling and why they were feeling either hostile and aggressive or overwhelmed, disappointed and withdrawn. The group did not serve as a source of support and interpretation for these students. Their behavior became progressively more negative and highly emotional in its expression. The satisfactory experiences that others had did not serve as a source of encouragement for these students. They could not adapt their needs, as others had, to the experiences that were

available. Anxiety became overpowering and they withdrew from their families and the group.

In assessing the experience, one student completely rejected the program and found no positive meaning in what had occurred. He disliked and distrusted the environment to which he had been exposed. The program was dismissed as a "bummer;" he would travel again, somewhere. The second student was deeply troubled by her non-accomplishment of an ideal ethnic return. The reality that had been experienced was not acceptable; she would return again in pursuit of her dream. She was left with the problem of facing family and friends, disappointed and deeply distressed.

#### Measurement of Self-esteem

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, counseling form, was administered three times during the research period: prior to departure for the overseas program; one week after placement with the host family; immediately after leaving the host community but before returning to the United States.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale consists of one hundred statements which the subject rates in portraying self. According to Fitts (1965:2):

Total-positive score is the most important single score on the counseling form for it reflects the overall level of self-esteem. Persons with high scores tend to like themselves, feel that they are

persons of worth and value, have confidence in themselves and act accordingly. People with low scores are doubtful of their own worth, see themselves as undesirable, often feel anxious, depressed and unhappy and have little or no confidence in themselves.

The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was selected for use in this study on an exploratory basis. The instrument was known to be valid in its total-positive score assessment of self-esteem for individuals in a counseling relationship. It was questionable as to whether total group of sub-group trends brought about by entering a new cultural environment could be assessed with the instrument.

#### Idiographic Data

Idiographic data were derived from the use of the total-positive score as a measure of self-esteem. A relationship between self-esteem and behavioral self-process was evidenced. The following table contains the total-positive score obtained by each subject and its rank order placement for the three test periods. The subjects are listed in code according to behavioral type. Subjects (A-1) through (A-4) displayed positive-receptive behaviors; subjects (B-1) through (B-4) displayed positive-adaptive behaviors; subjects (C-1) and (C-2) displayed negative-rejecting behaviors.

Rank order placement by total positive score fluctuated for all members of the study group except for

TABLE 1.--Total-Positive Score.

Subject	Pre-Test		Interim Test		Post-Test	
	Score	Rank Order	Score	Rank Order	Score	Rank Order
A-1	391	(1)	376	(1)	294	(1)
A-2	385	(2)	359	(5)	354	(4)
A-3	354	(3)	363	(3)	368	(2)
A-4	347	(5)	366	(2)	347	(6)
B-1	342	(6)	354	(6)	352	(5)
B-2	320	(9)	360	(4)	358	(3)
B-3	350	(4)	335	(8)	343	(7)
B-4	333	(7)	349	(7)	322	(9)
C-1	330	(8)	319	(9)	328	(8)
C-2	308	(10)	312	(10)	297	(10)

subjects (A-1) and (C-2). A comparison of scores obtained on the pre-test and the interim test indicated that changes in rank order placement occurred for five persons: subjects (A-2), (B-3) and (B-4) received lower total positive scores; subjects (A-4) and (B-2) received higher total positive scores. A comparison of interim test and post test scores indicated that an increase in rank order placement occurred for six subjects. In general it was noted that persons who received high total positive scores on two of the three tests administered displayed behaviors that were positive-receptive or positive-adaptive. Persons who obtained low total positive scores generally displayed negative-rejecting patterns of behavior in the overseas setting. Displayed behavior is defined as a total perspective of behavior rather than an individual enactment associated with and perhaps confined to a particular event or circumstance. For individuals in the study group, assessed levels of self-esteem were aligned with behavioral self-process but were not in all cases predictive of behavioral type.

#### Nomothetic Data

Nomothetic data were derived from a statistical treatment of the total positive score as well as the three row and five column scores of the instrument. An analysis of variance for sub-group differences with a trend analysis

over time was conducted for each of the nine measures available in the Scale.

For total positive score it was found that a significant difference existed ( $p=.004$ ) between scores obtained by members of the three sub-groups identified in the study. No significant differences were found in the analysis of the remaining measures for the total group, sub-groups within the total group or when considering these measures in relation to trends over time. Generally it was found that assessed levels of self-esteem were constant throughout the testing period although fluctuations in rank order did occur for individuals. It would therefore appear that, assessed levels of self-esteem are not significantly affected by placement with a host family and that such measures are highly correlated with enacted sub-group behavior patterns in the overseas setting. This generalization would seem to be valid when dealing with groups of students but would not necessarily be relevant when considering individual patterns of behavior.

#### Classification of Subjects

The ten students who were the focus of this study were categorized in the following manner based upon their recorded attitudes and descriptions, observed behaviors and test scores. Students who displayed positive-



receptive behaviors were designated with an "A," students who displayed positive-adaptive behaviors were designated with a "B" and those students who displayed negative-rejecting behaviors were designated with a "C". Rank order placement within sub-groups was assigned on the basis of average total-positive score obtained on The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Positive Receptive	Positive Adaptive	Negative Rejecting
A	B	C
A-1	B-1	C-1
A-2	B-2	C-2
A-3	B-3	
A-4	B-4	

Four students were identified as having those characteristics that became the positive-receptive category of behavior. Two of the students were female, one of whom was Black; two of the students were male. Three of these students were easily categorized in their behavioral style, which tended to be consistent. Subject (A-4) a student from The Dominican Republic tended toward the display of positive-adaptive behaviors at times. These were often noted in reactions to public situations away from the host family. However, the student was consistent in exclusively attending to the host family rather than the group during the homestay period.

Two subjects were identified as having those characteristics that became the negative-rejecting category of behavior. Their behaviors were dissimilar in enactment but comparable in effect and purpose. Subject (C-1), female, tended to be passive and negative in her displacement of hostility upon the host family because of their failure to meet her expectations. Subject (C-2) male, was negative and aggressive. He was constantly critical of the host culture environment and his host family. He displaced much of his hostility through physical action. In both cases there was an enduring and marked rejection of the total experience.

Those students who were defined as positive-adaptive in their behavioral style were not as readily placed within a behavioral category. Four of the students, three females and one male, were members of this sub-group. Subject (B-1) tended to be withdrawn and generally unable to socialize within the American group. Usually positive in outlook, she seldom displayed the extending and withdrawing pattern noted in other students. She did not become involved with her family in any appreciable way. Rather, she lived among them, observing. Seldom communicative, her interview responses were impersonal and intellectual. Generally speaking, she did not develop or enact behaviors that could be

defined as "coming to terms" with the host culture. Alternatively, she did not display the rejecting behavior noted in the patterns for subjects (C-1) and (C-2).

## Common Characteristics Within Behavioral Type By Program Period.

**Orientation  
Period**

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Personal, internalized goals</li> <li>2. General goal statements that were open ended and accomplishable</li> <li>3. Receptive to and trusting of the coming experience</li> <li>4. Low order needs for structure</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Other-directed externalized goal statements</li> <li>2. Specific goal statements that were structured and required</li> <li>3. Adaptive to, but anxious and hesitant about coming experience</li> <li>4. High order needs for structure</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Personal, internalized goals/ no goals, forced to join program</li> <li>2. Specific and non-specific requirements that were unrealistic and not accomplishable</li> <li>3. Not adaptive nor receptive to program or host culture as presented</li> <li>4. Rigid and required, sometimes fragmented needs for structure, rejection of program structure.</li> </ol> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**Homestay  
Period**

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Immediate family involvement, developing trusting relationship</li> <li>2. Constant, energetic outreaching behavior with broad communication in the host culture</li> <li>3. Continued development of receptiveness to host culture environment, no blocking of physical, affective or cognitive factors</li> <li>4. Little desire for American group contact</li> <li>5. Disengaged from home culture</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Family and group adaptive with group serving as resource for interpretation</li> <li>2. Late and limited development of trusting relationships with persons in host culture</li> <li>3. Enduring but extending and withdrawing communication with host culture environment</li> <li>4. Ambivalent/adaptive in receptiveness to host culture</li> <li>5. Blocking of physical, affective and cognitive factors.</li> <li>6. Desire of group contact</li> <li>7. Constant contact with home culture</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Self concerned, rejection of host family</li> <li>2. Affective blocking, avoiding, escaping, withdrawing, attacking host culture environment</li> <li>3. No development of trust nor communication with host culture representatives</li> <li>4. Occasional involvement with group, but for selective reasons. No involvement in group interpretation process</li> <li>5. Much or little contact with home culture</li> </ol> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**Post-Homestay  
Period**

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Positive, objective, self-responsible, holistic interpretation of experience</li> <li>2. Displayed sense of accomplishment, overseas oriented</li> <li>3. Avoided generalized interpretations, little need for closure</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lesser degree of objective, holistic, responsible interpretation</li> <li>2. Lesser sense of accomplishment not overseas oriented</li> <li>3. Prone to generalizations, need for closure, group interpretation</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Negative and rejecting of experience. Overwhelmed leading to diffused, hostile interpretation of host family experience</li> <li>2. No displayed sense of accomplishment</li> <li>3. Confused and selected generalizations; need for closure</li> </ol> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Part 2  
Examples of Typological Behavior:  
Case Studies and Analyses

In Part 2, three case studies are presented, which are representative of the students who were members of the study group. An analysis follows each study. In order to protect the identity of the individuals who consented to participate in this research, the cases presented are fictitious in name as well as identifying descriptions of behavioral enactment.

Case Study #1. JoAnne Subject (A-3)

I first met JoAnne in the library. She had finished her last class in Italian at the Language Learning School. Mike, an Experiment Administrator, introduced her. "Here comes one of your group members. JoAnne, come over and meet someone." I knew after five years of leading groups that something was wrong. The Experiment has subtle ways of conveying that to leaders. Meeting a group member randomly in the library, with Mike as an intermediary, was one way of conveying that message. It had not been a friendship reunion after all, Mike had a job to do; JoAnne was my "problem child."

She was twenty and in her junior year at State University where she was majoring in foreign languages. She moved toward us with a closed and tight posture. Friendly but determined, she did not have the bubbly personality of a "groupie"; the kids that immediately relate in a group context. She was a "loner"; one of the kids that make it on their own overseas or become completely helpless.

"Hi! I'm JoAnne. You're Ted." "How is the Italian coming?" "Pretty well." We chatted on for a few minutes and then I suggested that we get together for an interview. "O.K., see you at 2:15 in your room." She left. Mike said, "We've had a few sessions with her."

