ED 369 117   CS 508 555

AUTHOR   Stull, James B.; Von Till, Beth
TITLE   Determinants of Ethnocentrism: A Study of the
                Relationship between Students' Exposure to Other
                Cultures and Their Attitudes toward Cultural
                Values.
PUB DATE   Feb 94
NOTE   80p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Western States Communication Association (San Jose,
                CA, February 23-27, 1994).
PUB TYPE   Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
                Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Attitude Measures; College Students; Communication
                Research; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences;
                *Ethnocentrism; Higher Education; Sex Differences;
                *Student Attitudes; *Values
IDENTIFIERS   Cultural Sensitivity; San Jose State University CA

ABSTRACT
                A study investigated culturally shaped patterns of
behavior and how receptive or resistant people in an educational
setting are to different viewpoints held by members of other
cultures. As background, an extensive literature review probed the
definitions of "culture" and "ethnocentrism," the causes of
ethnocentrism, and how ethnocentrism is manifested. Subjects, 535
college students enrolled in business and communication studies
classes at San Jose State University, California, completed a
questionnaire designed to compare G. Hofstede's dimensions of
national culture (power distance, uncertainty avoidance,
individualism, and masculinity) with the independent variables of
birthplace, number of family generations born in the United States,
languages spoken, culture identified with, exposure through living in
another culture, travel, and formal study of cultures. Results
indicated that: (1) females scored higher than males on collectivism
and on high power distance, but lower on low power distance; (2)
subjects living in the United States longest disagreed with
collectivism and low risk taking; (3) students born in the United
States discriminated on all items, with statistically significant
differences indicated; (4) 332 subjects reported speaking a language
other than English at home; (5) 359 subjects identified with another
culture besides that of the United States; and (6) 318 had taken
courses emphasizing cross-cultural relations. Findings suggest that
the subjects possessed the skills necessary for survival in
post-university life--skills such as collaboration and behavioral
sensitivity. (Contains 93 references; the survey instrument, 11
tables of data, and an appendix of qualitative data are attached.)
(RS)

Determinants of Ethnocentrism:
A Study of the Relationship between Students' Exposure to Other Cultures and their Attitudes toward Cultural Values

by

James B. Stull, Ph. D.
Department of Marketing and Quantitative Studies

and

Beth Von Till, M. A.
Department of Communication Studies

San Jose State University
One Washington Square
San Jose, CA 95192-0069

Determinants of Ethnocentrism:
A Study of the Relationship between Students' Exposure to Other Cultures and their Attitudes toward Cultural Values

Abstract

Ethnocentrism is the tendency to view our own culture's ways as the right ways and then judging all other cultures in relation to our own. This paper discusses causes of ethnocentrism and how it is manifested. It then attempts to shed new light on the topic by investigating ethnocentrism in educational settings. A 40-item, Likert-type questionnaire was administered to 535 college students. The questionnaire was designed to compare Hofstede's dimensions of national culture (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity) with the independent variables, birthplace, number of family generations born in the U.S., languages spoken, culture identified with, exposure through living in another culture, travel, and formal study of cultures.

You see, Jack, it is all a matter of the Gods. Now ours is a nice, reasonable rational kind of a God. But the Ayotollah Khomeini's God—he's crazy.

(Fisher, 1988)

I don't see how there can be a job for her. Not until she learns the language.

(Matthews, 1982)

Gonzalez told me that it was customary to come to an under-the-table arrangement with the union leader in order to facilitate a quick and problem-free contract. Back where I come from we call this a bribe.

(Kras, 1988)

My face got red. I was kind of embarrassed. I said, "Why is money being mentioned? I don't want money. I just want to help you, because I am a member of the family."

(Santoli, 1988)

. . . the American never questions the fact that time should be planned and future events fitted into a schedule. He thinks that people should look toward the future and not dwell too much on the past.

(Hall, 1959)

1

3

All of the preceding quotes illustrate viewpoints that may not be shared equally or at all by interactants in each situation. While Fisher claims that his quote was a tongue-in-cheek remark made in the U. S. State Department, others could argue that it may truly reflect a more deep-seated attitude that the speaker harbors about Islam and Middle Eastern thought. Matthews and her husband sponsored a Vietnamese refugee family. Trying to help them, and experiencing simultaneous frustration regarding their different lifestyles, her husband assumed that the Vietnamese woman would not be employable without certain language skills. Understanding the host country language is ideal, but many survive without it. Kras presents a letter written by a U.S.-born manager in a *maquiladora* in Mexico. The manager was sent there because of his knowledge of Mexico, but his knowledge obviously did not include everything about how business is conducted. His use of the word "bribe" reflects values and definitions from his own country that may not apply equally to Mexico. Santoli presents the account of a man from Afghanistan living with a U.S. family in New England. The guest offered to help in the family's store. The wife asked him how much he expected to be paid. He wanted to help because he owed it to his new family. He was insulted and embarrassed about the issue of money being raised. He was also shocked that his host family's children worked to contribute 'o their college expenses and even paid rent to their parents. Hall's description of U.S. business representatives' attitudes toward time suggests that others may not see time as needing to be controlled. In fact, Terpstra and David (1991) contrast this to how business in many countries requires that time be spent chatting over coffee, meeting the right people, and generally developing the interpersonal relationship before business can even begin to be conducted.

They suggest that the U.S. executive revise the philosophy, "time is money" to "spend time so that I do not lose money" (p. 116).

These incidents represent countless others in which the differences in viewpoints about what is correct in a situation may cause discomfort or conflict between people. This common phenomenon is often studied under the concept "ethnocentrism."

Numerous articles and books have been written about cross-cultural relations in various settings, including government, business, and education. Training programs and university classes abound that focus on multiculturalism, cultural sensitivity, cultural pluralism and other cautiously labeled topics. Most people perceive a need for improved relationships among people of all cultures. The topic is not only regarded as important, but people's fascination with it has also made it very popular. Except for certain extremist militant groups, it might be safe to say that most people want interpersonal and intercultural harmony. Many cultural groups, however, maintain their identities and continue to practice their customs, even when they move into other cultures. This is normal. Why should they change? How can they change patterns of behavior that have taken years, perhaps centuries, to evolve? And if they find people just like themselves, they find support for their way of life.

This paper investigates culturally shaped patterns of behavior and how receptive or resistant people are to different viewpoints held by members of other cultures.

Culture

Culture has been defined as "the distinctive way of life of a group of people, their complete design for living" (Kluckhohn, 1961). It generally

refers to that complex, integrated whole that includes language, attitudes, values, customs, beliefs, morals, art, taboos, knowledge, politics, laws, social organization, religion, technology, education, and any other social influences that are acquired by people and that shape their behavior in a given society.

Culture is learned; people are not born with culture. They learn it through the process of enculturation. It is acquired by one generation from previous generations. Patterns of habits are formed based on people's social interactions. These habits are regarded by a society as the ideal norms for that society, satisfying its particular needs. Culture changes as inside and outside forces cause it to change. Culture has many consistencies among its many components (Walters, 1978).

Ethnocentrism

Once people learn the patterns of behavior that are acceptable to their society, they often view behavior patterns that differ from those patterns as bad or wrong. This behavior is a major part of ethnocentrism. Sumner defines ethnocentrism as . . . "the view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it. . . . Each group thinks its own folkways the only right ones." (1906, p. 13). Ethnocentric viewpoints constitute mindsets that influence all international and cross-cultural interactions (Fisher, 1988). People become programmed to respond to the world in ways that have been shaped by their own cultures. These ways often do not match the ways in which other cultures have been conditioned to respond to their own realities. This intensional orientation or blindering (Haney, 1986) limits our ability to see things objectively. Adams (1974) lists examples of "cultural blocks" that could interfere with our perceptions:

4

6

- Fantasy and reflection are a waste of time, lazy, even crazy.
- Playfulness is for children only.
- Problem-solving is a serious business and humor is out of place.
- Reason, logic, numbers, utility, practicality are *good;*
   feeling, intuition, qualitative judgments, pleasure are *bad*.
- Tradition is preferable to change.
- Any problem can be solved by scientific thinking and lots of money.
- Taboos (p. 31).

Blom (1969, p. 84) points out that it is not always just people's culture *per se* that differentiates them from others, but the manifestation of that culture through behavior that causes others to categorize them as different.

Levinson (1949) defines the ethnocentric person as "one who generally rejects and vilifies outgroups, and at the same time overly accepts and glorifies the ingroup" (in Rokeach, 1960, p. 12); the major facets of the ethnocentric syndrome are ingroup solidarity and outgroup hostility (Brewer and Campbell, 1976, p. 27). People from different ethnic groups tend to have more superficial relationships with each other than do people from the same ethnic group. Language, values, customs, expectations and other barriers limit mutual understanding, conflict and avoidance of interaction (van den Berghe, 1970, p. 15).

Borrowing from Sumner's early work, LeVine and Campbell (1972, p. 11) organized the facets of the syndrome of ethnocentrism according to how an ethnocentric person would perceive the ingroup and outgroups (Table 1). Rosenblatt (1964) also made similar comparisons.

Table 1
How Ethnocentrism Impacts the
Perception of Ingroups and Outgroups

Ingroup	Outgroup
•Seen as virtuous and superior	•Seen as contemptible, immoral and inferior
•Seen as strong	•Seen as weak
•Sanctions against ingroup theft	•Sanctions for theft against out-groups
•Sanctions against ingroup murder	•Sanctions for murder against outgroups
•Standards seen as universal, true, original, centrally human	•Hatred for outgroups
•Cooperation with ingroup members	•No cooperation with outgroup
•Obey ingroup authorities	•Do not obey authorities of outgroup
•Willing to remain in ingroup	•Avoid converting to outgroup
•Willing to fight and die for ingroup	•Will not fight and die for outgroup
	•Hold outgroup at a social distance
	•Virtue in killing outgroup members during war
	•Use outgroup as negative example when training children
	•Blame outgroup for ingroup's problems
	•Distrust and fear outgroups

Source: Adapted from Levine and Campbell (1972)

Ethnocentrism is natural to all groups of people. Reynolds *et al.* (1987) posit that every aspect of human behavior has some biological underpinning. They discuss the Social Darwinist theory that in-group/out-group behavior may vary with the evolution of societies, being less prevalent in more advanced societies. They state that individuals, for their own survival or in their own "genetic self-interest," may cooperate and reciprocate within the group but not outside it (p. 268). Ethnocentrism may lead to a wide range of behavior from simple misunderstandings or discomfort to actual destruction and death. Shaw and Wong (1989) suggest that ethnocentrism could be a root cause of warfare (p. 44). No group is immune from this tendency. As van den Berghe so clearly framed it, "If I've reached one conclusion in the course of my academic nomadism, it is that problems of ethnic particularism and hostility are not limited to the so-called developing countries" (1970, p. 8).

What causes ethnocentrism?

Reynolds *et al.* ask that research go a step beyond just knowing that social discrimination occurs and that studies be designed to uncover why it occurs (p. 270).