There were two days and a few hours left before the group would be getting on the bus for the airport. Building a group was not like it used to be. The excitement of travel was gone; going to Europe for the summer was no longer a novel experience. These students had been trained in interpersonal and group skills since high school, usually. The spontaneity of meeting new people was no longer a personal expression, it was a learned counter-culture communication pattern in which personal-self was hidden. In many ways these students were more experienced, more mature and aware of life

than were their counterparts of even a few years earlier. As Mike put it, "They are not eighteen going on twenty, they are eighteen going on thirty." Late adolescence covers a lot more years than it used to.

As a leader you have to find some way of getting through to them. Techniques that used to work are no longer effective. Leaders play on the idealism of The Experiment, the novelty of travel, group relations games and the openness of the students. It is tiresome to most of the students, but leaders keep believing. After five groups there is not much left that surprises you. Overseas, when students come to rely on the few bits that sink in, you realize that you were right. The students seldom admit that openly.

The door to my room was ajar but she knocked anyway. "Privacy is important." "Come in; you are right about that." "Thank you for being honest; group leaders are not supposed to be private." She sat on the bed and asked if I minded her smoking. She lit a European cigarette. I explained the research project to her and then turned on the tape recorder. Looking down she said, "Have you heard?" "Yes, but let me have your side of it." "Heinz is teaching German here for the summer. We have been together a lot. He leaves for London in a few weeks and will meet me in Amsterdam at the end of August."

"It began one night at dinner. I was late and some of the teachers were still eating. They were talking to each other in German, French, Italian and English. I was the only American. German isn't my best, but I can get along. I took French for a year and began German last semester. Italian is coming easier than either of the other languages. Heinz and I talked for a long while after the others left; we spent the night in his room."

"It was alright for the first few nights but later I guess that someone in the office didn't like it. They were going to fire him. Then, they got on my back. That was last week." A few tears, then she looked up.

"What do you see as the problem now, JoAnne?"  
'Nothing really. They are the ones who are uptight. They keep telling me that it won't work out overseas. 'What will I do when my Italian family insists that I stay in every evening?'"

"I'll do it - that's what the program is about. That is why I am here. Don't they know that? I can understand why they are upset about what might happen overseas but, it is no different there than it is here. You respect people who respect you; where they are and what they are."

JoAnne had never been overseas. She had spent her summers working. The older of two children, she was paying her own way. Her father was in a management



position in a small, private company. Last year she decided to major in languages. She didn't know how it happened, not really. Her roommate had taken Russian. The next semester she took French and then German. It had all come together. She felt involved in what she was doing. Studying languages gave her a sense of freedom. She felt alive and moving. Just knowing that she could talk to people anywhere in the world, on their terms, meant a great deal to her.

"Why did you chose The Experiment?" It was partly her folks; partly language training. Mostly though, she wanted to live with a family. Her father had approved of that. The university had a year abroad program but it was like boarding school and she couldn't afford it anyway. So, here she was. No expectations; none of the usual wanting to see everything or visit three countries in two days. Rome or Venice might be nice but travel was not her reason for going. Her host family had written. There were two children at home, an older boy and a little girl. Another son was away at a university and would be on summer break before she left. The program and the family were what she wanted.

"Ted, what are you thinking? Heinz?" "Yes."  
 "It doesn't bother you?" "No, not here. But you have got to come to grips with it. The program is not worth

it, if you are feeding yourself a line. There are other ways to go overseas. Living with a family is not easy. You may think that you want to, but actually doing it is another experience altogether. Think it over."

Two years before that Meg had been in my group. Birth control pills were new, at least in their effect upon Experiment group behavior. We had lost a host family and nearly a whole community in England because Meg had gone off for a weekend with a boy in the town and was completely open about sleeping with him. Her family had insisted that she stop seeing him. She refused but stayed on at their home. They would never accept another Experimenter; it had been their first experience. Word got around in the community and the local representative had to struggle to find families for another group that were to come in early September for an extended program.

Meg had reacted to the family and the group. She wanted to "do her thing." The other kids were embarrassed; they locked her out. Even in London, the group would not allow her to regain an intimate relationship with them. They wanted to be "Experimenters" and she had broken the pattern. Meg had survived it all but at what price, and to whom?

JoAnne said very little after that. I didn't want her to. "Lets go for a walk." Early summer in

Vermont is a pleasant setting in which to build a relationship. The others arrived. We had supper together and came back to the dormitory. Ten people meeting each other for the first time.

JoAnne met me the next morning after breakfast. "I'll do it. I've decided that the family is what I want. I'm meeting Heinz for coffee. We will see each other in Amsterdam; he won't be coming to Italy. I didn't tell you about that yesterday." I nodded. Mike laughed after she left. I decided that she would go. It had been my choice, a choice that sometimes has to be made at the last minute.

JoAnne was packed and ready to leave that afternoon. She carried little with her. In two days she had "gotten into the group thing." There were two others like her and one more later. Not "groupies," serious kids that went along with the orientation program. They came to all of the sessions but somehow resented wasting their time there. JoAnne taught us some Italian phrases and tried to contribute in other ways. I knew that she was fighting her tendencies to be private, alone and free. The other two weren't as cooperative. The usual demographic, economic, political and historical "garbage" didn't do much for them.

In personal expectations these students were like JoAnne. They didn't have any. They weren't excited.

Calm, sure, aloof, concerned - much of the business of packing, travel schedules, addresses, host family descriptions and The Experiment line, did not get to them. It was just a six week program overseas.

They were each different, but somehow the same. Frank had travelled before with his parents and wanted to see Italy from the other side. "What do Americans look like to Italians?" Toni had never been overseas and didn't speak a foreign language. But, she wanted to live in another country. So it was for each of them; little identity with the group or The Experiment, but deeply motivated to experience life as other people lived it.

There had been other group members like these kids. Self directed people; strong people. The small things did not bother them. But people who were concerned with little details, did. They could get along in the group, but for just so long. Lost tickets, luggage, late trains, cold showers they didn't complain. Resourceful, they picked up the broken pieces for themselves and for everyone else. Whether it was climbing in the Alps or rescuing a tipsy friend from an embarrassing situation, "they had it together." Once in awhile, they broke down emotionally; the cognitive realities of life abroad, not their personal discomforts, get to them. But, they did

it in private. They did not always like their host families but they made the best of it. No expectations, they accepted life for what it offered at the time.

Our first day in Italy was a mixture of excitement and disappointment. Exhausted, we arrived in Milan at 5:17 a.m. Some of us went to bed. Later that day a few of the group went out together to exchange money and visit the shops. That evening three of the girls were molested in the cathedral square. JoAnne and Frank came back late. She had been gone all day and had met Frank at the cathedral, by accident. She listened to the stories and shared in the discussion. No, she had not been bothered. "Maybe, we should not go wandering around without one of the guys." She went to bed, the others stayed up and talked about the next day.

As the train approached our host community everyone became excited. Tears, laughter, goodbys. The train stopped. We got off and our families surrounded us. I saw JoAnne leave. Her Italian father had come to meet her; they left quietly waving to no one.

A week later, Paolo the local representative, drove me around to each of the families. JoAnne had been reading while waiting for us to arrive. Her Italian mother joined us. JoAnne translated for her, when she could. She had been babysitting one afternoon and had left the house but twice since her arrival. One trip

had been an early morning visit to the vegetable market; the second was an evening ride through the city.

It was a formal meeting. The family were upper class and traditional in their orientation. A maid called Paolo to the telephone, Mrs. Antanelli went to check on the coffee. "How is it going?" "Good, I like it. Got any novels that you want to share?" "No, but can I take you to the beach tomorrow?" Paolo had told me that the family were very strict with their own children and thought that it might be hard for JoAnne to adapt without a break. "No thanks. We've made plans for late morning, here at home." "Cigarette?" "No, thank you, Dr. Antanelli doesn't approve of women smoking. I smoke in my room."

The coffee arrived and the maid went back to the kitchen. "Have you seen any of the others?" "No, but I think Toni's family called. We are going for coffee tomorrow afternoon. Dr. Antanelli suggested that you be invited for dinner here some evening. I said that you were busy, was that alright?" "I nodded, she smiled. I didn't need another invitation for dinner.

I only saw JoAnne twice during the weeks that followed. She didn't come to the beach nor did she join in activities that were planned for the group and the host families. JoAnne and Toni talked to each other on the telephone once in awhile. The others were curious about where she was and what she was doing. I never really

knew. Once, she and Mrs. Antanelli went to Rome for a day. The rest of the summer JoAnne stayed at home with her host family.

After we left the community she gave me an envelope and asked that I read it after she had gone to Amsterdam. She had not kept a diary. In the next several days as we traveled to Venice and then Florence with people from our families, JoAnne spent most of her time with the Italians. The others were glad to be together again, they had started to pull away from their involvement with their hosts. Not exclusive in a deliberate way, she seemed more comfortable with the Italians. Using the new language that she had learned, she flirted with our bus driver. It was a source of merriment among the Italians. At the hotel, in the streets, on the trains, she was with the group but apart from the group; not Italian, not American.

We eventually reached Brussels. JoAnne stayed with us for the last two days before we were to fly home. On Thursday, she said goodbye. I gave her a per diem allowance, we walked down the hall and Frank joined us. Toni had a few tears at the front door. She shook my hand, "Thanks, Ted." They walked to the station.

Later I opened her envelope.

Ted,

I thought you were going to be a creep, but you weren't. You made it livable. If you hadn't understood, I was going to split in Milan. I've had a lot of time to think. No diary, I wanted you to know how I felt.

The Experiment is not one of my loves - but I guess it has to exist or I wouldn't be here. Orientation was the worst of all. Some of us were just not with it. I guess you needed to know us or teach us something. I hated it.

Now you have it. I feel like a snob but I can't get excited about Boy Scout games. Other people seem to.

Reality hit that night in Milan. I got my . . . pinched too. I didn't like it. I understand why the Italians react that way. I agree with Toni, we go around asking for it and then wonder why.

My family made it worthwhile. We weren't close and friendly like some of the others. They were wonderful people. They were strict but, I could have done what I wanted to. I wouldn't let them down. They see enough Americans who don't care. No picnics, no beach - I stayed at home. I snuck out once with my brother, to a dance.

Most of the time I was with the housekeeper or the children. Time dragged after the first week or so. One night they gave me a present and a party. The two children stayed up late and Dr. Antanelli stayed at home. It was nice. I cried. After that it was comfortable. They cared, they knew that I was trying. Mrs. Antanelli told me lots of things. Things I don't know about my own parents. We talked about Heinz. She understood. She is afraid that something will happen to me. I can come back. I will come back. But it won't be the same. I belong here, not with the family - just here. This morning I cried again. The garden, the kitchen - the last day. It was painful but wonderful, I tried to touch everything one last time.



(Mrs. A) Rosa came into the breakfast room, we had coffee and said little. We are more than friends. We said goodbye. It will be too busy tomorrow. I'm writing this now before it ends.

God bless.

Case Study Analysis #1:  
JoAnne Subject (A-3)

JoAnne's experience was representative of and similar to that of three other persons in the positive-receptive category. Frank subject (A-2), Juan subject (A-4) and Toni subject (A-1). their shared pattern of behavior and experience interpretation was described as positive-receptive in the typology developed in this study.

JoAnne's reasons for going overseas were clear, definite and purposeful. Primarily she wished to learn another language but she was also desirous of having a cross-cultural experience which was personal and occurred in a family setting. Her motivation was not to travel as a tourist, not to visit a given number of places nor see a series of objects. Rather, she wanted to experience life as it was lived, not observed, in another country. From this experience she hoped to derive an understanding of a different life pattern, another way of living.

Open and receptive to whatever the experience presented, JoAnne operationally defined her expectations and therefore would achieve a degree of satisfaction

from their accomplishment. In general, this was also true of other students in this category.

For whatever reasons, not easily defined, JoAnne was attracted to the cross-cultural arena. She had a sense of trust about, openness to and receptiveness for things international. She was willing to communicate broadly with the environment. While JoAnne and Frank displayed attitudes typical of their counter-culture compatriots, this was not true of Toni and Juan. Their concerns were more traditional-established and, in fact, atypical for their generation.

In common, they shared no specific expectations that were required and which could be defined in temporal or physical terms. Self-responsible, situational, receptive, they would become involved in whatever relationships and experiences were available in the family where they were placed.

Approach: JoAnne was committed to learning another language. This commitment had been developing over time and would continue. Initially her engagement of the host culture was literary and linguistic. Frank had taken the time to explore and read widely about Italy. Although not attending language classes, he learned some of the language on his own. This degree of preparedness and engagement was less true of Toni and Juan. Relaxed, informal, they were less intense. They

were simply going to meet new friends; "history books would get in the way." In common their approach was not one of labelling, nor gathering facts that were pre-definitive or stereotypical. They could comfortably participate in an undefined experience, one that they knew little about. In an exclusive way, they focussed upon their host families as the motivation and purpose for their overseas experience.

They rejected groupism, referring to it as Boy Scout behavior in the orientation period. They did not need group membership, they were secure in themselves and in their reasons for travel. The group was a format, an acceptable vehicle, at times a social entity to which they could relate. Although participating, they remained individuals. Programmatic issues were of little concern. Broader issues, less well defined experiences that would occur but which could not be prepared for, were a concern. They knew that essential human and cultural differences would have to be confronted and dealt with. Awareness, not planned answers, was the important issue.

Orientation was not necessary, it was a bother. Almost simplistic in their approach, they moved readily and with ease, carrying little physical or mental baggage. Realistic, not apprehensive, they were ready to leave. In outlook, JoAnne was perhaps mature, perhaps turned off. She had strength. A strong individual but you

wouldn't have known it ordinarily. Both she and Toni had a sense of character not easily swayed. Perhaps lost. JoAnne had no one else but herself. Having difficulties in her personal life because she needed The Experiment to achieve a purpose, she was able to cope, to adjust, to achieve what she intended. If respected in her judgment, she would in turn respect the judgment of others. She did what she had committed herself to do. For Frank, Toni and Juan this attitude, a sense of self, was only felt. It had never been displayed as fully as it had been with JoAnne, but it was there.

Integration: For each of these students, the single focus of their overseas experience continued to be the host family. JoAnne secluded herself and excluded others. Not sharing her experience with the group, only on occasion did she relate to Toni. The intimacy of her experience was interpreted in a personal way but was also characteristic of Toni, Frank and Juan. She accepted the relationship for what it was - a six week homestay. In her own way, not over reacting, she had an affective relationship with her family. She remained controlled. Active within and committed to her family, she was constant in her engagement and did not withdraw. Attending to their wishes in a situation that other group

members might have found difficult, she was willing to cope. Not the hostile individual that might have been predicted, she was able to withhold judgment, to set issues aside, to relate. More than accepting, she was receptive. .

JoAnne's language fluency improved greatly during the summer. Frank learned to speak a few essential phrases and could make himself understood, but he did not become fluent. In spite of the limits that this placed on communicating with his family, he gained a great deal of understanding of both them and the culture in which they lived.

Toni and Juan became members of their families. Language was not a barrier. Their families were bilingual. The depth of their relationships contained intimacies and personal knowledge which they described and shared with very few, in private. Aware of comparative differences in their own and Italian family values, they did not interpret their experiences in a simplistic manner. Reluctant to share issues in a group setting, they reacted strongly to the sweeping and judgmental statements that were made by others in the group at the end of the summer.

They were self-responsible people. Able to see that disappointments, annoyances and frustrations were

as much their fault as that of their hosts, they were positive and realistic about their homestays. On occasion each of these students was deeply troubled, almost overwhelmed in their realization of life differences. Frank's family was poor. They had wanted an American student to live with them although they had little to share. His presence was a financial burden. An older couple with two children still living at home, they both worked during the day and had little time in the evening when they could relax. Frank was deeply touched by their sincerity and friendship. The disparate standards of living found among our hosts bothered him. The drastic change in his personal surroundings - a lack of bathing facilities, poor sanitation, a simple diet, etc. - did not cause him to withdraw. Unlike Paul, discussed in case study #2, he became intensely committed to being with his family during the last weeks of the homestay. Not the physical surroundings but the affective and cognitive reality of a different cultural life style was his source of discomfort.

It was difficult to know these students. My time and attention were drawn elsewhere. Seldom seen, their day to day experiences had to be pulled out in interviews or from random conversations. However, whatever they chose to share was a rich resource, even when

pieces were missing. The full depth and breadth of their experience was theirs - private - self experience was their focus. The group was far away, as was America. Protective of themselves and their hosts, they survived on their own.

Assessment: JoAnne, Toni, Frank and Juan all would return, maybe not to their families, maybe not to Italy. To what? They didn't know. They had found something, something that they wanted to continue, to explore, to do again. It had been a challenge. Positive in their retrospective analysis, both the difficult and the happy times had meaning for them. It was a realistic appraisal. JoAnne had tested herself. The risk of not doing so might have meant losing something of value. They did not talk at length with others in the group. The experience had been too much, it was too personal. As for The Experiment, they were not enthusiasts. When asked, they would reply, "Yes I went to Europe last summer. I lived with a family." They would probably not express their interpretation of the experience in Experiment terms. So much had happened, they all felt that conclusions were impossible to come by, right then. Maybe later, answers would be available.

Case Study #2. Paul Subject (B-3)

Paul stumbled into my room a few minutes late for the interview. He was tall and thin, with an acceptable length of long hair. Dressed in jeans and loafers, he looked like a lot of other students that had been in my groups. On Sunday, he had arrived early and was there to meet the others. He carried Cathy's luggage to her room. At dinner he was friendly, a popular kid. Students from other groups knew Paul within hours of his arrival. Easy going, he filled in the spaces, the breaks in conversation. He had been chosen by a committee at Eastern College to be a college ambassador. It is a special program in The Experiment. Students are selected to represent their college of community in the overseas host community. They receive a scholarship and spend the next year lecturing to sponsoring organizations.

One of Paul's friends had been to Spain on The Experiment. The program was popular at his college and Paul had wanted to travel. The scholarship helped. His father had passed away two years earlier and although the family was comfortable, he could not afford to pay his own way. He had a younger brother and sister who also wanted to go to college. Without a summer income, he would be short of funds next semester.

"I'll help in any way that I can. I don't write very well but I'll try. The diary will be a good reference



when talking to groups at school next year." The diary became an expectation that he would live up to. Paul responded to other peoples' needs; their requirements of him. He was dependable.

"I'm twenty-one, finishing college next year, majoring in economics and business - I'll look for a job in a small company. I haven't made up my mind specifically, about what I want to do. I'll probably get drafted and that will give me another few years to think things over."

"Ten years from now? That is hard to say. We know that society will change but you can't predict in what ways. I'm the type that will stay with the same company; not change jobs and move around. I'd like to own a small business someday, my father and I had talked about that."

"I got a letter from my Italian family today. They live on a farm outside of the city. There are two sons my age. Although they both speak English, they found it difficult to write very much. Apparently the farm is near a small village, no one else from the group will be with a nearby family, or so it seems." "Does that bother you?" "No, not really. But it would be nice to have some company. I'll get along."

"A big part of the experience is meeting people from our own country. It is an interesting way to travel.

I've met everyone in the group and we are all from different states, different schools and backgrounds. You never think about it until you begin to explain the United States to someone from another country. I have two friends at school, one from France and the other from Iran. Living in America was very confusing for them at first. I'm sure that the same will be true for us when we get to Italy."

"The German occupation is a special interest. We in the United States know so little about what war means. Viet Nam is an example. We always seem to be fighting overseas, in someone else's country. I'd like to know what war is like for the people who have to live through it."

"I'd like to see Rome and Venice if there is time. Other things too; an opera, the Vatican. But the important part is the family. Six weeks is such a short time and I may never get back again."

"When you travel alone it is a hassle. With the group for company it should be more interesting. Looking at a country from the outside as a tourist is different from the way that we will see Italy. Sharing what is experienced will be the best part. Two fraternity brothers went to Europe last year and traveled together. They didn't have an opportunity to really talk with people. I wanted more than hotels and museums."

You could find Paul or someone like him in any Experiment group. Trustworthy, reliable, helpful, they try. The overseas environment has more to offer than they can deal with. But, they stick it out. Sometimes they need to be shaken up, reminded of why they are there. They touch and withdraw. Their personal experiences with their hosts are shared with the group. They are proud of learning about differences between themselves and their host families.

Paul is oriented to the group. You'd see him overseas as a nice American kid who is trying to do exactly what the program is all about, living with a host family. Not an individual like JoAnne or Frank, with others around he is strong. He is dependent upon the group and the group is dependent upon him for filtering through the experience.