Segall (1979) recaps a major study of ethnocentrism among African tribes by Brewer and Campbell (1976). Based on their data from 30 East African societies, he concluded that (1) people tend to perceive their own groups as being good; (2) people's attraction toward outgroups is individual; (3) intergroup attractiveness is reciprocal; (4) intergroup attraction depends on contact, similarity and proximity; (5) "backward" outgroups are not as attractive as "advanced" outgroups, and attractiveness again depends on similarity; (6) the content of the perceptions of outgroups cannot be predicted solely on the basis of their attractiveness; and (7) the opportunity for contact is related to perception.

Perhaps to gain a stronger understanding or enthnocentric thinking, it will help to look at early writings on authoritarian personalities closed minds.

Closed minds

Adorno *et al.* (1950) conducted research on authoritarian character structure and authoritarian personalities. These pioneer social scientists were interested in anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany. They wondered if anti-Semitic people also showed hostility toward other ethnic groups. This broader study of the rejection and vilification of outgroups in general was a seminal study of what is now classified as ethnocentrism. The California F-Scale (Facism Scale, Authoritarian Personality Scale) measured facist attitudes; scores on the F-Scale correlated positively with measures of anti-Semitism, anti-blacks, ethnocentrism, and political conservatism. These studies of intolerance, discrimination, prejudice, bigotry, social distance, and ethnocentrism were typically directed toward "bigots on the political right" (Rokeach, 1960, p. 15). It was concluded, however, that authoritarianism and rigidity about interpersonal relationships are not owned solely by Facists, Ku Klux Klansmen, and conservatives. They cross all walks of life.

Rokeach (1960, p. 103) discusses early studies he conducted at Michigan State University using the Ethnocentrism Scale, Dogmatism Scale, F-Scale, and Opinionation Scale. Graduate students' scores correlated positively on all four instruments in one study, but in another study very significant differences were found. Rokeach attributed these differences to political orientation and religion (Protestant, Catholic, non-believer).

In his follow-up work, Rokeach (1970) describes people's belief systems as simultaneously serving two very powerful, conflicting sets of motives (p. 67): the need for a cognitive framework to know and to understand ("open"

systems) and the need to ward off threatening aspects of reality ("closed" systems). He explains that as the need to know is up and threat is absent, the result should be open systems. But, as the need to ward off threat becomes stronger, the need to know becomes weaker, resulting in closed belief systems. These systems operate at different magnitudes to meet the needs of each situation. He explains clearly that perceived threat leads to dogmatism and that closed systems help one justify egocentric self-righteousness and the moral condemnation of others (p. 69).

It is easy to find experiences that support Rokeach's model. People who are novices to schools of thought typically have their minds open to take in as much information as they can. Consider, for example, the college student or the recently converted member of a religious organization. However, the information they selectively strive to absorb is typically that which supports their new concepts and beliefs. Frequently, enthusiasts find themselves promoting causes only to encounter those who do not share the same beliefs. When the two opposing perceptions collide, people tend to shut out the other's rationale a looming source of dissonance. As people become truly more knowledgeable about their beliefs, many become more comfortable with and more tolerant and appreciative of other viewpoints.

Troldahl and Powell (1965) found that people who rated high on the dogmatism scale varied in their openness to innovative ideas, depending upon the social system within which they lived. Those who lived in communities that valued innovation more frequently adopted recommendations of (in this study) agricultural agents. Those "dogmatic" people who lived in areas that historically resisted innovation tended not to adopt those same recommendations.

Most students of cross-cultural relations believe that while ethnocentrism is a natural phenomenon and that it does have some positive value in developing a culture, it seems to be something that we also talk about trying to reduce. It would seem, then, that a less ethnocentric person might be considered socially better adjusted. The "Is of Identity" Test (Weirs, 1954) was designed to measure social adjustment and is regarded as a reliable tool for differentiating between socially adjusted groups and maladjusted ones.

Practicality in Organizational Settings

Business people often make staffing decisions based on ethnocentric attitudes, and their justification of these decisions may make good sense from a business perspective. Studies by Zeira et al. (1975) and Zeira (1975) concluded that ethnocentric staffing policies are prevalent among multinational companies (MNCs), and these policies create serious personnel problems for everyone, including expatriates, host country managers and employees. Ethnocentric attitudes often lead to organizational dysfunction. In a subsequent study, Zeira (1979) conducted research in 111 host-country organizations in Holland, Belgium, France, Germany and England. He administered a seven-item questionnaire asking executives and other managers to agree or disagree. In all five countries, subjects showed ethnocentrism in company staffing policies. In follow-up interviews, respondents disclosed why they answered as they did. A succinct summary of this study is that people want managers to be as much like themselves as possible. Respondents believed that all top managers should be host-country nationals; expatriate managers should be of Western European origin, adhere to local managerial behavioral patterns, be familiar with the culture of the host-country, be proficient in the host-country's language, have a perfect

knowledge of the host-countries social characteristics, and be familiar with the history of the host country. When asked to justify their positions on these items, respondents gave very practical reasons: people most familiar with local customs would be more effective in marketing products, dealing with personnel, keeping up the morale, and they would tend to stay in their positions longer than would expatriate managers.

Enculturation v. Acculturation

Reynolds *et al.* ask us to consider how we are socialized during childhood. Early socialization contributes to our tendency to learn certain behavior. Studies by Feather (1975) support those of Rokeach (1968), suggesting that children may be more open to new ideas than their parents might be. One of Feather's studies suggests that adult migrants adhere to their original attitudes, values and ways of living, whereas their children start with a "cleaner slate" and may be less set in their ways (p. 105). As children mix at school and at play with children from the host culture, they tend to adapt more toward the norms of that society. In another study where he used the Australian Ethnocentric Scale, Feather found that ethnocentrism scores were higher for adults than for their children for both Ukranian and Australian families. He does pose a *caveat*, however, that these studies did not account for other possible contributing factors such as lifestyle changes and historical events.

Sachs (1976) provides a succinct statement about how ethnocentrism appears in the arena of international relations. Exclusive reliance on the imitative transfer of knowledge in the form of finished intellectual products and technological processes, is in fact a fallacious shortcut to modernity. . ." (p. 85). He goes on to point out that so often "developed" countries try to apply strategies that worked in their own environments to environments with

different urgent problems, natural, social and economic conditions. "In particular," he says, "Western technology aims to replace human labor by capital, whereas the Third World, on the contrary, needs technologies which are sparing in their use of capital and call for as large a supply of manpower as possible." Booth (1979) states, "Strategy is ethnocentric and ethnocentrism can get in the way of strategy" (p. 20). He goes on to illustrate that ethnocentrism is pervasive throughout both theory and practice of strategy. He poses that overcoming ethnocentrism is not the key to peace, but that realizing ethnocentrism and "incuriosity" and replacing them with "sophisticated realism" and strategic relativism will take us closer to the goal of a more harmonious world community (pp. 179-182).

Wiard (1985) presents excellent examples of ethnocentrism in United States programs designed to assist other countries.

> "Agrarian reform. . . is based on the model of a medium-sized, middle-class, family-based, civically conscious yeoman farmer that may still apply in rural Wisconsin but seems of limited usefulness in Latin America" (p. 6). . . . "For as now structured, liberal arts education is essentially *Western* education, the Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian traditions and European history, from which derive a set of concepts, ethics, and governing norms and experiences that have their basis in the Western background and that may have little reference to or applicability in other global areas. . . .Our concepts of justice, fair play, good government, progress, and development are similarly Western concepts. The latter two terms imply a certain unilinearism and inevitability in the evolution of man's social and political institutions. The former three concomitants that are supposed to follow from industrialization and economic development" (p. 11-12).

Wiarda goes on to caution us that not only are our liberal arts traditions and hence our social science assumptions Western, but they are also based strongly on metaphorical concepts. Great danger lies in our tendency to reify our metaphorical constructs *and* extend what are essentially

12

14

Western metaphors to the rest of the world where they neither fit nor have much meaning. When we use concepts such as progress, development, stages of growth or modernization, these are metaphors, poetic devices, shorthand tools, and abstractions that have some relation to reality but are not to be confused with the real thing. Wiarda goes on, then, to point out how this argument applies to Western biases in political theory, political sociology and political economy.

Asante (1987) scolds the the communication "expert" who defines a speech as an uninterrupted spoken discourse because such a definition demonstrates either a disregard or ignorance of the African tradition of speech. Leslie Fieldler showed a purely European conception of fiction when he contended that romance was a central theme in literature. Familiar with the classics of American and British literature, he apparently accepted Western literature as world-defining (p. 6). Charles Larson (1973) wrote a perceptive essay, "Heroic Ethnocentrism: The Idea of Universality in Literature," in which he examined the European notion of universality. Larson first encountered the problem of assuming universality in a concept while teaching an English literature course in Nigeria. Larson's students did not understand the idea of kissing in the Victorian novel, and as he searched for words to explain the writings of a very famous Western author to his African audience, he learned how culture shapes the interpretation of literature. Larson concluded that kissing has no counterpart in the African novel and no major African novel's plot progresses because of a hero's attempt to attract a mate. The failure to consider other realities is prevalent throughout writing.

Ethnocentrism in Our Own Research

Hunter and Foley (1976) remind us to be aware of how our subjective predispositions to label and interpret the behavior of others distort our ability to observe that behavior. We must learn to scrutinize our internal processes during observation, recording, and communicating those behaviors.

Hofstede (1980) illustrates clearly how ethnocentrism creeps into cross-cultural research. In studies done using Maslow's hierarchy of human needs, subjects from the United States scored closer to what experimenters expected on questionnaires than did subjects from other countries. The hierarchy is based on U.S. standards, implying that needs are satisfied in a predetermined order.

Hofstede suggests that, to avoid ethnocentrism in empirical research, questionnaires should be developed nonethnocentrically. Data collection and analysis can be culturally decentered by having members of other cultural groups participate in validation of instruments and the interpretation of results. Some measures have been taken here to attempt to meet those objectives.

Will Newcomers Try to Assimilate?

Barth (1969b) suggests that cultures that are in contact with other cultures will actually strive to maintain cultural identity. Laurent (1983) found that cultural differences were even more pronounced among foreign employees working in the same plant in one country than those working in their own native lands. He studied managers from ten countries who were working in their homelands; he followed this study with another in which he observed managers from those same ten countries working at a company in one location. He originally expected to find more similarities among employees who worked together; however, he found just the opposite. He

14

found employees to be more emphatic in demonstrating their cultural differences when they worked together. To be sure of his findings, Laurent replicated the study in two more companies. His results were similar.

Eidham (1969) suggests that this tendency might not always be true. In northern Norway, Lapps may try to fake their identity or to live a double lifw—pass— as a kind of Norwegian and as a "back-stage" Lapp. Lapps have adapted to Norwegian ways by speaking the local Norwegian dialect (but with Lappish influence). Some have even abandoned the Lappish language (p. 42). In public and commercial relations, Lapps and Norwegians behave as if ethnicity does not count. Typically, however, Lapps marry Lapps and Norwegians marry Norwegians. Siverts (1969) contrasts the poly-ethnic situation in the highlands of Chiapis, Mexico with the typical minority situation of northern Norway. The Indian highlander is always an Indian, whether at home or interacting with *Ladinos* . His destiny is shaped by a situation in which his Indianhood is the very basis for interaction (pp. 115-116).