We became friends during orientation. I enjoyed his company. The night before departure he was packed and ready to go. Some of the others were still mailing extra clothing home. Heavy luggage had been a problem. After a luggage hike that day, a few students became convinced they could get along on less than they had packed. The next morning he helped the girls with their bags, first to the corridor and then onto the bus.

When we arrived at our hotel in Milan everyone disappeared into their rooms. Paul later organized a group of several people to go for a walk. After the incident at the cathedral square, he became more protective of the girls in the group. He could understand what had happened. "American girls in short skirts are asking for trouble when they talk to Italian men that they don't know." Why it happened to an Experiment group was difficult for Paul to accept. The possibility of the incident was one thing, the reality another. He was angry about the incident and he was angry with himself for being upset. Later in the summer he faced other confusing issues. Things that he saw or heard but didn't ask about. On the outside he remained calm and tried to accept what was happening. He wanted to learn to understand his family, and others. Inside he was hesitant and reserved, he held himself back.

Paul's Italian brothers met him at the railroad station. Jovial, the three friends left in a roar, their Alfa Romeo headed for the country. Several days later I went to visit Paul. He hadn't had a shower in two days. There had been no rain for a week and the wells were dry. He had worked in the family mill and been to the fields with his Italian father. Paul and his brothers carried on a conversation that could have occurred in any fraternity house in the United States. Their interests

were the same. They dealt with issues lightly. Personal sharing was not an easily entered level of communication. Paul would be coming to town in another few days for a group activity. "Can I stay at your place? Getting back at night is a problem." I left feeling that Paul was having the kind of experience that he wanted to have; it was friendly and safe.

Returning from the beach with my Italian sister, I met Paul and his brother in the street. Giulio would return on Thursday. He roared off. Paul "freaked out" over my apartment. My host family had given me a guest suite. With an attractive sister in a bikini, a separate living space and lots of water, my experience was different. We talked about my involvement with The Experiment. Finally he said, "Do you really enjoy doing this every summer? Don't the kids get to be a drag?" "Yes, and this would probably be my last Experiment group - but, I have seen a lot of the world that I might not have seen otherwise." Paul was trying on a new role.

He went to the shower and I left to get some cold beer and to tell my sister to set another place at dinner. When I returned, the apartment was steamed. "What's for dinner?" "Have a beer. Four courses, more than you can eat." "No chicken heads?" His family cooked the whole chicken. He had watched the grandmother eat the legs one evening at dinner. He had had a bad

time of it. The brothers laughed and said that they didn't like the idea of a whole chicken being served but that was their grandmother's way. He was angry that he had reacted. The lack of water, the heat, the flies on the farm, it had gotten to him; he hadn't noticed until he came to town. We talked about the war. He was still curious but hadn't asked his family about the Germans or the American bombings. "Ted, do you know how your family feels about the United States?" "Somewhat, but we haven't talked about it at any length." "Are other people having similar kinds of experiences; not asking, not knowing what is going on around them?" "Yes."

When the group got together later that evening for a party, there was a lot of laughter. It was the first time that everyone had been together in over a week. Overseas, Experiment groups become close very quickly. JoAnne was missing, Toni stayed for a little while but left early with her sister. Frank asked to stay at my place for the evening with Paul. For the Italians it was great fun sharing with the Americans, but mostly they watched, and talked among themselves.

We returned to my apartment late and talked until dawn. Frank was also finishing college next spring. He was sure that he would be drafted. Should he go to Canada? Paul didn't see that as an option for himself. He did not want to be drafted either, but he would serve.

We talked about their host families. The things that bothered each of them were different. Frank's family was very poor. He was closer to them than was the case with Paul. Frank was aware of the economic gap that existed between his family and the other host families. Paul was more concerned with the physical and affective problems that he had to face. The evening was a welcome time away for Paul; Frank looked forward to returning to his host family.

In the next few weeks Paul and Cathy spent a lot of time together. He came to town by truck and visited with her family. Sometimes they went to the beach, often with her Italian sister. His brothers seemed to understand that he needed to be away. Cathy was available.

Before he left at the end of the summer, his host family gave him a photo album of their time together. It meant a great deal to him. The effect of seeing himself with his host family made the experience more meaningful. Paul was then able to internalize an experience to which he could not easily relate.

Guillio came on the trip to Venice. He had to leave us there, it was time to return to the university. Confused and tired, Paul spent the next few days with the group, but alone. There were still questions to be answered. He didn't relate to the other Italians until the last day in Rome. He had become closer to Cathy.

Paul helped to make the final days in Europe pleasant. The group was exhausted. For some it had been a good experience, for others this was not equally true. We took an overnite train to Brussels to catch a charter flight home. Paul shared his experiences with the group. He spent time with everyone, listening to their stories as well as talking about his family. He was trying to understand himself and others. More groups got on the train as we crossed the continent.

In Brussels, Paul and Frank selected a restaurant for our last dinner together. JoAnne's abrupt departure left him disgruntled. A year later, he applied for a leadership position.

His diary contained entries for most days throughout the homestay. Filled with dates, places and people, it was a good travelogue. It contained little of Paul. But on two occasions he wrote of himself and his family:

My brother Guillio wants to get married. It is just not possible. There are no jobs available in the city and he doesn't want to live with his family. Life does not have the options for him that it does for me. He was really depressed; I can understand how he feels. Breaking away from tradition - the farm and the country - is going to be difficult. I couldn't accept not having a future that I wanted.

Pappa came in from the fields late. He was very tired. His family has owned this farm for generations but that doesn't make farming any easier. They are rich by local standards but not by ours. I don't remember ever seeing my own father so worn out. Maybe I was too young or didn't notice.



The boys are close to him but not in a father-son way as it was with me. He rules this family. He seems open when I am around but not comfortable about it. I wish that I could speak Italian; I don't understand enough of what is happening to all of us.

When Paul could move around an issue, explore it from a distance, he would try to gain an understanding of its meaning. When he was with Cathy he wrote a great deal more of how he felt. He analyzed his feelings when away from his family. He had found the first days exhausting, intense, too much to cope with. As time passed there was less written of dates and places. He began to see the group differently. He was embarrassed on occasion by the brashness of their "American reactions." The Italians had enjoyed the vitality and freedom that the Americans expressed. Paul could not resolve that issue. He felt self-conscious. Many disappointing experiences were seen as his fault. At other times he saw the Italians as being uncaring. His diary ended when we left Pescara.

Case Study Analysis #2.  
Paul Subject (B-3)

Paul was representative of those students in this study who displayed positive adaptive behavior, the second descriptive category found in the typology of overseas behavior patterns.

Motivation and Expectation: For Paul Subject B-3, Ellen Subject B-4, Barbara Subject B-2 and Cathy Subject B-1 a popularity pull was exercised by the overseas program. Two of the students were college ambassadors, on scholarship, receiving credit for their participation. Perhaps their motivation was language learning or the excitement of doing something interesting and different during the summer. An external, ambiguous quality pervaded their reasoning when they were questioned about their motives for joining The Experiment. Theirs was a motivation that would be learned and developed during orientation and throughout the summer. They were able to recite The Experiment line; they knew what they should want to do and how it should be done. Whether they believed in what they were saying was another matter. They were part of an "in thing."

Each of these students had expectations and requirements of their journey. Some of these plans were possible in their fulfillment; other were not. Preconceived notions and requirements organized their future time, everything had to be planned. One student mentioned that she would like to go to Spain or Greece for a few days. Eventually she concluded that a visit to these countries was not possible. Others negotiated among themselves for brief excursions to Sicily. Finally, the

reality of a six week scheduled homestay experience disallowed further planning. Their side ventures become passing wishes, disappointments that could be overcome and done without.

During orientation a sense of apprehension developed. The Experiment was not a vehicle for developing their personal expectations. The program had expectations of them. Orientation and group membership created for them a learning environment. In the first few days they grew into a sense of awareness about and a desire for what they were about to become involved in. This engagement did not come easily, nor was it congruent with their personal orientation, they had to adapt. Not fully receptive of the consequences of overseas involvement they found it difficult to reach out. The group became an ever more important means for coping, defining and filtering their hesitant communicative intake.

For Paul, the group represented security. He wanted to live in a European country with a host family. He did not want to be a tourist nor did he want to travel alone. He needed support but was also supportive. Group interaction was his most familiar mode of relating to and learning about his environment; his college experience had grounded him in this pattern. Somewhat reluctant, but open to change, he could cope in a group context.

Barbara, Cathy and Ellen were accepting people. They could adapt, convince themselves or be convinced. Their expectations became shared, averaged and sanctioned by their peers. Unlike their positive-receptive counterparts who were singular and private, these students talked openly about themselves and were in contact with each other from the first day of orientation. They developed in each other what each of their experiences would become.

Approach: These students were enjoyable to work with. They looked at every map of Europe that could be found in the last week before coming to orientation. With a ready supply of answers, they brought all of the program mailings for reference. Their passports were ready and desperately clung to. All of the required vaccinations were taken. They fussed with travelers checks and camera supplies. Needing structure, they were external in their organization. Constantly busy, they filled their time with questions about the program schedule. They wrote to friends. They shared concerns and plans with each other. Labelling and coding, they created the limits of their overseas experience.

Not as independent as their positive-receptive counterparts, these students had psychological needs which were shared with others. Home relationships, personal problems, self-doubts began to crop up as the

time for departure grew closer. Often they would telephone a friend or their parents, or talk in private with the leader, about their concerns. In a few cases these problems got blown out of proportion when the pressures of the homestay began to build upon them. Like their excess luggage, they took their past with them. Needing to keep in touch, these students did not disengage from America; address lists, telephone numbers, things to buy for friends kept their relationships with home alive.

Integration: Paul survived the homestay experience. For some of the others it had been equally tenuous. Trying to be positive about what they were experiencing, they stumbled through day to day experiences and found shared answers within the American group. Their focus of attention was dual: both the group and the host family were equally important parts of the cross-cultural experience.

Paul withdrew after the first few weeks of living with his family. He found security with Cathy. There was too much to understand, too much to take in. Paul could not be as secluded nor exclusive in his family relationship as were JoAnne and Frank; he needed to get away. Constraints placed upon him affected him physically and emotionally. In some ways he avoided developing relationships with his Italian brothers; he kept them at a distance. This fact bothered him because he was not

living up to The Experiment code. If others were having the same problems, maybe he was alright.

The physical environment affected Barbara even more than it did Paul. Her homestay was pleasant but traditional Italian in its definition of appropriate female behavior. She was chaperoned everywhere she went. She was ill a great deal of the time which added to her host family's concern for her. Food, heat, plumbing, the doctor, the telephone; she complained and suffered for six weeks. On occasion, she became the clown of the group; the verbal exchange gave her courage. Going home to her family, she left the beach with a "hang in there baby" expression of determination.