Haaland (1969) studied the Baggara people of Western Sudan. Physically, they are "inhabitants of negro stock." Culturally, they are Arabs (p. 59). At what point does a change of identity actually take place? When does an Baggara become an Arab? a Vietnamese become an American? a Lapp become a Norwegian. Does it ever happen? Does it require the acquisition of prosperity? Do children who grow up in the new culture who no longer identify with the old culture automatically become associated with the new culture? Much of the identity seems to be associated with different value standards (p. 65). Many who try to change still often exhibit socio-cultural traits that distinguish them from the norm (p. 67). While we might expect identity to be signalized by "easily visible cultural features," it is more often

15

through the persistence of habits that are difficult to change overnight, like language (p. 69).

This leaves us with the question as to whether people want to acculturate or assimilate when entering a new culture, or whether they want to live in the new land and carry on much as they did in their old lands.

Methodology

Subjects

Subjects for this study were 535 students from San Jose State University enrolled in business and communication studies classes from the Spring 1992 through Spring 1993 semesters.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables selected for this research come from Hofstede's (1980) massive study of the international differences in work-related values. Hofstede compared nations in terms of **power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity.**

Power Distance. One cultural phenomenon is that a certain degree of inequality occurs in areas such as prestige, wealth and power. In some societies, employees and other people of lower status try to reduce the power distance between themselves and their bosses or superiors while the superiors try to maintain or enlarge it. In other societies, the status given a superior is sacred.

Uncertainty Avoidance. In different cultures, people deal with uncertainty in different ways. Hofstede concerns himself with issues such as rule orientation, employment stability and stress.

Individualism/Collectivism. In some cultures, individualism is seen as a blessing and a source of well-being. In others it is alienating. Hofstede's concern here is the relationship between the individual and the collectivity

16

which prevails in a given society. Hsu (1983) describes individualists as aggressively creative, self-reliant, competitive, goal-oriented, and self-centered. The work of Tonnies (1957), Hui (1986), and Crandell (1980) purport that collectivist societies rely more on people's cooperation and concern for others, where success is shared by the group and one person's loss is felt by everyone.

Masculinity/Femininity. Some cultures are characterized slightly more by assertiveness, advancement, and earnings and have been classified as masculine; others place more emphasis on nurturing, interpersonal aspects, rendering service and the physical environment, and have been classified as feminine. Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988) report one finding that individuals from masculine cultures tend to be more self-conscious than individuals from feminine cultures. One explanation of this is that the masculine cultures place more emphasis on personal ambition (an internal frame of reference) while feminine cultures emphasize service to others (an external frame of reference).

Independent Variables.

The independent variables in this research were generated from the literature on sojourners (Klineberg and Hull, 1979; Gudykunst and Kim, 1984; Koester, 1985, 1987; and Kauffmann *et al.*, 1992) and from *a priori* assumptions. These variables include gender, length of time lived in the United States, birthplace, where raised, where lived, where traveled, generation in the United States, languages spoken, cultures identified with, and if the person has taken a course emphasizing cross-cultural relations. It was hypothesized that subjects' responses to items on the measurement instrument would vary depending upon personal characteristics presented in the next section on independent variables.

17

Questionnaire.

The measurement instrument for this study was a 40-item questionnaire, using a Likert-type scale (1 = strongly agree; 5 = strongly disagree). Statements were constructed to fit Hofstede's (1980) four dimensions of national culture: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity, with ten statements designed around each construct.

The items for the questionnaire were constructed intuitively and then compared with the features of the Dogmatism Scale, The California F-Scale, the Australian Ethnocentrism Scale and the Opinionation Scale (Rokeach, 1960, 1968, 1979); the "Is of Identity" Test (Weiss, 1954); the "HERMES" Attitude Survey Questionnaire (Hofstede, 1980); and the Tolerance for Human Diversity Index (Byrd, 1993, pp 192-197). The instruments are noticeably similar in the types of items and the way in which the items are presented.

Individualism/Collectivism

Questionnaire items 5, 13, 21, 25, and 33 were designed to measure individualism.

5. If an individual thinks of a different way to perform a task, that person should be encouraged to do it that way.a

13. It is important that people have lots of free time to pursue heir own interests.

21. When children become 21 years of age, they should be encouraged to move away from home.

25. It is important that I receive individual recognition at work.

33. When I work on group projects, it is important for me to be

the leader.

Someone with an individualistic perspective would strongly agree or agree with these items. One with a collectivistic perspective would disagree or strongly disagree.

Items 1, 9, 17, 29, and 37 were designed to measure collectivism.

1. It is important that people conform to company norms in order to reach company goals.

9. I would always cooperate to keep group harmony

17. Parents have the right to choose the spouse for their children.

29. If I were given a large sum of money, I would share it equally with members of my family.

37. When working on a project, I would rather work as a group member than as an individual.

Someone with a collectivistic perspective would strongly agree or agree with these items. One with an individualistic perspective would disagree or strongly disagree.

Avoidance of Uncertainty

Items 2, 10, 18, 30, and 38 were designed to measure one's tendency to avoid uncertainty.

2. It is important to me to plan for the future very carefully

10. Company rules are always to be followed.

18. A manager must be an expert in the field in which he or she manages.

30. Managers and bosses should be selected on the basis of seniority.

38. Employees should remain with one employer for life.

Someone who prefers to avoid uncertainty would strongly agree or agree with these items. One who is a risk-taker would disagree or strongly disagree.

19

Items 6, 14, 22, 26, and 34 were designed to measure one's tendency to take risks.

6. I enjoy taking risks.

14. Organizational conflict is healthy.

22. I can achieve anything I set out to achieve.

26. Change in my life is important to me.

34. It is important to be flexible during negotiations.

Someone who is a risk-taker would strongly agree or agree with these items. One who prefers to avoid uncertainty would disagree or strongly disagree.

Power Distance

Items 3, 15, 23, 27, and 31 were designed to measure one's tendency to maintain power distance.

3. The eldest male should be the head of the household.

15. Employees should not talk to their bosses about personal matters.

23. Power and wealth are evil.

27. It is important for managers to make all decisions.

31. It is important that bosses closely supervise their employees.

Someone who tends to maintain power distance would strongly agree or agree with these items. One who prefers to minimize this distance would disagree or strongly disagree.

Items 7, 11, 19, 35, and 39 were designed to measure one's tendency to minimize power distance.

20

7. Employees should participate in company decision-making.

11. It is all right for employees to disagree openly with their bosses.

19. It is all right for employees to call their bosses by their first names.

35. It is important for me to be able to work independently.

39. I like to trust and to cooperate with other people.

Someone who prefers to minimize power distance would strongly agree or agree with these items. One who tends to maintain this distance would disagree or strongly disagree.

Masculinity/Femininity

Items 4, 16, 20, 24, and 36 were designed to measure the masculine perspective.

4. It is very important for me to receive recognition for my work.

16. It is more important to me to be paid well than to have a close relationship with my boss.

20. It is important for me to keep my work life separate from my private life.

24. The most important things to my career are a good salary and a job that I do well and like.

36. People must learn to make their own way in this world.

Someone who has a more masculine perspective would strongly agree or agree with these items. One who has a more feminine perspective would disagree or strongly disagree.

Items 8, 12, 28, 32, and 40 were designed to measure the feminine perspective.

8. My job is only one of many parts of my life.

12. I would rather work for a small company than a big one.

28. It is important to shake hands before all business interactions.

21

32. It is important to finish one interaction before rushing off to another.

40 People will achieve organizational goals without being pushed.

Someone who has a more feminine perspective would strongly agree or agree with these items. One who has a more masculine perspective would disagree or strongly disagree.

Research Questions

Q1 Will subjects who were born in a country other than the United States who live in the United States show degrees of ethnocentrism that correlate with the amount of time lived in the United States?

Q2 Will subjects who have taken a class emphasizing cross-cultural relations show less ethnocentrism than those who have not?

Q3 Will subjects who have traveled to other cultures show less ethnocentrism than those who have not?

Q4 Will subjects who have lived in more than one culture show less ethnocentrism than those who have not?

Q5 Will subjects who were born in another culture show less ethnocentrism than those who were not?

Q6 Will subjects who were raised in another culture show less ethnocentrism than those who were not?

Q7 Will subjects who identify with another culture show less ethnocentrism than those who do not?

Q8 Will subjects who speak more than one language show less ethnocentrism than those who do not?

Q9 Will males and females differ on the masculinity variable?

Statistical Analysis

An Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on items 41 through 50 to determine any statistical significance of subjects' discrimination

22

among responses. A *post hoc* Scheffé test was performed on multiple-response items 42 (number of years subject has lived in the United States) and 44 (which family generation subject is of those living in the United States) to pinpoint which groups discriminated more than others. A Pearson *r* was calculated on all dependent variables to determine whether an inverse correlation existed between responses to "opposite" or bipolar items. All statistical applications came from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

<div align="center">

Findings

</div>

The statistical analysis indicated that subject groups did, in fact, discriminate among items. Data are presented by group within each independent variable.

Gender

Subjects included 301 females and 234 males. While females and males scored differently on all dependent variables, three variables showed statistically significant differences ($p \le .05$). Females scored higher than males on collectivism, suggesting that they agree less with the questionnaire items than males do. Females also scored higher on high power distance and lower on low power distance, suggesting they disagree more than males with the high power items and agree more than males do with low power items (Table 1).

Years Lived in United States

Subjects included 4 students who lived in the United States less than one year, 18 who lived here one year or longer but fewer than three years, 137 who lived here three years or longer but fewer than ten years, 130 who lived here ten years or longer but fewer than 20 years, and 245 who lived here more than 20 years.

23

Subject groups discriminated among response choices on all items, with statistically significant differences on collectivism, low risk taking, high risk taking, high power distance, low power distance, and femininity (Table 2) A *post hoc* Scheffé test indicated that statistically significant differences (p ≤ .05) existed primarily between those who had been here greater than 20 years and those living here less than 20 years (Table 2.1). Those living here longest disagreed with collectivism and low risk taking while the other subject groups scored on the agree side of the scale. Those living here longest disagreed more with high power distance items than other subject groups. They agreed more with low power distance items than those living here three years or longer but fewer than ten years. They also agreed less with femininity items than those living here ten years or longer but fewer than 20 years.

Birthplace

Only 525 students indicated whether they were born inside or outside the United States. Of those, 233 were born in the United States; 292 were born outside, representing 50 countries and territories (with one student calling Africa his birthplace). Respondents discriminated among responses, with statistically significant differences in every category (Table 3). Those born outside the United States agreed less than those born inside on individualism (p ≤ .05). Those born inside disagreed more with collectivism, low risk taking, and high power distance items than those born outside (p ≤ .001). In fact, on collectivism items, those born outside the U.S. agreed. Insiders agreed more with high risk taking items than outsiders (p ≤ .001). Outsiders agreed less with low power distance items than insiders (p ≤ .01). Insiders agreed less with masculinity and femininity items than outsiders (p ≤ .01).

Generation Born in U.S.

The 250 students born in the United States discriminated on all items (Table 4), with statistically significant differences ($p \leq .05$) indicated by a *post hoc* Scheffé test (Table 4.1). Those with both parents born in the U.S. disagreed with the items, while those who were first generation born here or who had only one parent born here agreed. Those whose grandparents were born here also disagreed, while those of first generation and one parent groups agreed. Those with both parents born here disagreed with low risk taking items while first generation students agreed. Those with grandparents born here also disagreed with the items, while first generation students agreed.