Used to talking out their problems, these students contacted each other and the leader, frequently. They needed a boost, a bit of support, with direction and reassurance, they could finish that which they had started out to accomplish. Gradually they learned to sort things out for themselves. Self-responsibility and shared responsibility were difficult to accept; the host-guest relationship lingered for a time. Intermittent, they withdrew and then gradually reached out again. Letters from and to America continued to occupy their time, they were a helpful escape from boredom, inaction and the occasionally threatening perceptions of life in another culture.

It was difficult for these students to develop a trusting relationship with their families. Interaction remained at a superficial level for a long period of time. Gradually they developed more depth as they began to feel secure in their new environment. These were adaptive rather than receptive behaviors.

Sudden cultural assault traumatized these students; they needed to learn slowly, to gain understanding over time. Paul had a difficult time accepting and understanding his perceptions of the father-son relationship in his host family. The value that he placed upon personal future freedom did not exist for his friends. It took time to explore what that meant in Paul's value structure. Paul and Frank experienced many of the same cultural differences in their host families but, Frank reacted differently to the same set of circumstances. Paul had to adapt to a new perception of life; Frank was receptive of it.

Some of the students in this sub-grouping did learn to speak Italian beyond a cursory level. However, objects, places, time and directions were their concerns. In-depth conversations were not frequently explored. In a sense they did not share and exchange with the host culture environment; they selectively incorporated that which was around them. Physical and affective reactions tended to block the development of patterns of interchange

which could have led to more in-depth communication with their hosts.

For most of these students the last two weeks of the overseas program became a "downhill run." Exhausted and ready to go home, they almost stopped trying to learn. The excitement was gone. As the final days came closer, a sense of "leaving soon," sustained them. But there were also high points during that period. With defenses down and expectations changed some very crucial relationships occurred.

Urgency became a motif in their relating. During the last days, some of them tried to capture what they had missed or that others had experienced. Their host families became more trusted; they were no longer guests. A deeper realization of friendship within the family setting drew them away from their American compatriots. They left the security of the group behind for a brief period.

The program ended abruptly. For most of the students it was an emotional separation. Tears, souvenirs, a flurry of activity, something to remember; they were sad that the program was over but glad to get away. All of them returned to America on the charter flight; they did not pick up the option to stay in Europe on their own for an extra few weeks.



Assessment: Paul looked back upon his summer with mixed emotions, but with positive feelings. He would not let himself feel bad or negative. After talking his experiences over with the other group members, it didn't seem so bad after all. Unlike the positive-receptive individual who could admit with a sense of security that an experience had been unpleasant or bothersome, these students glossed over their discomforts, physical illnesses and personal frustrations. By the time that they were on the flight home, they felt very good about what had happened. Emotionally difficult times were blocked out. Alternatively, persons like Barbara continued to assume a critical interpretation of the experience but presented an acceptable negative image. As difficult as it might have been, it was worth it. Three of these students felt that they might join another Experiment group. They verbalized requirements about a future homestay but they found this form of overseas experience comfortable. For others, once was enough. It was not unusual for people like Paul to apply for leadership positions in the year or two following the first overseas experience. It takes time for them to grasp what the homestay experience meant to them.

For the positive-adaptive student life overseas was a time away. Cards and letters kept them in touch

with home. What happened while they were away was important. In talking about The Experiment with their American families and their friends, they relive what happened. It was a role that was not a part of their continuing and total life reality.

Case Study #3. Caroline Subject (C-1)

Caroline was the last to arrive and everyone knew it. The group had wondered who the missing person was.

She bumped her way down the corridor, luggage in hand with her camera hanging. Traveling by bus, she had been on the road for hours.

She joined us for dinner and had everyone laughing before the "mystery meat," a non-distinguishable cut of meat covered with gravy, was served with a standard diet of institutional green beans and soggy potatoes. Very present, not overbearing, she added a sense of humor to the group membership. Some of the others were quiet, shy and hesitant. They needed her bubbly presence just then. By the time we left the dining room the formal hellos were over with and group friendships had begun to happen. Caroline had eased the strain of the first few hours.

After the first meeting that evening Caroline stopped by my room and asked when she could come for an interview . The next afternoon we talked for a long

while. The interview was longer and more relaxed than any of the others had been. Her personality and interest were infectious.

Bright and excited, she could hardly wait to meet her host family. She knew what the summer was going to be like in very definite terms. Her grandfather had migrated from Italy. There was much of her ethnic history that she wanted to explore. Was life with an Italian family the same in Italy as it was here in the United States? She wanted to live with a traditional family on the coast or in the mountains; a family of strong women, jovial uncles and a venerated set of grandparents.

In addition to an idyllic return to ethnic origins she planned a visit to relatives, an elderly priest, who lived in a rural village where he served as pastor and two cousins who had migrated back to the same village after years of working in the United States. Some of her American family had been there to visit.

This was going to be the best Experiment summer that anyone ever had. By the time she left, I was enthusiastic for her and had my faith restored in the values of the program. Caroline kept a well written diary. She made entries every day. Her diary became one of the better accounts of living with a host family.

She had been one of the girls molested at the Cathedral Square in Milan. Different from the verbalized experience that she related at the hotel, she simply wrote:

I've learned to be cautious and skeptical about Italian guys after Le Duomo. It was really an awful feeling. I was afraid that something would happen. I felt trapped, all of those faces and hands. No more for now. Tomorrow is another day and it will be better.

We arrived in our host community the next afternoon. She had been excited and nervous during the whole trip. Often the center of attention, Caroline was able to express what the others might have been feeling.

That night she wrote:

At first I was a little disappointed because my parents were so young. Their apartment is beautiful. I have a room of my own and a bath. Ten rooms and a maid is not what I had expected. Their little girl, who is thirteen, is very friendly and nice.

After dinner: I am so afraid that I am not going to get along. It was really strange, we were watching T.V. and I got homesick. It is difficult to communicate. (Her hosts were bilingual.) They don't seem very typical. I'm going to close for now - the more I write the more afraid I become. I just hope to God that I can fall asleep tonight. My stomach is all knots. What the hell am I doing here?

On the second day she went for a walk with the children, apparently the younger one had been in bed when she arrived.

God it is boring. Unfortunately, they seem to treat me differently because I'm an American. I wanted to be so happy and I'm not. Its got to get better. I want so badly to call my parents mamma and pappa and kiss them goodnight and feel like I belong. But I don't; I'm a foreigner and a guest.

That afternoon she met one of the other girls in the group at a cafe. They were at my apartment a little after three o'clock. I was surprised to see them. Crying, smoking, laughing; they were both panicked. They talked, drank some cold coffee and I listened. After an hour they left, feeling better. That evening at dinner everything went well for Caroline. She noted that because she was relaxed, her family seemed to be. She brought up the subject of her uncle's village and everything changed. She had to get there. They didn't understand, but it could be worked out. She was happy for a few days.

Later that week after a talk with Ellen, her closest friend in the group, Caroline realized that other people were having problems too. "I'm beginning to feel better about my family." She tried to reach out to her hosts but became discouraged. The few times that she was successful in relating, she was delighted. They were little incidents. Mostly, she felt that something was missing, her homestay was incomplete. For those around her, it appeared that Caroline had changed. Meeting her on the beach or out walking after dinner, she

was sad. Nothing was working out the way that she had planned it. The children in the family began to bother her.

Paolo and I went to visit the family one evening. Much of what was written in the diary was only suspected at that point. We both knew that something was wrong. There were two conversations from the minute we arrived. Caroline welcomed the opportunities for group travel; she needed to get away from her host family. Was it their fault that she was so sad? What could they do to help? We left, each with a different impression; a different idea of how to help. They were both trying, why didn't the relationship work out?

In Caroline's diary her Italian mother is mentioned often. Little things, a special picnic, a borrowed handbag for a dance, efforts that were appreciated but somehow not enough. She wanted more. Caroline leaves the family increasingly as the days pass. Any excuse, a telephone call from Ellen, two meetings that were never scheduled. Not sure in her own mind as to why, the absences during the day become longer and more frequent. Sometimes, she sits alone in a cafe for hours writing letters to friends or making entries in her diary.

Finally her trip to the mountain village becomes a reality. We had talked it over with her parents and

helped her to schedule the trains. Trying to discourage her, no one in her host family would go with Caroline. None of the group felt that they wanted to join her. Half asking for company, half rejecting assistance, she left on her own. At last her expectations would be met. Her host family was terrified. What if something should happen to her? Alone on a train in the mountains, a part of Italy that was poor and a place that they would never go; why was she going there?

Caroline's description of the experience is graphically written; a rapid account filled with emotion, names and images that only she could understand. A village priest, a leaking roof, an elderly aunt, surprises, fears, a cemetery, a procession, a simple gift, tears, departure; images for which she somehow found the time to enter in her diary. Reaching out to a distant cousin as the train is leaving she realizes that she will never return. Her life is different but it could have been this. It had been four days, she had to go back to her host family.

According to Caroline, they did not welcome her return. For four days they had been frantic. There were no telephones, they had tried to call. Had she arrived safely? Why didn't she wire from the station? Finally, they asked. Caroline grudgingly responded to their questions and gave little information about her visit.

From then on, with only ten days left, little was said between them.

Caroline kept busy with Paula and the group. She found things to do; her diary was filled with street scenes and stories of waiters and Italian boys. She returned to her host family's apartment to eat dinner and sleep. One evening, she returned at midnight. Her parents had given permission for her to go to a dance with the group. She was to return early. By this time we were familiar with the city and knew where everyone lived. In some of the families it was acceptable for students to stay out all night; many of us did. For others, a traditional expectation required that chaperones escort young women to their homes before midnight. Her host parents had been up, waiting, and were obviously tired. Paolo escorted her to the door, little was said.

I cried so much last night that it was unreal. I was just so disgusted with always having to rush home when everyone is going someplace else. The killer was, when I got in at twelve thirty, my mom looked at me like I had done something terrible. You'd think that I was a little slut. I'm so damned annoyed with them.

The last few days went quickly for her. On one last occasion, a Holy Day, I saw Caroline run up to her family's car when they arrived at the farewell picnic which the Americans had prepared. All of our Italian friends were there. She introduced her parents to



everyone before they left. They were apparently happy as they walked away, it was their last evening together.