Raised Inside or Ouside the U.S.

Out of 534 students who answered this item, 289 were raised in the United States, and 235 were raised outside, representing 49 countries and territories (with one student reporting having been raised in "about ten" countries. Responses indicated discrimination in all categories (Table 5), with significant differences in several. Those raised in the U.S. agreed significantly more ($p \leq .01$) with items measuring individualism than students raised elsewhere. Those raised in the U.S. disagreed with collectivism items, while those raised elsewhere agreed ($p \leq .001$). Those raised in the U.S. disagreed with low risk items, while those raised elsewhere agreed ($p \leq .001$). Both groups agreed with high risk taking items, with U.S.-raised subjects agreeing more ($p \leq .001$). Both groups disagreed with high power distance items, with U.S.-raised subjects disagreeing more ($p \leq .001$). Both groups agreed with low power distance items, with U.S.-raised subjects agreeing more ($p \leq .01$).

Lived Inside or Outside the U.S.

Of the 535 subjects, 218 indicated they had lived only in the United States, while 304 had lived in one or more of 65 other countries.

2 5

Some subjects didn't respond to this item. Subject groups discriminated among response choices in all categories, with statistically significant findings in five (Table 6). Those living only in the U.S. agreed more on individualism items than those living elsewhere (p. ≤ .01). Those living only in the U.S. disagreed with collectivism items, while those living elsewhere agreed with those items (p ≤ .001). Subjects living only in the U.S. disagreed with low risk items, while those living elsewhere agreed (p ≤ .001). Both groups disagreed with high power distance items, with those living only in the U.S. disagreeing more (p ≤ .001). Both groups agreed with femininity items, with those living only in the U.S. agreeing more (p ≤ .05).

Traveled Outside the U.S.

Of the 535 subjects, 388 reported having traveled outside the U.S., while 146 indicated they had not. One person did not respond to this item. Nearly every country in the world was represented, with Mexico and Canada receiving the most responses. Only one category showed significant differences in responses (Table 7). Subjects who traveled outside the U.S. agreed more with high risk taking items than those who had not (p ≤ .001).

Speak Language Other than English at Home

Of the 535 subjects, 332 reported speaking a language other than English (LOTE) at home, while 201 speak English at home. Fifty LOTEs were reported. Two subjects did not respond to this item. Subjects discriminated among all responses, with statistically significant differences showing in several categories (Table 8). Those speaking a LOTE agreed with collectivism items, while those speaking only English disagreed with those items (p ≤ .001). Those speaking a LOTE agreed with low risk taking items, while those speaking only English disagreed (p ≤ .001). Both groups agreed with high risk taking items, with those speaking only English agreeing more (p ≤ .01). Both

groups disagreed with high power distance items, with subjects speaking only English disagreeing more (p ≤ .001). Both groups agreed with masculinity and femininity items with those speaking a LOTE agreeing more on both (p ≤ .01).

Identifying with a Culture Besides the U.S.

Of the 535 subjects, 359 identify with another culture besides that of the U.S., while 162 identify with the U.S. Fourteen subjects did not respond to this item. Subjects discriminated among all responses choices, with statistically significant differences in several categories (Table 9). Those identifying with another culture agreed with collectivism items, while those identifying with the U.S. culture disagreed (p ≤ .001). Those identifying with another culture agreed on low risk taking items, while those identifying with the U.S. culture disagreed (p ≤ .001). Both groups disagreed with high power distance items, with those identifying with the U.S. culture disagreeing more (p ≤ .001). Both groups agreed with masculinity and femininity items, with those identifying with another culture agreeing more with masculinity (p ≤ .05) and femininity (p ≤ .001).

Took Courses Emphasizing Cross-cultural Relations

Of the 535 subjects, 318 had taken courses emphasizing cross-cultural relations, while 213 had not. Four students did not respond. Over 125 courses were reported as emphasizing cross-cultural relations. Several statistically significant differences were found (Table 10). Both groups agreed with collectivism items, with those not taking courses agreeing more (p ≤ .01). Both groups agreed with low risk taking items, with those not taking courses agreeing more (p ≤ .001). Both groups agreed on high risk taking items, with those taking courses agreeing more (p ≤ .05). Both groups disagreed with high power distance items, with those taking courses disagreeing more (p ≤ .01).

Correlation Coefficients

While the data did not support the notion that responses on bipolar variables would result in negative correlations, some findings merit reporting here (Table 11). One statistically significant negative correlation was found between high power distance and low power distance items (p ≤ .05). Negative correlations emerged between individualism and collectivism and between low risk taking and high risk taking, but not at a statistically significant level

Discussion

Gender

Hofstede (1980) states, "we cannot speak of 'Individualism' as being systematically better linked to the male or to the female role" (p. 223). Male and female responses did not differ significantly, although males agreed more than females with individualism items. However, males agreed significantly more than females with collectivism items (p ≤ .05), although their scores were both near the midpoint on the scale. Hofstede reports that women scored interpersonal/collectivist aspects (p. 261), "friendly atmosphere" and "cooperation" (p. 274) as more important to job satisfaction than males did. This study does not support those findings.

No significant differences existed between males and females on uncertainty avoidance/risk taking scores, although females agreed more with low risk items and males with high risk items. Hofstede's study also reported no significant difference between males' and females' scores on uncertainty avoidance items.

Females disagreed more with high power distance items than males (p ≤ .05), and agreed more with low power distance items than males (p ≤ .05). Hofstede declined to conclude anything significant regarding gender

28

differences, although the study did result in some. For example, females showed less preference for a consultative manager. The current study differs from Hofstede's on overall scores. Is this because Hofstede studied managers from one company while this study looked at students?

Intuitively, it would appear if differences were to emerge by gender, they would show up between masculinity and femininity items. However, no significant differences were found. Ironically, females did agree more with masculinity items and males agreed more with femininity items.

Overall, both males and females agreed with statements representing all variables except high power distance, where both groups disagreed.

Years Lived in U.S.

Statistically significant differences were found in five of the eight variables between those respondents living in the U.S. more than twenty years and those respondents falling into other groups. A safe generalization might be that the length of time one spends in a culture affects one's perceptions of what is right or wong.

With nearly every variable, those living in the U.S. greater than twenty years scored higher or lower than most groups, although some were not statistically significant. All groups agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and femininity. All groups agreed with statements representing collectivism and low risk taking except those living in the U.S. more than twenty years. All groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Birthplace

Statistically significant differences were found in every category. Those born in the U.S. agreed more with individualism statements ($p \le .05$) than those born elsewhere. Those born in the U.S. disagreed with collectivism

29

statements while those born elsewhere tended to agree (p ≤ .001). This is consistent with Hofstede's findings that the U.S. is the most individualistic country (1980, p. 222).

Those born in the U.S. disagreed more with low risk taking statements while those born elsewhere tended to agree (p ≤ .001). Those born in the U.S. agreed more with high risk taking statements than those born elsewhere (p ≤ .001). This is consistent with Hofstede's uncertainty avoidance index (1980, p. 165). The U.S. is considered to be a country where people are more likely to take chances. What is interesting to note, however, is that those born elsewhere also agreed with high risk taking, suggesting that those who leave their homelands to live and study somewhere else are risk takers.

Those born in the U.S. disagreed more with high power distance statements than did those born elsewhere (p ≤ .001). The U.S. ranked relatively low on Hofstede's power distance index (1980, p. 104). Once again, it is interesting to note that those born elsewhere also disagreed with high power distance statements. This could certainly lead to many interpretations, the most obvious being (1) people who live in high power distance cultures don't necessarily agree with high power distance, and (2) those who live in high power distance cultures may find ways to leave those cultures to find a culture that gives them more access to authority.

Those born in the U.S. agreed less with both masculinity and femininity statements than those born elsewhere (p ≤ .01). Hofstede's study placed the U.S. toward the high end of the masculinity index (1980, p. 279) although the only data available for this index was from occupations filled by men. Perhaps, because the U. S. has been going through changes in the role expectations of males and females, ambiguity and no definite direction of results can be expected.

Overall, respondents born in the U.S. and those born outside the U.S. agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and femininity. Those born in the U.S. disagreed with statements representing collectivism and low risk taking, while those born outside the U.S. tended to agree. Both groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Birthplace

As with number of years lived in the United States, which generation is living here also seems to impact scores on our questionnaire. Statistically significant differences only occurred with two variables. Those respondents who had grandparents or both parents who were born in the United States disagreed with collectivism statements while those who were first generation or who had just one parent born here tended to agree ($p \leq .05$).

Again, those with grandparents or both parents born in the U.S. disagreed with low risk taking statements more than those with just one parent born here. First generation respondents tended to agree with low risk taking statements, although the responses were very close to midpoint on the scale.

Overall, all groups agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and feminity. Those who were first generation born or who had one parent born in the U.S. tended to agree with statements representing collectivism, while those with both parents or grandparents born in the U.S. tended to disagree. Those respondents who were first generation born in the U.S. tended to agree with statements representing low risk taking, while all other groups tended to disagree. All groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Where Raised

Those raised in the U.S. agreed more with individualism statements that those raised elsewhere (p ≤ .01). Conversely, they tended to disagree with collectivism statements, while those raised elsewhere tended to agree (p ≤ .001). This is consistent with Hofstede's findings.

Those raised in the U.S. disagreed with low risk taking statements, while those raised elsewhere agreed (p ≤ .001). Those raised in the U.S. agreed more with high risk taking items than those raised elsewhere (p ≤ .001). Again, these findings are consistent with Hofstede's.

Those raised in the U.S. disagreed more with high power distance items than those born elsewhere (p ≤ .001). Those raised in the U.S. agreed more with low power distance statements than those born elsewhere (p ≤ .01). This is consistent with Hofstede's results.

No statistically significant differences were found on the masculinity and femininity items.

Overall, both groups agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and femininity. Those raised elsewhere agreed with statements representing collectivism and low risk taking, while those raised in the U.S. disagreed. Both groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Where Lived

Respondents living only in the U.S. agreed more with individualism statements than those who had lived elsewhere (p ≤ .01). Those living in the U.S. only disagreed with collectivism statements, while those living elsewhere agreed

(p ≤ .001).

Those living only in the U.S. disagreed with low risk taking statements, while those living elsewhere agreed (p ≤ .001).

Those living only in the U.S. disagreed more with high power distance items than those living elsewhere (p ≤ .001).

Those living elsewhere agreed more with femininity statements than those living only in the U.S. (p ≤ .05).

These data support Hofstede's results. They also suggest that living in more than one culture can affect one's perceptions of what is "right."

Overall, both groups agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and femininity. Those who had lived outside the U.S. agreed with statements representing collectivism and low risk taking, while those living only in the U.S. disagreed. Both groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Traveled

Only one variable showed significant results. Those who never left the U.S. agreed less with high risk taking statements than those who had traveled outside the U.S. (p ≤ .001). This makes *a priori* sense. Travelers take risks.

Overall, both groups agreed with statements representing all variables except high power distance, where they both disagreed.

Speak LOTE

Those speaking a LOTE at home agreed with collectivism statements, while those speaking English at home disagreed (p ≤ .001).