The bus left the square at seven the next morning. Caroline had no one with her. Her Italian sister had decided not to come at the last minute. We would not be returning to our host community. JoAnne and Caroline sat together for the first few kilometers. JoAnne changed seats at the first stop.

As the days passed Caroline began to smile again and eventually laughed. It had been a trying experience. By the time we reached Rome she was able to talk about what had happened.

I don't know how it happened. It was so much. I'm still numb. It wasn't their fault but I don't think they wanted me.

Maybe another family would have made it different. But you know, I liked them in a way. The grandmother, I remember her best. Do you remember the time that you came to our store? My grandma was working. My mother came over and talked and tried to sell you a handbag for your girlfriend. After you had left grandma said that we should get married. I laughed and laughed. She danced around me and it was so much fun. But there were other times that were terrible. It is all in my diary, you can have it when I finish in Brussels.

I had watched her for weeks. Sometimes I had been of help, at other times I was at a loss as to what should have been done. Maybe it had been my fault in part. Should I have insisted upon another family? Would it have made a difference? No, not in a small

traditional city with a tight social structure. I had other problems to cope with. Tom had skipped out on his host family. His story was like Caroline's but he had been more hostile and aggressive. I had to do something about his situation.

Brussels at last. When not busy with final paper work for The Experiment, I interviewed each of the students. Caroline was the last. "Did I let you down?" The tears came down her face. "You tried to make it work out for me. I'm really sorry." Finally she smiled, we were going to dinner in another hour. The trip would end happily. We drank a lot of wine and on the way back to the hotel I was thrown into the city hall fountain.

Case Study Analysis #3:  
Caroline Subject (C-1)

Caroline became representative of a third descriptive category of overseas behavior, Negative-Rejecting. One other person in the study also displayed these characteristics, Tom (C-2).

Motivation and Expectation: From the beginning of orientation, these students had specific and required expectations of their overseas experience. These were not ambiguous, they were clear. Not adaptive, they were rigid. Both Tom and Caroline had requirements which were so strong that in reality they were unachievable. For Caroline, two categories of motivation defined her

purpose for travel; one was accomplishable in a physical sense, she would visit her uncle's village; a second was not accomplishable, an idyllic ethnic return. She had wanted a stereotypical Italian homestay, one that she had planned and perhaps only existed in fantasy.

Tom was on a vacation. Although guarded in his statements, it was clear that the purposes of the program were not his reasons for joining the group. He wanted a place to live while pursuing a set of indefinite activities. He did not want the restrictions of family involvement. This was one in a series of summer placements for which his American parents had paid, perhaps for their own reasons.

When either student was challenged in their reasoning, answers became rationalized. "Yes, but. . . , or "I know, but it won't be that way . . ." Tom did not want to participate in a program which he was joining. Caroline saw the program as a vehicle to achieve her own purposes, not those of the organization.

Caroline at first appeared to be the ideal Experiment student. Selected as a college ambassador, she was a happy, motivated and excited person. There was no way of knowing ahead of time how her summer was going to turn out. Tom was the kind of student that leaders get hooked on. You think that you can work with

them; they will make out somehow. Not able to cope with the reality of the program, they do not adapt to their host families. The group becomes an important part of their experience but they do not learn and share as do their positive-adaptive counterparts. The group is a refuge, a place to hide. Externally they contribute during orientation but it is not an Experiment experience that they are developing. It is a personal and unachievable set of expectations that are apart from the organizational structure which they have joined.

Approach: Caroline was popular and had developed a number of interpersonal skills during college. She knew a great deal about Italy; about the program that she had joined. To the group she appeared more sure of herself than they were. Some of her closest friends in the group were excited about Caroline's plans to visit her uncle, her desire for a particular kind of host family. Their own ambiguous feelings were eased by her presence. Aunts, cousins, specific buildings, gifts for relatives; it all became an exciting diversion in their informal conversations.

In Tom's case, an outlet was found in ethnic humor. At first accepted, he later became an embarrassment to his friends when overseas. Both individuals seemed to have an approach to their homestay experience

that was rational and secure during orientation; one that might be adaptable. Internally they were uncomfortable, uneasy. Other problems, some within their personal lives were hinted at during the initial interview. In one case, American family relationships were made explicit but not discussed.

Integration: Caroline, confronted with the reality of her host parents on the first evening and during the next day became panicked. Bothered by the lack of congruity that existed between her ideal and realized placement, she became hysterical. As time passed she could not give up her wished-for family image. Although her host family was bilingual and she understood Italian, Caroline had a difficult time communicating with them. She closed her mind to or was threatened by their concern for her. She could not trust that they would not interfere with her accomplishment of a visit to relatives. She did not accept when they reached out to her; to have done so would have changed her perception of an ethnic past with which she identified.

Tom also had problems immediately. His family was "boring," in his terms. The father was too dominant. He skipped out after dinner on the first evening, not telling anyone that he was doing so. He got into a fist fight with some Italian boys in the neighborhood. After

two weeks had passed, he packed and left for a few days on his own. Finally, he gave in to his Italian father's wishes that he stay with the family. Both Italian parents became concerned about his behavior; "He is just a young boy, give him time to settle. He needs a home."

Caroline's village experience had a great deal of meaning. It was in part, the accomplishment of a goal. It was a physical experience that was tangible. However, it left her with questions and separated her from her host family. What was to have been a happy experience proved to be the opposite.

Tom struck out aggressively at everyone. His behavior was intolerable at times. The group began to isolate him. A few male friendships with Italians from other families were his only cross-cultural communication of purpose during the summer.

For both, the summer grew progressively more difficult. They found a number of ways to escape both physically and through psychological withdrawal. Not communicating, not trusting, not adapting, they rejected and negatively interpreted their Italian homestays.

Assessment: When Caroline looked back over the experience she was sad. It had not worked out; there were many questions that she had created about herself and her hosts. How was she going to face the

happy interpretation expected by her American family and her sponsoring friends? As time passed she countered her lack of achievement with some warm remembrances of the three cities that we visited, and the few Italian friends that she made during that time. Yes, she would like to come back again, possibly with a friend, to travel informally and live by the sea. She rejected the host family experience but could not give up the desire to continue seeking what she had not found.

Tom was irritated by the restrictions of the program. Under the legal age for leaving the group on his own, he was confined when he wanted to be free. His American parents would have been notified if he were to travel on his own again. This program, like the many others he had been on, was a nuisance. He felt negative about the entire experience.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Review of the Study

The Experiment In International Living is an international exchange of persons organization that has greatly affected the lives of a number of its participants. Founded in 1932, The Experiment was a reflection of American liberal ideals in its quest for world peace through the development of understanding between persons and nations.

Today, The Experiment is composed of thirty-five autonomous member-nation organizations which exchange student groups annually. A group of ten students and a leader travel abroad to live with families in a host community for a period of six weeks. The purpose of their sojourn is to gain an understanding of life as it is lived in another culture. Over the years a prescribed program has been developed to enhance the process of bicultural, interpersonal exchange between the student and the host family.

The American Experiment begins with an orientation period of several days during which group identity is built



and issues related to living in the host nation are discussed. The overseas program consists of a four week homestay and a ten day informal trip. The student lives with a host family as one of its members and later travels with young people from the family or community. "Living as your hosts live," becomes a reality while hiking in the mountains or sharing limited space during binational group travel. At the end of the summer a few final days are spent by the American group in a major city of that world area. The program ends overseas prior to the return flight to the United States.

In the previous decade the American Experiment organization involved more than thirty thousand families around the globe. Early in that period the author traveled to India (1964) as an Experiment student and later as a group leader to Switzerland (1966), Great Britain (1967), Japan (1968), Finland-Russia (1969) and Italy (1970). During that time student culture nation wide and world wide changed greatly as did the nature of overseas travel. Living in another country was no longer a novel idea. The American political scene also changed. In the late 1960's students were very different from their counterparts of even a few years earlier. However, it was possible to observe similarities in overseas student group behaviors: most students were in need of counseling assistance in the course of the program; some students

adjusted readily to life with a host family; very few were not able to cope with the host family and the program. A need was identified to objectify and define the nature of this particular cross-cultural interaction set; bicultural, interpersonal exchange between the student and the host family.

This is an exploratory study. Data were gathered during a 1970 Experiment In International Living summer program in Italy from a subject group of ten students. The study is concerned with the characteristic differences noted in overseas student behaviors as these differences relate to personality. The findings of the study are limited in their use to persons who work with young people in The Experiment or other similar exchange of persons organizations.

When young people in their pre-adult, formative years are placed with families in another culture, the degree of personal satisfaction and cross-cultural learning achieved in the program is considered to be dependent upon two factors of personality; self-esteem and behavioral self-process. Self-esteem is assessed in this study through the use of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale; four phases of behavioral self-process are explored - motivation and expectation, approach, integration and post experience assessment. Case study material was developed from student interviews and personal diaries.

An interpretation of the bicultural exchange process from the students point of view, as it was being experienced overseas, was an important consideration in designing the study. The elements of trust, receptivity and communicative facility were utilized in analyzing the data gathered. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale was administered three times during the program in approximation of psychological adjustment to the overseas environment. Clusters of Scale scores were assumed to be related to characteristic patterns of sub-group behavior within the population studied.

Three studies were identified in the bicultural exchange of persons literature which contained typologies of behavior that in part described the behaviors observed in overseas Experiment groups. Taba (1953) developed three descriptions of sojourner response on the basis of a factor analysis of data gathered from an American overseas study tour. Lambert and Bressler (1956) did a case study analysis of Indian students in the United States and also identified three types of behavioral reactions to cultural assault. Bailyn and Kelman (1962) through the use of an interview format studied the effects of an extended overseas study program upon the self-image of Scandinavian students on an American study tour. Four behavioral reactions were identified. Three questions

for investigation were posed from the findings of these three studies; they are discussed later in this chapter.

A review of recent research pertaining to overseas student groups led to the development of three additional study questions. These are also discussed later in the chapter.

### Findings of the Study

On the basis of the data gathered during the program a typology of student behavior was developed. The typology describes three characteristic patterns of response to the bicultural interpersonal student-host family exchange process. The typology interrelates the factors of behavioral self-process and self-esteem. Assessed levels of self-esteem were found to be significantly ( $p=.004$ ) related to behavioral type at the subgroup level; this relationship was not found to be necessarily predictive of individual patterns of enactment.