Those speaking a LOTE at home agreed with low risk taking statements, while those speaking English at home disagreed (p ≤ .001). Those speaking a LOTE at home agreed less with high risk taking statements than those speaking English at home (p ≤ .01).

33

Those speaking English at home disagreed more with high power distance statements than those speaking a LOTE at home (p ≤ .001).

Those speaking a LOTE at home agreed more with both masculinity and femininity statements than those speaking English at home (p ≤ .01).

Overall, both groups agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and femininity. Those speaking a LOTE at home agreed with statements representing collectivism and low risk taking, while those speaking only English at home disagreed. Both groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Identify with Another Culture

Those respondents who identified with another culture agreed with collectivism statements, while those who identified with the U.S. disagreed (p ≤ .001).

Those respondents who identified with another culture agreed with low risk taking statements, while those who identified with the U.S. disagreed (p ≤ .001).

Those respondents who identified with the U.S. disagreed more with high power distance than did those respondents who identified with another culture (p ≤ .001).

Those respondents who identified with another culture agreed more with masculinity statements (p ≤ .05) and femininity statements (p ≤ .001) than those who identified with the U.S.

Both groups agreed with statements representing individualism, high risk taking, low power distance, masculinity and femininity. Those identifying with a culture other than that of the U.S. agreed with statements

3 4

representing collectivism and low risk taking, while those identifying with the U.S. disagreed. Both groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance.

Cross-cultural Course

Those who took a course in cross-cultural relations agreed less with collectivism statements than those who didn't take a course ($p \leq .01$).

Those who took a course in cross-cultural relations agreed less with low risk taking statements ($p \leq .001$) and more with high risk taking statements ($p \leq .05$) than those who didn't take a course.

Those who took a course in cross-cultural relations disagreed more with high power distance statements than those who didn't take a course ($p \leq .01$).

Overall, both groups agreed with statements representing all variables except high power distance, where both groups disagreed.

Correlation Coefficients

The purpose of running the Pearson r Correlation Coefficient was to test the experimenters' *a priori* assumption that a person scoring in one direction on one variable of the bipolar scales would score in the other direction on the other variable. The results of the study did not support this hypothesis except for the relationship between low power distance and high power distance ($p = .05$).

Numerous negative correlations and statistically significant negative and postitive correlations emerged between unrelated variables that merit discussion.

For example, individualism and high risk showed a statistically significant positive correlation ($p = .01$), as did collectivism and low risk ($p = .01$). Taking risks may be a more individual characteristic, whereas

35
37

collectivism and group orientation may suggest caution and taking fewer risks.

Individualism and low power distance were correlated (p = .01), as were collec. vism and high power distance. Is power and status less desirable in individualistic cultures and more acceptable in collectivistic ones?

Low risk correlated with high power distance, and high risk correlated with low power distance (p = .01). Do people who live in more egalatarian societies take more risks, while those in more authoritarian societies take fewer risks?

Masculinity and femininity correlated with all of the other variables (p = .01), suggesting that masculine and feminine characteristics can be found with any of the other behaviors.

Individualism, High Risk Taking, Low Power Distance, Masculinity and Femininity

Statements representing these five variables tended to be agreed with by all groups with great regularity, regardless of gender, birthplace, generation in the U.S., where raised, where lived, whether or not one had traveled outside the U.S., whether one spoke a LOTE or English at home, whether one identified with a culture other than the U.S. or that of the U.S., or whether or not one had taken a course emphasizing cross-cultural relations.

High Power Distance

All groups disagreed with statements representing high power distance. This suggests that reducing the psychological, communication and behavioral distances between students and teachers, employees and managers, politicians and their constituencies may be desirable. There seems to be a trend toward reducing power distance in the U.S.

36

Collectivism and Low Risk Taking

Statements representing collectivism and low risk taking tended to be agreed with by several groups: those living in the U.S. fewer than twenty years, those born outside the U.S., those first generation born in the U.S., those with one parent only born in the U.S. (collectivism only), those raised outside the U.S., those who had lived outside the U.S., those who spoke a LOTE at home, and those who identified with a culture other than that of the U.S. Those who had lived in the U.S. greater than twenty years, born in the U.S., who had both parents or grandparents born in the U.S., who were raised in the U.S., who had lived only in the U.S., who spoke only English at home, and who identified with the U.S. culture disagreed with those statements.

Applications of findings

In a recent article in the *San Jose Mercury News* Marilyn Lewis reported that corporate survival may depend on the traits and characteristics of women, members of minority groups, teachers, and networkers—those who are collaborative, sensitive listeners, nurturers, and builders of relationships: women. The female style, practiced by both men and women, may be better equipped to deal with many of today's corporate problems: computerized information, downsizing, global competition, instant decision-making.

Lewis quotes Perry M. Smith, a leadership and strategic planning consultant, who believes that corporations may be being held back by traditional male ideals: "risk aversion, comfort with hierarchy, following chain of command, communicating with people only in your immediate area." He predicts that it will take twenty years or more for the new leadership style to prevail. New leadership will include listening; sharing information; making personal connections up, down and across the

corporation; and insistence on examining all sides of a complicated problem; working on a problem until it is solved.

Ginsburg (1989) idenfies more leadership characteristics of women:

- more emphasis on collaborative decision-making

- less concern with titles and formnal authority, more concern with responsibility and responsiveness

- less concern for empire building, power, domination, and consciousness about one's turf

- a greater concern with process and fairness

- more decentralization

- more democratic, participative, consultative management; less autocratic, domineering, ego-involved management

- more concern with the quality of outcomes

- a greater responsiveness and concern for individual feelings, ideas, opinions, ambitions, and on- and off-the-job satisfactions

- high value placed on loyalty, longevity, and interpersonal skills

- more emphasis on skills as a listener and conversationalist (in Simons et al., 1993, p. 181).

Many of these skills seem to be present more in women than in men or in some ethnic/national cultures more than others. The point here is not to fill all management positions with women or people from certain cultures only; rather, to educate and train all managers—women as well as men, U.S.-born as well as foreign-born—to acquire managerial and leadership skills that work.

Students in this study appear to possess the skills necessary for survival in post-university life. It is important that these skills be developed, recognized, and employed for the maximum benefit to the, must numbers of people. Many stereotyopes of cultural behavior may not apply to those who

38

move to another culture. Through acculturation and because the person has decided to leave, sterotypes may be inappropriate.

Questions for Further Research

Of course, all research leads to questions for further study. A number of questions arose as these results were being analyzed.

What differences can be tied directly to specific cultures? Qualitative data were also collected that can subsequently be used to group responses by country.

What is the significance of the various correlations that were calculated? Do some characteristics naturally coexist within individuals? Can we expect someone who is individualistic to be a high risk taker or someone who is collectivistic to be a low risk taker? Are women more likely to reduce power distance because of equity and fairness issues?

What differences between this study and Hofstede's study can be attributed to the fact that the subjects of this study were students in one university and the subjects of his study were managers of various divisions of a single multinational business organization? Is a university a safe haven for answering questions as compared to answering them on the job? Do students have "reality checks"? Do they have a firm grasp on the true consequences of their responses in the outside world?

What affects did making "politically correct" or socially appropriate responses have on this study? How would subjects really behave when confronted with situations related to individualism, risk taking, power distance, and masculinity/femininity?

What additional studies could be done to relate responses of those speaking a LOTE to fear of communicating, communication competency, speaker apprehension, saving face and other conditions impacting their

willingness to be more individualistic, take risks, reduce power distance, and engage in relationship building and other organizational skills.

Why do the youth of a culture seem to break the stereotype when they move into a new culture? Is there a natural tendency to rebel against the older generations? Does peer pressure to conform to the new society cause students to want to break away from strict adherence to previously held cultural practices?

Do students enroll in courses emphasizing cross-cultural relations with the intention of improving the intercultural communication skills and empathy toward others? Do they select courses that will help them meet their graduation needs with the least amount of difficulty?

These and other questions keep us constantly aware that studying people and cultural differences is an extremely complex process that needs to be done with an open and clear mind. No study is complete. No study gives all the answers. Every study should be looked at as merely an approach to trying to appreciate that there are differences.

McGrane (1989) summarizes beautifully what all students of cultural differences should conclude:

> A culture which 'discovers' that which is alien to itself also thereby fundamentally reveals that which it is to itself (p. ix). . . . "To see the Other as culturally different is no cause for applause and self-congratulation. To see *difference* as 'only' difference or as 'merely' difference is itself an accomplishment. . . (p. 129).

References

Adams, J. L., *Conceptual Blockbusting: A Guide to Better Ideas*, San Francisco: Freeman, 1974.

Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D.J. Levinson and R.N. Sanford, *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York: Harper, 1950.

Asante, Molefi Kete, *The Afrocentric Idea*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.

Awa, N. E., "Ethnocentric bias in development research," in M. K. Asante *et al.*, *Handbook of Intercultural Communication*: Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979, pp. 263-281.

Baldwin, J. R. and J. L. Hecth, "Difference is better: conceptualizing and measuring tolerance for human diversity," Speech Communication Association Annual Conference, 1993.

Bakan, D., *The Duality of Human Existence*, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1962.

Barth, Fredrik (Ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969a.

Barth, Fredrik, "Pathan identity and its maintenance," in F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969b, pp. 117-134.

Block, J. H., "Conceptions of sex role: some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives," *American Psychologist*, 28, 1973, pp. 512-526.

Bogardus, E. S., "Measuring social distances," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, Vol. 9, 1925, pp. 299-308.

Booth, Ken, *Strategy and Ethnocentrism*, New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, Inc., 1979.

Blom, Jan-Petter, "Ethnic and cultural differentiation," in F. Barth (Ed.),*EthnicGroups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 74-85.

Bredemeier, M. E., G. Bernstein and W. Oxman, "Ba fa ba fa and dogmatism/ethnocentrism: a study of attitude change through simulation- gaming," *Simulation and Games*, Vol. 13, No. 4, December 1982, pp. 413-436.

Brewer, Marilynn B., and Donald T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism and Intergroup Attitudes: East African Evidence*, New York: Sage Publications/John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Brislin, R. W., *Cross-Cultural Encounters*, New York: Pergamon, 1981.

Byrd, Marquita L., *The Intracultural Communication Handbook*, New York: McGraw Hill, 1993

Church, A. T., "Sojourner adjustment," *Psychololgical Bulletin*, 91, 1982, pp. 540-563.

Crandell, J. E., "Adler's concept of social interest: theory, measurement and implications for adjustment," *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 39, 1980, pp. 481-495.

Eidham, Harald, "When ethnic identity is a social stigma," in F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 39-57,

Feather, N. T., *Values in Education and Society*, New York: Free Press, 1975.

Fernandez, John P., *Managing a Diverse Work Force: Regaining the Competitive Edge*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1991

Ferguson, H., "Culture to teach languages," in *Teaching Languages in College: Communicative Proficiency and Cross-Cultural Issues*, Albany, NY: SUNY-Albany Conference Proceedings, October 1984, pp. 19-20).

Fisher, G., *Mindsets: The Role of Culture and Perception in International Relations*, Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1988.

Fromm, E., *Escape from Freedom*, New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941.

Ginsburg, Sigmund, "Lessons for American management from female-dominated organizations," *The President*, New York: Amacom Books, May 1989.

Gudykunst, W. B. and Y. Y. Kim, *Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Communication*, New York: Random House, 1984.

Gudykunst, W. B. and S. Ting-Toomey, *Culturesand Interpersonal Communication*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1988.

42

Haaland, Gunnar, "Economic determinants in ethnic processes," in F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 58-73.

Hall, E.T., *The Silent Language*, New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Haney, W. V., *Communication and Interpersonal Relations: Text and Cases*, (5th ed.), Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1986.

Harris, P. and R. Moran, *Managing Cultural Differences: High Performance Strategies for Today's Global Manager*, (2nd ed.) Houston: Gulf, 1987.

Hofstede, G., *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Hofstede, G., and M. H. Bond, "Hofstede's cultural dimensions: an independent validation using Rokeach's value survey," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 1984, pp. 417-434.

Hsu, F. L. K., *Rugged Individualism Reconsidered*, Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press, 1983.

Hui, C. H. and H. C. Triandis, "Individualism-collectivism: a study of cross-cultural researchers," *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 1986, pp. 225-248.

Hunter, David E., and MaryAnn B. Foley, *Doing Anthropology: A Student-Centered Approach to Cultural Anthropology*, New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Ivey, A., L. Shizuru, and P. Pedersen, *Issues in Cross-Cultural Counseling*, N. Amherst, MA: Microtraining Associates, 1981.

Jamieson, David, and Julie O'Mara, *Managing Workforce 2000: Gaining the Diversity Advantage*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Johnston, William B., and Arnold H. Packer, *Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the 21st Century*, Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute, 1987.

Kauffmann, N., J. N. Martin and H. Weaver, *Students Abroad: Strangers at Home*, Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1992.

Klineberg, O., and W. F. Hull, *At a Foreign University: An International Study of Adaptation and Coping*, New York: Praeger, 1979.

Kluckhohn, Clyde, "The study of culture," in D. Lerner and H.D. Lasswell (eds.), *The Policy Sciences*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1951.

Kluckhohn, F. and F. Strodtbeck, *Variations in Value Orientations*, New York: Row Peterson, 1960.

Koester, J., *A Profile of the U. S. Student Abroad*, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1985.

Koester, J., *A Profile of the U. S. Student Abroad—1984 and 1985*, New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1987.

Kras, E.S., *Management in Two Cultures: Bridging the Gap Between U.S. and Mexican Managers*, Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1988.

Lamet, M. S., and S. A. Lamet, "The impact of international, exchanges on university students," *International Understanding at School*, 41, 1981, pp. 7-8.

Larson, Charles R., "Heroic ethnocentrism: The idea of universality in literature," *American Scholar*, 42, No. 3, Summer 1973, pp. 463-467.

Laurent, A., "The cultural diversity of Western conceptions of management," *International Studies of Management and Organization*, Vol III, No. 1-2, Spring-Summer 1983, pp. 75-96.

Levine, Robert A. and Donald T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

Levinson, D. J., "An approach to the theory and measurement of ethnocentric ideology," *Journal of Psychology*, 28, pp, 19-39, 1949.

Lewis, Marilyn, "The female touch," *San Jose Mercury News*, March 22, 1994, pp. 1A, 22A.

Loden, Marilyn, and Judy B. Rosener, *Workforce America! Managing Employee Diversity os a Vital Resource*, Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin, 1991.

Lonner, W. J. "An overview of cross-cultural testing and assessment," in R. W. Brislin (Ed.) *Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990, pp. 56-76.

44

Lukens, J. "Ethnocentric speech," *Ethnic Groups*, 1978, Vol. 2, pp. 35-53.

Maslow, A.H., "The authoritarian character structure," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 18, pp. 401-411, 1943.

Matthews, E., *Culture Clash*, Chicago: Intercultural Press, 1982.

McGrane, Bernard, *Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.

Morrison, Ann M., *The New Leaders: Guidelines on Leadership Diversity in America*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992.

Reynolds, Vernon, Vincent Falgar and Ian Vine (Eds.), *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism: Evolutionary Dimensions of Xenophobia, Discrimination, Racism and Nationalism*, Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1987.

Rokeach, Milton, *The Open and Closed Mind: Investigations into the Nature of Belief Systems and Personality Systems*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

Rokeach, Milton, *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Rokeach, Milton, *Understanding Human Values: Individual and Societal*, New York: Free Press, 1979.

Rosenblatt, P. C., "Origins and effects of group ethnocentrism and nationalism," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 8, 1964, pp. 131-146.

Sachs, Ignacy, *The Discovery of the Third World*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976.

Samover, L. and R. Porter, Intercultural Communication: A Reader (2nd ed.), Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1976.

Santoli, A., *New Americans: An Oral History*, New York: Viking, 1988.

Segall, M. H., *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Human Behavior in Global Perspective*, Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole, 1979.

Shaw, R. Paul, and Yuwa Wong, *Genetic Seeds of Warfare: Evolution, Nationalism, and Patriotism*, Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1989.

Simons, George F., *Working Together: How to Become More Effective in a Multicultural Organization*, Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications, Inc., 1989.

Simons, George F., Carmen Vazquez, and Philip R. Harris, *Transcultural Leadership: Empowering the Diverse Workforce*, Houston: Gulf, 1993.

Simons, George F., and G. Deborah Weissman, *Men and Women: Partners at Work*, Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications, Inc., 1990.

Singh, P. N., S. C. Huang and G. G. Thompson, "A comparative study of selected attitudes, values, and persuasive characteristics of American, Chinese, and Indian students," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 57, 1962, pp. 123-132.

Siverts, Henning, "Ethnic stability and boundary dynamics in southern Mexico," in F. Barth (Ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969, pp. 101-116.

Sumner, W. G., *Folkways*, New York: Ginn, 1906.

Terpstra, V. and K. David, *The Cultural Environment of International Business*, Cincinnati: South-Western, 1991.

Thomas, R. Roosevelt, Jr., *Beyond Race and Gender: Unleashing the Power of Your Total Work Force by Managing Diversity*, New York: AMACOM, 1991.

Thiederman, Sondra, *Profiting in America's Multicultural Marketplace: How to Do Business Across Cultural Lines*, New York: Lexington Books, 1991.

Tonnies, F., *Community and Society*, (translated by C. P. Loomis), East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1957.

Triandis, H. C., "Collectivism v. individualism: a reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural social psychology," in C. Bagley and G. K. Verma (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Studies of Personality, Attitudes, and Cognition*, London: MacMilian, 1988, pp. 60-95.

Triandis, H. C., "Theoretical concepts that are applicable to the analysis of ethnocentrism," in R. W. Brislin (Ed.) *Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990, pp. 34-55.

Troldahl, V. C. and F. A. Powell, "A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies," *Social Forces*, 44, pp. 211-214, 1965.

van den Berghe, Pierre, *Race and Ethnicity: Essays in Comparative Sociology,* New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Von Till, B. and J. Stull, "Preparing the teaching assistant to deal effectively with a multicultural student population," Second National Conference on the Training and Employment of Teaching Assistants, Seattle, WA, November 1989.

Weiss, T. M., "The 'Is of Identity' Test," San Francisco: The International Society for General Semantics, 1954.

Walters, C. G., *Consumer Behavior: Theory and Practice,* Homewood, IL: Irwin, 1978.

Wiarda, Howard J., *Ethnocentrism in Foreign Policy: Can We Understand the Third World?* Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1985.

Zeira, Y., E. Harari, and D. Izraeli, "Some structural and cultural factors in ethnocentric MNCs and employee morale," *Journal of Management Studies,* February 1975, pp. 66-82.

Zeira, Y., "Overlooked personnel problems of MNCs,," *Columbia Journal of World Business,* Summer 1975, pp. 96-103.

Zeira, Y., "Ethnocentrism in host-country organizations," *Business Horizons,* June 1979, pp. 66-75.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire

VonTill-Stull Attitude Survey

Please mark your response to each of items 1 through 40 according to the following scale:

SA = I strongly agree with this.
A = I agree with this.
N = I have no opinion on this.
D = I disagree with this.
SD = I strongly disagree with this.

	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. It is important that people conform to company norms in order to reach company goals.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
2. It is important to me to plan for the future very carefully.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
3. The eldest male should be the head of the household.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
4. It is very important for me to receive recognition for my work.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
5. If an individual thinks of a different way to perform a task, that person should be encouraged to do it that way.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
6. I enjoy taking risks.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
7. Employees should participate in company decision-making.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
8. My job is only one of many parts of my life.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
9. I would always cooperate to keep group harmony.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
10. Company rules are always to be followed.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
11. It is all right for employees to disagree openly with their bosses.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
12. I would rather work for a small company than a large one.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
13. It is important that people have lots of free time to pursue their own interests.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
14. Organizational conflict is healthy.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
15. Employees should not talk to their bosses about personal matters.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
16. It is more important to me to be paid well than to have a close relationship with my boss.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
17. Parents have the right to choose the spouse for their children.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
18. A manager must be an expert in the field in which he or she manages.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

	SA	A	N	D	SD
19. It is all right for employees to call their bosses by their first names.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
20. It is important for me to keep my work life separate from my private life.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
21. When children become 21 years of age, they should be encouraged to move away from home.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
22. I can achieve anything I set out to achieve.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
23. Power and wealth are evil.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
24. The most important things to my career are a good salary and a job that I do well and like.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
25. It is important that I receive individual recognition at work.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
26. Change in my life is important to me.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
27. It is important for managers to make all decisions.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
28. It is important to shake hands before all business interactions.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
29. If I were given a large sum of money, I would share it equally with members of my family.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
30. Managers and bosses should be selected on the basis of seniority.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
31. It is important that bosses closely supervise their employees.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
32. It is important to finish one interaction before rushing off to another.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
33. When I work on group projects, it is important for me to be the leader.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
34. It is important to be flexible during negotiations.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
35. It is important for me to be able to work independently.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
36. People must learn to make their own way in this world.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
37. When working on a project, I would rather work as a group member than as an individual.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
38. Employees should remain with one employer for life.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
39. I like to trust and to cooperate with other people.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
40. People will achieve organizational goals without being pushed.	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

41. I am a
    a. female.
    b. male.

42. I have lived in the United States for
    a. less than one year.
    b. one year or longer, but fewer than three years.
    c. three years or longer, but fewer than ten years.
    d. ten years or longer, but fewer than twenty years.
    e. twenty years or longer.

43. I was born
    a. in the United States of America.
    b. in a country other than the United States of America.
       Name of country_____

44. Select one of the following (Answer only if you were born in the United States.):
    a. I am of the first generation of my family born in the United States.
    b. One of my parents was born in the United States.
    c. Both of my parents were born in the United States.
    d. My grandparents were born in the United States.