The three behavioral types identified in this study were:

Type 1.--Positive Receptive: Characteristically, persons in this grouping tended to focus upon the host family as the core of their overseas experience. They expressed personal goals that were congruent with those of the program. During their overseas experience they developed trusting relationships with members of the host

family, communicated broadly with the host culture environment and were receptive to a broad range of cross-cultural experiences which they actively explored. Generally, within the study group, these students obtained high total positive scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. In retrospective assessment these students were objective and positive in their interpretation of the experience. They were able to identify both the enjoyable and the difficult aspects of the family stay; theirs was not a generalized interpretation. Many of these students found the cross-cultural environment enjoyable, something with which they would seek continued involvement in their future lives.

Type 2.--Positive Adaptive: Persons in this grouping held a dual focus in their exploration of the bicultural exchange process: the host family and the group. The host family was the core of their overseas experience; the group served as a means of defining, interpreting and regulating the experience. Personal goals held by these students were relatively less congruent with program goals than was the case with those who were positive-receptive in their behavior. Goal statements were at times ambiguous in expression or unrealistic in terms of the total program. In general these students did not develop trusting relationships

in depth with members of their host family nor did they communicate broadly with persons in the host community and were less receptive than their positive counterparts of the broad range of experiences possible in the host culture environment. These students in general received total positive scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale that ranged from high to intermediate within the group studied. In retrospective assessment they were not objective in their interpretation of the experience and tended to gloss over the difficult experiences in the program in favor of a generalized positive remembrance of their family stay. Most of these students did not express a desire for continued involvement in other cross-cultural experiences.

Type 3.--Negative Rejecting: Students in this category did not focus upon the host family as the primary source of experience in the program. Self concerns or unrealistic expectations of the program were the focus of their attention. Self-oriented and often overwhelmed, personal problems caused them to withdraw psychologically from the family stay experience or to aggressively enact behavioral responses to the limits imposed by the program. Their goals were at times ambiguous and at other times clearly stated but in neither case were they congruent with those of the program. These students did not develop

trusting relationships with members of the host community and rejected the host culture environment. Within the group they received the lowest total positive scores on the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Their retrospective interpretation of the program was negative. They were highly emotional and critical in their descriptions of the experience and displayed psychological blocking when discussing their family stay. They indicated no interest in further involvement with cross-cultural programs.

From the findings of the study it is possible to conclude that:

1. An overall measure of self-esteem is a general indicator of student behavior when considering groups of pre-adult sojourners who are placed with host families in non-prescribed roles where the personality of the student influences the outcome of the bicultural, interpersonal exchange process.

2. Shared characteristic patterns of response are to be found among members of student groups on the basis of their retrospective assessment of the experience and their differing expressions of trust, receptivity and communicative facility during overseas host family placement. These expressions are indicative of differences in behavioral self-process, the nature and limits of which combined with the influence of self-esteem are predictive of overseas student typological behavior.

### Answers to Questions Posed in the Study

The study began with two questions concerning overseas student behavior as observed during an Experiment In International Living summer program. The questions were based upon the assumption that personality factors greatly affect the degree of personal satisfaction and cross-cultural learning achieved by students when they are placed with host families. The relevance of this assumption was limited to programs where pre-adult sojourners are placed with host families in an interaction set that is bicultural and interpersonal in format. Two factors of personality were identified which became the focus of this investigation: self-esteem and behavioral self-process. The questions posed in relation to these factors were:

Factor #1.--Self-esteem. Does self-esteem change in the course of the overseas experience? How is it related to overseas behavioral style?

For the group studied, it was found that self-esteem did not change significantly during the course of the overseas experience. However, for individuals, fluctuations were noted in varying components of the instrument employed. In regard to behavioral style for the group studied, significant differences were found to exist between sub-groups which in turn, were, related to



behavioral style. However, for individuals, scale scores and behavioral enactment were not absolutely related.

Factor #2.--Behavioral self-process. In the areas of motivation and expectation, approach, integration and assessment, are there differences which exist among persons that are indicative of behavioral types, the characteristics of which are shared among sub-group members?

For the group studied, it was found that differences did exist in the several areas of behavioral self-process explored in the study. These differences were shared by members of sub-groups and were therefore found to be characteristic of differing behavioral types.

The answers to the initial questions posed were derived from the findings of this investigation. This study was designed and developed following a review of the literature pertaining to the bicultural exchange process. Three related studies were identified that contained behavioral descriptions which generally outlined the behaviors observed among Experiment group members. The three studies were: Taba's (1953) investigation of an American overseas study tour; Lambert and Bressler's (1956) study of Indian students in the United States; Bailyn and Kelman's (1962) study of Scandinavian

students in the United States. Each of these studies created questions for investigation:

Question #1. How closely did the findings of Taba's study describe the behavioral sub-groups that could be observed during an Experiment tour?

Generally, it would appear that both study groups shared similar behavioral characteristics which aligned by type. This was particularly evident when comparing Taba's Type-1 description with the positive-receptive description developed in this study. Differences were noted, however, in the two remaining typological descriptions found in both studies.

In this research, persons who displayed positive-adaptive behaviors were similar in their behavioral enactment to those persons who were categorized as positive-receptive. These descriptive categories generally aligned with Taba's Type-1 and Type-2.

Taba noted that Type-2 and Type-3 were similar in a number of characteristics. Type-3 tended to align with the negative-rejecting category of this study. This apparent difference in type relatedness between the two studies may well indicate a difference in modal tendencies in the particular populations studied rather than an actual difference in the array of behavioral characteristics to be observed in overseas groups.

Finally, the crystallized ethnocentrism observed in Type-3 behavior was not observed in the negative-rejecting behaviors of the two persons who comprised that category in this study. A similarity was noted in the descriptions of behavior for both groups. Therefore, it is possible to speculate that a common psychological mechanism is operant regardless of the source of its activation. This author concurs with Taba's hypothesis that the complexity of individual reactions to overwhelming cultural assault, for persons who display Type-3 behaviors, requires an individual assessment by case to define causative factors.

Question #2. In relation to Lambert and Bressler's (1956) study, to what degree does the factor of congruency between personal expectations and program goals affect the overseas behavior of Experiment students?

The factor of congruency between personal expectations and program goals was a major source of differentiation noted in the behaviors of the study group. Varying degrees of congruency were noted as being related to behavioral type. Positive-receptive behaviors were enacted by persons who held internalized goals and expectations that were largely congruent with those of the program. Positive-adaptive persons often held externalized expectations and goals that were less well aligned with those

of the program. Negative-rejecting behaviors were noted among persons who held expectations that were not congruent with the program.

The typological descriptions developed by the authors were also similar to those developed in this study. Particularly, their concept of "coming to terms," applied to those students who were categorized as positive-adaptors. Also, the aggressive tendencies and expressed insecurity noted in their Type-3 description were found to describe the behaviors of persons placed in the negative-rejecting category of this study.

The essential difference between the two studies is the identified source of behavioral causation noted in the populations researched. It would appear that common psychological mechanisms are operant which would indicate that self-esteem and behavioral self-process are closely linked to congruent expectations and perceived national status.

Question #3. Can the behavioral reaction patterns observed by Bailyn and Kelman (1962) which were based upon internal versus external structuring of self-image and change versus maintenance of self-image also be observed among members of an Experiment overseas group?

The factor of internal versus external structuring of self-image was noted among the three sub-groups identified in this study and served as a source of characteristic

differentiation within the developed typology. Generally, the behavioral types found in both studies were in alignment. Persons who displayed positive-receptive behaviors shared characteristics which were in part similar to those observed among persons who underwent an internalization reaction described in the Bailyn and Kelman (1962) study. Both groups held internal self-referents and had high levels of assessed self-esteem. Persons who displayed positive-adaptive behavior were similar in characteristic response to Bailyn and Kelman subjects who underwent identification and confirmation reactions. Both groups had high to intermediate levels of assessed self-esteem. However, in this study members of this sub-group held external self-referents. Persons displaying negative-rejecting behaviors were in part similar to those subjects who underwent a resistance reaction in the Bailyn and Kelman study. Both subject groups expressed feelings of ambivalence, obtained low assessed levels of self-esteem, held external self-referents and were psychologically confused and unstable in their behavior.

The factor of change versus maintenance of self-image, as assessed through the measurement of self-esteem, was noted among the sub-group members of the study group. Generally within the sub-groups identified, self-esteem remained stable throughout the experience. Possibly the

brevity of the program and the nature of the instrument employed account for the differences in characteristics between the two groups researched.

In addition to the three studies cited as major references for this investigation, a review of recent research further defined the nature of the bicultural overseas student program. Three additional study questions were raised and explored on the basis of three assumptions. The findings of this study generally lent credence to the assumptions made. The study questions and assumptions were:

Study question #1. If host families exert a positive pull in regard to their foreign student, what part does the student play in the relationship?

It was assumed that the positive alignment of self-esteem and commitment to program goals served as a positive thrust in the relationship.

The answer to the question varied among persons by behavioral type. The assumption made was particularly evident for persons in the positive-receptive category. High levels of self-esteem and congruency between personal and program goals were a major distinction for this subgroup. Lower levels of self-esteem and lesser degrees of congruency were noted for persons who displayed behaviors that were positive-adaptive or negative-rejecting. Generally it was found that congruency and the degree of

commitment were jointly influential in developing a positive thrust in the student-host family relationship. Further, the generalization made that positive self-assessment acts as an enhancer in the bicultural interpersonal interaction set was supported.

Study question #2. Are there limits to the number of possible approaches that the student could have to the host family-student relationship?

It was assumed that personality and program do determine the limits and nature of the overseas experience; personality is the major determining factor in relationships between pre-adults and host families in the bicultural interpersonal exchange process.

Based upon the findings of this study it is possible to conclude that the factors of self-esteem and behavioral self-process determine and limit pre-adult sojourner approach to the bicultural, interpersonal exchange process. Within the typology developed it was found that persons who were positive-receptive in their behaviors were more open in their approach to the cross-cultural experience than were their positive-adaptive counterparts. Persons who displayed negative-rejecting behaviors were not open in their approach to the overall experience. The assumption that program goals also limit the student's approach to the experience was borne out. Persons with expectations

congruent with program goals achieved a greater degree of satisfaction from the program than persons who held lesser or non-congruent expectations. Generally, it was found that students on the basis of prior expectations and varying styles of behavioral self-process largely determined the degree of personal satisfaction achieved from the host family program. These conclusion are in agreement with the findings of Smith (1955) and Starr (1970).

Study question #3. What role does the personality factor, self-esteem, play in the development of bicultural interpersonal relationships?