45. I was raised
    a. in the United States of America.
    b. in a country or countries other than the United States of America.
       Name(s) of country(ies)_____

46. I have lived
    a. only in the United States of America.
    b. in countries other than the United States of America.
       Name(s) of country(ies)_____

47. I have traveled in other countries.
    a. yes
    b. no
       Name(s) of country(ies)_____ _____

48. I speak another language at home besides American English.
    a. yes
    b. no
       Which language(s)?_____

49. I identify with another culture besides that of the United States.
    a. yes
    b. no
       Which culture(s)?_____

50. I have taken a class that emphasizes cross-cultural relations.
    a. yes
    b. no
       Name of class(es)_____

51

Appendix 2

Quantitative Data Tables

Table 1
ANOVA for Gender Differences on Scores for
Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance,
Power Distance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Females	13.2757	533	1.02	1.67
Males	12.9444			
Collectivism				
Females	14.7575	532	1.02	2.29[b]
Males	14.1373			
Low Risk Taker				
Females	14.3067	532	1.12	-.48
Males	14.4231			
High Risk Taker				
Females	11.6512	533	1.21	1.81
Males	11.2650			
High Power Distance				
Females	17.9799	531	1.01	2.08[b]
Males	17.4786			
Low Power Distance				
Females	9.9033	532	1.18	-2.15[b]
Males	10.3162			
Masculinity				
Females	10.7874	532	1.12	-.50
Males	10.8927			
Femininity				
Females	12.4849	531	1.06	1.16
Males	12.2564			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \leq .05$

53

Table 2
ANOVA for Years Lived in United States
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty
Avoidance, Power Distance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	Mean Squares	df	F Ratio
Individualism				
< 1 yr	13.0000	9.8955	4	1.9156
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	13.5000			
≥ 3 yrs,< 10 yrs	13.4599			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	13.2615			
> 20 years	12.8449			
Collectivism				
< 1 year	13.2500	263.6824	4	34.0372[d]
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	12.8889			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	13.0803			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	13.3538			
> 20 yrs	16.0082			
Low Risk Taker				
< 1 yr	12.7500	169.8490	4	26.0958[d]
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	12.5000			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	13.2701			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	13.5308			
> 20 years	15.5656			
High Risk Taker				
< 1 yr	13.0000	19.5301	4	3.3749[c]
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	11.6111			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	11.8467			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	11.7846			
> 20 years	11.0857			
High Power Distance				
< 1 yr	15.7500	137.9532	4	20.5290[d]
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	16.8333			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	16.4853			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	17.2946			
> 20 years	18.8122			

54

Table 2
ANOVA for Years Lived in United States
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty
Avoidance, Power Distance, and Masculinity
(Continued)

Variable	Mean Score[a]	Mean Squares	df	F Ratio
Low Power Distance				
< 1 yr	10.7500	16.4566	4	3.4905[c]
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	10.8333			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	10.5839			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	9.9154			
> 20 years	9.8279			
Masculinity				
< 1 yr	10.5000	11.7461	4	2.0601
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	11.1667			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	10.6788			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	10.4264			
> 20 years	11.1184			
Femininity				
< 1 yr	11.2500	20.7357	4	4.1415[c]
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	13.3333			
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	12.2279			
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	11.8605			
> 20 years	12.6898			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[c] $p \leq .01$
[d] $p \leq .001$

55

Table 2.1
Differences Between Means for Years Lived in United States
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance,
Power Distance, and Masculinity: Scheffé

Variable	Mean[a]	≥1yr	≥3yr	≥10yr	>20yr
Collectivism					
<1 yr	13.2500				
≥1 yr, <3 yrs	12.8889				
≥3 yrs, <10 yrs	13.0803				
≥10 yrs, <20 yrs	13.3538				
>20 yrs	16.0082	3.1193[b]	2.9279[b]	2.6544[b]	
Low Risk Taker					
< 1 yr	12.7500				
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	12.5000				
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	13.2701				
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	13.5308				
> 20 yrs	15.5656	3.0656[b]	2.2955[b]	2.0398[b]	
High Power Distance					
< 1 yr	15.7500				
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	16.8333				
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	16.4853				
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	17.2946				
> 20 yrs	18.8122	1.9789[b]	2.3269[b]	1.5176[b]	
Low Power Distance					
< 1 yr	10.7500				
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	10.8333				
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	10.5839				.7560[b]
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	9.9154				
20 yrs	9.8279				
Femininity					
< 1 yr	11.2500				
≥ 1 yr, < 3 yrs	13.3333				
≥ 3 yrs, < 10 yrs	12.2279				
≥ 10 yrs, < 20 yrs	11.8605				
> 20 yrs	12.6898			.8283[b]	

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.

[b] $p \leq .05$; Scheffé did not pick up some values indicated in Table 2.

56

Table 3
**ANOVA for Birthplace Inside or Outside the U.S.A.
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty
Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity**

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Born in U.S.A.	12.8755	523	1.07	-2.38[b]
Born elsewhere	13.3493			
Collectivism				
Born in U.S.A.	16.0259	522	1.37	10.72[d]
Born elsewhere	13.3493			
Low Risk Taker				
Born in U.S.A.	15.5345	522	1.31	9.00[d]
Born elsewhere	13.4521			
High Risk Taker				
Born in U.S.A.	11.0644	523	1.14	-3.52[d]
Born elsewhere	11.8082			
High Power Distance				
Born in U.S.A.	18.7983	521	1.48	8.23[d]
Born elsewhere	16.9483			
Low Power Distance				
Born in U.S.A.	9.8233	522	1.16	-2.72[c]
Born elsewhere	10.3390			
Masculinity				
Born in U.S.A.	11.1803	522	1.08	2.80[c]
Born elsewhere	10.5945			
Femininity				
Born in U.S.A.	12.7082	521	1.14	2.69[c]
Born elsewhere	12.1724			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \le .05$
[c] $p \le .01$
[d] $p \le .001$

57

Table 4
ANOVA for Generation Born in United States
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty
Avoidance, Power Distance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	Mean Squares	df	F Ratio
Individualism				
First generation	12.9828	11.6683	3	2.4018
One parent	13.2857			
Both parents	13.2969			
Grandparents	12.4486			
Collectivism				
First generation	13.7241	137.8006	3	15.7428[d]
One parent	14.3810			
Both parents	16.7460			
Grandparents	16.5794			
Low Risk Taker				
First generation	14.0517	47.4858	3	6.3495[d]
One parent	15.7143			
Both parents	15.8095			
Grandparents	15.8785			
High Risk Taker				
First generation	11.3448	1.8085	3	.3006
One parent	11.3333			
Both parents	10.9688			
Grandparents	11.0841			
High Power Distance				
First generation	17.8276	20.1510	3	3.1947[b]
One parent	18.2381			
Both parents	19.0938			
Grandparents	18.8692			
Low Power Distance				
First generation	9.7931	4.2284	3	.9835
One parent	10.3333			
Both parents	10.0938			
Grandparents	9.6604			

Table 4
ANOVA for Generation Born in United States
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty
Avoidance, Power Distance, and Masculinity
(Continued)

Variable	Mean Score[a]	Mean Squares	df	F Ratio
Masculinity				
First generation	10.8621	3.9755	3	.6633
One parent	11.1429			
Both parents	11.4844			
Grandparents	11.1402			
Femininity				
First generation	12.1579	9.5452	3	1.8294
One parent	12.2381			
Both parents	13.0000			
Grandparents	12.8318			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.

[b] $p \le .05$

[d] $p \le .001$

59

Table 4.1
Differences Between Means for Generation Born in United States and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, and Masculinity: Scheffé

Variable	Mean	First Gen	One Par.
Collectivism			
First generation	13.7241		
One parent	14.3810		
Both parents	16.7460	3.0219[b]	2.3830[b]
Grandparents	16.5794	2.8553[b]	2.1984[b]
Low Risk Taker			
First generation	14.0517		
One parent	15.7143		
Both parents	15.8095	1.7578[b]	
Grandparents	15.8785	1.8268[b]	

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.

[b] $p \leq .05$; Scheffé did not pick up some values indicated in Table 2.

60

Table 5
ANOVA for Raised Inside or Outside the U.S.A.
and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty
Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Raised in U.S.A.	12.8962	522	1.00	-2.80[c]
Raised elsewhere	13.4511			
Collectivism				
Raised in U.S.A.	15.7743	521	1.64	11.28[d]
Raised elsewhere	13.0851			
Low Risk Taker				
Raised in U.S.A.	15.2882	521	1.43	8.85[d]
Raised elsewhere	13.3064			
High Risk Taker				
Raised in U.S.A.	11.1073	522	1.08	-4.05[d]
Raised elsewhere	11.9489			
High Power Distance				
Raised in U.S.A.	18.6678	520	1.28	8.94[d]
Raised elsewhere	16.6137			
Low Power Distance				
Raised in U.S.A.	9.8264	521	1.24	-3.19[c]
Raised elsewhere	10.4340			
Masculinity				
Raised in U.S.A.	10.9514	521	1.09	.95
Raised elsewhere	10.7532			
Femininity				
Raised in U.S.A.	12.5744	520	1.08	1.81
Raised elsewhere	12.2146			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \le .05$
[c] $p \le .01$
[d] $p \le .001$

61

Table 6
ANOVA for Lived Inside or Outside the U.S.A.
and Scores on Individualism,Uncertainty
Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Lived U.S.A. only	12.8073	520	1.10	-2.63[c]
Lived elsewhere	13.3289			
Collectivism				
Lived U.S.A. only	15.8341	519	1.11	8.50[d]
Lived elsewhere	13.6217			
Low Risk Taker				
Lived U.S.A. only	15.2350	519	1.04	5.99[d]
Lived elsewhere	13.7961			
High Risk Taker				
Lived U.S.A. only	11.2339	520	1.10	-1.78
Lived elsewhere	11.6118			
High Power Distance				
Lived U.S.A. only	18.5945	518	1.49	6.15[d]
Lived elsewhere	17.1749			
Low Power Distance				
Lived U.S.A. only	9.8848	519	1.12	-1.66
Lived elsewhere	10.2007			
Masculinity				
Lived U.S.A. only	10.9174	519	1.06	.47
Lived elsewhere	10.8185			
Femininity				
Lived U.S.A. only	12.6820	518	1.17	2.39[b]
Lived elsewhere	12.2079			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \le .05$
[c] $p \le .01$
[d] $p \le .001$

62

64

Table 7
ANOVA for Traveled Outside the U.S.A. and Scores on Individualism,Uncertainty Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Left U.S.A.	13.1005	532	1.13	-.52
Never left U.S.A.	13.2123			
Collectivism				
Left U.S.A.	14.6047	531	1.26	1.37
Never left U.S.A.	14.2123			
Low Risk Taker				
Left U.S.A.	14.4485	531	1.13	1.18
Never left U.S.A.	14.1379			
High Risk Taker				
Left U.S.A.	11.2526	532	1.61	-3.99[d]
Never left U.S.A.	12.0890			
High Power Distance				
Left U.S.A.	17.8575	530	1.02	1.27
Never left U.S.A.	17.5137			
Low Power Distance				
Left U.S.A.	10.0825	531	1.01	.03
Never left U.S.A.	10.0759			
Masculinity				
Left U.S.A.	10.8346	531	1.04	.00
Never left U.S.A.	10.8356			
Femininity				
Left U.S.A.	12.3178	530	1.10	-1.10
Never left U.S.A.	12.5655			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \leq .05$
[c] $p \leq .01$
[d] $p \leq .001$