This study assumed that self-esteem, as a measure of a healthy personality structure, is a critical determining factor in the nature and development of bicultural interpersonal relationships.

The data derived in this study indicate that self-esteem is a critical factor in the development of bicultural, interpersonal relationships. Assessed levels of self-esteem - total positive score derived from the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale - were found to be significantly related to behavioral type ( $p=.004$ ) for sub-groups within the larger study group. On the individual level this generalization was not equally valid. Behavioral style varied greatly for some persons in the study group and was not always congruent with predictions that might have been made on the basis of Scale scores. It would



appear that assessed levels of self-esteem are general indicators of behavioral self-process for persons within groups of pre-adult sojourners enacting non-prescribed roles. These factors combined, self-esteem and behavioral self-process, are predictive of bicultural interpersonal behavior style. Their assessment establishes a perceptual reference useful in the counseling process for young persons involved in cross-cultural programs.

### Recommendations

A lingering question remains which is based upon the premise with which most experiments begin: What has The Experiment proven? A direct answer to that question cannot be derived from this study. However, it is possible to make observations about the program as well as its role in the remaining years of this century.

The Experiment In International Living began in 1932. Since that time an entire field of social science research has been developed which pertains to the objectives and activities of the organization. The Experiment has not incorporated this knowledge in its outbound student program. If The Experiment is to continue being an experiment, several changes are in order:

Comprehensive training for group leaders should include recent research pertaining to individual student and group behavior in the overseas setting. If students are to maximally benefit from the program, counseling assistance based upon an established set of principles and knowledge of the field must be available. The

current leadership training program does not assure that all leaders are qualified to deal with the psychological stress with which students are faced in the cross-cultural environment.

If The Experiment is to become more than 'a nice overseas experience,' which has lost its relevance in the post-modern world, a new program model should be developed. An opportunity should be created for young people who wish to learn about the process of cross-cultural exchange through formal study to combine that activity with the homestay experience as it now exists. The current outbound group model does not fully invest the student in the bicultural, interpersonal exchange process at the cognitive level. Too often persons leave the program with impressions and interpretations of host families and host nations that have not been adequately developed.

In addition to these elemental changes in program administration and design, three general areas of research are suggested.

Further use of the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale is suggested on the basis of its correlation with the behavioral types identified in this study. Can the findings of this research be validated when applied to larger Experiment populations?

Longitudinal studies should be conducted on the basis of behavioral type displayed during the Experiment program. Several questions are in need of exploration: Is behavioral type a fixed or variable attribute and dependent upon developmental level and personal experience? Are future attitudes, careers and other life patterns related to behavioral type? Do differences in cross-cultural attitudes exist among persons with similar behavioral characteristics?

An assumption was made in this study concerning the families with which students are placed: Host families provide similar experiences for students. Also, the influence of the group leader in determining behavioral style was not explored. What influence do host families and group leaders have in determining the outcome of the overseas experience for Experiment students?

Finally, as we approach the year 2000, members of the world community are becoming ever more interdependent in their commerce, diplomacy and quest for survival. The need for persons who are skilled in the process of relating between cultures is also equally evident. No longer a mystical capability, interpersonal relations between members of different cultures is a beginning social science. The need to make explicit the principles which are operant in this interaction set continues to grow. Controlled experiences in cross-cultural relations remains an essential undertaking if humane commerce between persons and nations is to be one of our alternative futures. A belief that persons can learn, change and grow underlies that perspective. If we are to gain a peaceful world community we must continue to experiment, to develop answers to the questions that are raised in this and other similar studies.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akutsu, Yoshihiro. Commitment, Self Evaluation and Communication Activity in a Dissonant Situation: A Study of Foreign Students with English Language Deficiency. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1969, (Dissertation).
- Bailyn, Lotte and Kelman, Herbert. The Effects of a Year's Experience in America on the Self-Image of Scandanavians: A Preliminary Analysis of Reactions to a New Environment. Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, Vol. 1, 1962, pp. 30-40.
- Baskin, Samuel (Ed). Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Benedict, Ruth. Patterns of Culture. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934.
- Bennett, J.W. and McKnight, R.K. In Search of Identity. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958, pp. 179-183.
- Bjerstedt, Ake. Informational and Non-Informational Determinants of Nationality Stereotypes. Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, Vol. 1, 1962, pp. 24-29.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Reduction of Barrier Tendencies During the Experience of International Co-Living. Acta Psychologica, XIV, 1958, pp. 329-346.
- Bonilla, F. and Wilson, E.C. Evaluating Exchange of Persons Programs. Public Opinion Quarterly, XIX, Spring 1955, No. 1, pp. 20-30.
- Bressler, M. and Lambert, R.D. The Sensitive Area Complex: A Contribution to the Theory of Guided Culture Contact. The American Journal of Sociology, LX, July 1954, pp. 583-592.
- Brown, I.C. The Cultural Background of International Education, in Governmental Policy and International Education. Edited by S. Fraser, New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1965, pp. 47-58.

- Brown, R.W., Englebirth, J.F., et al. Developing Cultural Understanding Through Language Study. P.M.L.A., LXVII, December 1953, pp. 1196-1218. (Modern Language Association Publication.)
- Coelho, G.V. Impacts of Studying Abroad. Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, Vol. 1, 1962.
- Cook, S. and Selltitz, C. Social Factors in Personality. Some Factors Which Influence the Attitudinal Outcomes of Personal Contact. International Social Science Journal, Vol. VII, 1955.
- Correa, Joseph M. Intercultural Interaction and the Worldmindedness of College Students. University of Washington, 1970. (Dissertation.)
- Dean, Vera M. The American Student and the Non-Western World. Cambridge: Inglis Lecture, Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Deutsch, K.W. and Merritt, R. International Behavior: A Social and Psychological Analysis. H.C. Kilman (Ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.
- DuBois, Cora. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1956.
- Dove, C.J. Intercultural Training for Foreign Assistance. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1968. (Dissertation).
- Edgerton, Robert B. Some Dimensions of Disillusionment in Culture Contact. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, XXI, Autumn 1965, pp. 231-243.
- Festinger, L.A. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1957.
- Fitts, William. The Tennessee Self-Concept Scale Counseling Recordings and Tests. Nashville, Tennessee, 1965.
- Fraser, Simon (Ed). Governmental Policy and International Education. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Gultung, Ingrid Gide. The Impact of Study Abroad: A Three by Three Study of Cross-Cultural Contact. The Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 1, 1964, pp. 258-276.

- Garraty, J. Adams, W. From Main Street To The Left Bank. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959.
- Goffman, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 1956.
- Goldsen, R.K., Suchman, E.A., and William, R.M., Jr. Factors Associated with the Development of Cross-Cultural Social Interaction. The Journal of Social Issues, XII, No. 1, 1956, pp. 26-32.
- Gullahorn, J.T. and Gullahorn, J.E. An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis. Journal of Social Issues, XIX, July 1963, pp. 33-44.
- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hook, Sydney. Philosophy and Human Conduct - Philosophy and Culture, East and West. Edited by C.A. Moore. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1962, p. 16.
- Inkeles, Alex. Industrial Man: The Relation of Status to Experience, Perception, and Value. The American Journal of Sociology, LXVI, July 1960, pp. 1-31.
- Jacobson, E.H. Soujourner Research: A Definition of the Field. Journal of Social Issues, XIX, July 1963, pp. 123-126.
- Kafka, Eric P. The Effects of Overseas Study on World-mindedness and Other Selected Variables of Liberal Arts Students. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1968. (Dissertation.)
- Kelman, H. and Bailyn, L. Effects of Cross-Cultural Exchange on National Images: A Study of Scandinavian Students in America. The Journal of Conflict Resolution, VI, 1962, pp. 319-334.
- Kilpatrick, W.H. and Van Til, E. Intercultural Attitudes in the Making. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- Klineberg, O. and Lambert, W. The Human Dimension in International Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

- Lambert, R.D. and Bressler, M. Indian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Laves, W. and Thomson, C. Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.
- Lundstedt, S. An Introduction to Some Evolving Problems in Cross-Cultural Research. Journal of Social Issues, XIX, July 1963, pp. 1-5.
- Lysgaard, Sverre. Social Factors In Personality. Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the U.S. International Social Science Journal, Vol. VII, 1955.
- Marshall, Robert A. (Ed) The Next Challenge in Education for Global Understanding. American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C., 1973.
- Peters, W. Passport to Friendship. Philadelphia and New York: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1957.
- Piaget, J. The Childs Conception of the World. London: Granada Publishing, Ltd., 1973.
- Riegel, O.W. Residual Effects of Exchange-of-Persons. Public Opinion Quarterly, XVII, Fall 1953, pp. 319-327.
- Rogers, E., Ashcoft, J. and Röling, N. Diffusion of Innovations in Brazil, Nigeria and India. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, pp. 1-24.
- Sanders, J.T. and Ward, J.C. Bridges to Understanding. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Scanlon, D.G. and Shields, J.J. Problems and Prospects in International Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968.
- Shank, D.J. The American Goes Abroad. Annals of the American Academy. May 1961, pp. 333-338.
- Smith, Brewster M. A Perspective for Further Research on Cross-Cultural Education. The Journal of Social Issues, XII, No. 1, 1956, pp. 56-66.



Smith, Howard P. Changes in Attitudes Resulting from Experiences in Foreign Countries. Harvard, 1954. (Dissertation.)

\_\_\_\_\_. Do Intercultural Experiences Affect Attitudes? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, VI, 1955, pp. 469-477.

Starr, Jerold M. Cross Cultural Encounter and Personality Change: Peace Corps Volunteers in the Philippines. Brandeis, 1970 (Dissertation).

Taba, Hilda. Cultural Attitudes and International Understanding: An Evaluation of a Study Tour. Institute for International Education, Research Program, Occasional paper No. 5, June 1953, New York Institute.

VanDeWater, J.G. The American College Student and the Foreign Host Family: A Comparative Evaluation of the Syracuse University Foreign Study Program. Syracuse University, 1970/71. (Dissertation.)

Watson, J. and Lippitt, R. Learning Across Cultures. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955, pp. 3, 4, 17, 19.

\_\_\_\_\_. Social Factors in Personality. Some Special Problems of Learning and Teaching Process in Cross-Cultural Education. International Social Science Journal, Vol. VII, 1955.

Watt, Donald. Intelligence is Not Enough. Brattleboro, Vt: The Experiment Press, 1967.

Weist, W.M. A Quantitative Extension of Heider's Theory of Cognitive Balance Applied to Interpersonal Perception and Self Esteem. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1965.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03070 9830