63

Table 8
ANOVA for Speak a Language Other than English (LOTE) at Home and Scores on Individualism,Uncertainty Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Speak LOTE	13.2470	531	1.03	1.59
Speak English	12.9254			
Collectivism				
Speak LOTE	13.3825	530	1.07	-12.03[d]
Speak English	16.3650			
Low Risk Taker				
Speak LOTE	13.6867	530	1.04	-7.59[d]
Speak English	15.4900			
High Risk Taker				
Speak LOTE	11.6988	531	1.09	2.76[c]
Speak English	11.1095			
High Power Distance				
Speak LOTE	17.0939	529	1.56	-7.88[d]
Speak English	18.8607			
Low Power Distance				
Speak LOTE	10.1994	530	1.40	1.70
Speak English	9.8806			
Masculinity				
Speak LOTE	10.6133	530	1.06	-2.80[c]
Speak English	11.2139			
Femininity				
Speak LOTE	12.1758	529	1.10	-2.78[c]
Speak English	12.7413			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \le .05$
[c] $p \le .01$
[d] $p \le .001$

64

Table 9
**ANOVA for Identifying with Another Culture Besides
the United States and Scores on Individualism,
Uncertainty Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity**

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Other culture	13.1950	519	1.03	1.15
U.S. culture	12.9444			
Collectivism				
Other culture	13.8663	518	1.00	-7.49[d]
U.S. culture	15.9565			
Low Risk Taker				
Other culture	13.9164	518	1.11	-5.63[d]
U.S. culture	15.3789			
High Risk Taker				
Other culture	11.6100	519	1.17	1.90
U.S. culture	11.1852			
High Power Distance				
Other culture	17.5042	517	1.22	-3.62[d]
U.S. culture	18.4136			
Low Power Distance				
Other culture	10.1198	518	1.47	.84
U.S. culture	9.9565			
Masculinity				
Other culture	10.6536	518	1.12	-2.49[b]
U.S. culture	11.2284			
Femininity				
Other culture	12.1569	517	1.09	-3.40[d]
U.S. culture	12.8704			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \le .05$
[c] $p \le .01$
[d] $p \le .001$

65

Table 10
ANOVA for Having Taken Courses Emphasizing Cross-cultural Relations and Scores on Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, PowerDistance, and Masculinity

Variable	Mean Score[a]	df	F	t
Individualism				
Took course	13.0472	529	1.06	-1.18
No course	13.2864			
Collectivism				
Took course	14.8145	528	1.00	2.91[c]
No course	14.0189			
Low Risk Taker				
Took course	14.6877	528	1.14	3.24[d]
No course	13.9061			
High Risk Taker				
Took course	11.2830	529	1.18	-2.38[b]
No course	11.7840			
High Power Distance				
Took course	18.0503	527	1.19	2.94[c]
No course	17.3175			
Low Power Distance				
Took course	10.0631	528	1.05	-.26
No course	10.1127			
Masculinity				
Took course	10.7476	528	1.01	-.90
No course	10.9390			
Femininity				
Took course	12.4479	527	1.02	.84
No course	12.2783			

[a] Represents combined means of five items on a scale of 1-5, with 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree.
[b] $p \leq .05$
[c] $p \leq .01$
[d] $p \leq .001$

66

68

Table 11
SPSS Correlation Coefficient
Pearson r

Variables	Individual	Collectiv	Low Risk	High Risk	Hi Power	Low Power	Masculine	Feminine
Individual	1.0000	-.0180	.0684	.3178••	.0374	.2015••	.2577••	.2025••
Collectiv	-.0180	1.0000	.4849••	-.0113	.4486••	-.0292	.1582••	.2783••
Low Risk	.0684	.4849••	1.0000	-.0655	.4959••	-.0549	.1806••	.2488••
High Risk	.3178••	-.0013	-.0655	1.0000	-.0823	.2229••	.1190••	.1405••
Hi Power	.0374	.4486••	.4959••	-.0823	1.0000	-.1065•	.1846••	.2277••
Low Power	.2015••	-.0292	-.0549	.2229••	-.1065•	1.0000	.1583••	.1513••
Masculine	.2577••	.1582••	.1806••	.1190••	.1846••	.1583••	1.0000	.2097••
Feminine	.2025••	.2783••	.2488••	.1405••	.2277••	.1513••	.2097••	1.0000

• p = .05

•• p = .01

Appendix 3

Qualitative Data

I was born in a country other than the United States of America

Country	Number	Country	Number
Afghanistan	2	Korea	5
Africa (sic)	1	Kuwait	1
Argentina	1	Laos	6
Bolivia	1	Lebanon	2
Burma	3	Malaysia	3
Cambodia	11	Mexico	3
Canada	1	Morocco	1
China	21	Okinawa	1
Colombia	2	Pakistan	1
Cuba	1	Palau	1
England	4	Panama	1
Ethiopa	1	Peru	3
Finland	2	Philippines	19
France	1	Singapore	1
Germany	2	Spain	1
Greece	1	Sri Lanka	1
Guam	1	Sweden	1
Guatemala	1	Switzerland	1
Hong Kong	28	Taiwan	32
India	9	Thailand	3
Indonesia	2	Trinidad	1
Iran	12	Uganda	1
Iraq	1	Ukraine	1
Israel	1	Venezuela	1
Italy	1	Vietnam	94
Japan	9		
		Total	304

Note: 57% of the students surveyed were born outside the United States.

I was raised in a country or countries other than the United States of America.

Country	Number	Country	Number
About 10*	1	Italy	3
Afghanistan	2	Japan	9
Argentina	1	Korea	5
Australia	1	Kuwait	1
Austria	1	Laos	4
Bolivia	1	Lebanon	2
Burma	2	Malaysia	2
Cambodia	6	Morocco	1
Canada	3	Nigeria	1
China	14	Pakistan	1
Colombia	2	Palau	1
Costa Rica	2	Panama	2
England	4	Palau	1
Ethiopia	1	Peru	3
Finland	2	Philippines	12
France	2	Poland	1
Germany	2	Singapore	1
Guam	1	Sweden	1
Holland	1	Switzerland	1
Hong Kong	29	Taiwan	30
India	9	Thailand	6
Indonesia	3	Trinidad	1
Iran	11	Uruguay	1
Iraq	1	Venezuela	1
Israel	1	Vietnam	73
		Total	269

*Student was raised in over ten countries.

Note: Some students reported being raised in more than once country.

Others born outside the United States report they were raised inside the United States.

70

I have lived in countries other than the United States of America.

Country	Number	Country	Number
About 10	1	Japan	12
Afghanistan	1	Korea	6
Africa (sic)	1	Kuwait	1
Argentina	1	Laos	4
Australia	1	Lebanon	2
Austria	1	Liberia	1
Belgium	1	Macao	2
Bolivia	1	Malaysia	4
Brazil	1	Mexico	6
Burma	3	Morocco	1
Cambodia	12	New Zealand	1
Canada	5	Nigeria	1
China	20	Pakistan	2
Colombia	2	Panama	2
Costa Rica	1	Peru	4
Ecuador	1	Philippines	23
El Salvador	1	Poland	1
England	18	Saipan	1
Egypt	1	Singapore	4
Ethiopia	1	Spain	3
Finland	2	Sri Lanka	1
France	7	Sudan	1
Germany	11	Sweden	1
Guam	2	Switzerland	1
Guatemala	1	Taiwan	36
Holland	1	Thailand	15
Hong Kong	44	Trinidad	1
India	8	Turkey	2
Indonesia	4	Uganda	1
Iran	10	Ukraine	1
Iraq	1	Venezuela	1
Ireland	2	Vietnam	83
Israel	2	Yugoslavia	2
Italy	4		
		Total	**402**

Note: Some students reported living in other countries, but did not specify the country.
Note: Total could be increased to 411 to represent additional 9 countries represented by student who reported living in over 10 countries.

71

I have traveled in other countries

Country	Number	Country	Number	Country	Number
Africa*	2	Guatemala	3	Orient*	1
All Continents*	1	Hawaii*	3	Pakistan	1
Argentina	1	Hong Kong	52	Panama	4
Asia*	6	Hungary	1	Peru	1
Australia	8	Iceland	1	Philippines	23
Austria	8	India	7	Poland	1
Azores	2	Indonesia	7	Portugal	4
Belgium	7	Iran	2	Puerto Rico	2
Bermuda	2	Ireland	2	Romania	2
Brazil	3	Israel	2	Saudi Arabia	1
Brunei	1	Italy	38	Scandinavia*	1
Canada	109	Japan	49	Scotland	2
Cambodia	1	Jordan	1	Singapore	30
CarJamBahVI	14	Kenya	2	So Africa	1
Central Amer*	1	Korea	18	So America*	6
China	40	Kuwait	2	Spain	13
Costa Rica	2	Laos	1	Sweden	4
Cyprus	2	Luxembourg	1	Switzerland	16
Denmark	7	Macao	4	Syria	1
E. Asia*	1	Malaysia	20	Taiwan	17
Egypt	2	Many*	1	Tanzania	1
England/UK/Bi	46	Mediterrean.*	1	Thailand	38
Europe*	44	Mexico	120	Tobago	1
Far East*	2	Mid East*	4	TooMny2Name*	1
France	44	More than 30*	1	Turkey	4
Finland	1	Morocco	1	USSR/Russia	4
French Polyn.	2	Netherlands	8	W. Europe*	3
Germany	28	New Zealand	5	Vietnam	6
Greece	8	Nigeria	1	Yugoslavia	3
Guam	1	Norway	3		
				Total	955

Note: Student responses often did not reflect specific countries.
In fact, some did not reflect countries at all.
Note: Totals of specific countries are probably higher because
of cases where people reported traveling to continents

I speak another language at home besides American English.

Language	Number	Language	Number
Amharic (Eth.)	1	Korean	5
Arabic	7	Laotian	3
Assyrian(Bab)	5	Malay	4
Burmese	3	Mandarin	19
Cambodian	9	Marathi	1
Cantonese	40	Mien (Laos)	2
Chau Choi ?	2	Palauan	1
Chinese	86	Pampango	1
Danish	2	Persian	4
Dutch	1	Portuguese	2
Farsi (Iran)	8	Punjabi (Ind.)	4
Filipino	6	Russian	1
Finnish	2	Serb/Croat.	1
French	13	Sign Language	1
German	4	Spanish	35
Guji.rti	6	Swedish	2
Hebrew	2	Tagalog	11
Hindi	2	Taiwanese	9
Hmong	1	Tamil	2
Ilocano (Phil)	4	Telegu	1
Indian*	1	Thai	3
Indonesian	2	Toruba/Nigeria	1
Italian	3	Turkish	2
Japanese	13	Urdu	1
Khmer	1	Vietnamese	77
		Total	**407**

*Note: This student indicated Indian rather than a specific dialogue.
Another student listed several Indian dialects and then put "etc."
Note: Many students responded "yes," not listing the
specific language.
Note: Some students reported speaking more than one
language at home.

I identify with another culture besides that of the United States.

Culture	Number	Culture	Number
Afghan	1	Italian	8
African	4	Jamaican	1
All ·	4	Japanese	18
Almost all	1	Jewish	2
Amer Native	3	Korean	6
Arabian	1	Laotian	2
Asian	1	Malaysian	1
Assyrian	2	Many	2
Bavarian	1	Mexican	16
B/W/HispOth	2	Middle Eastern	2
BritishEnglish	2	Moroccan	1
Cambodian	2	NonCommEur	1
Canadian	1	My own cult.	1
Checkoslavak.	1	Oriental	1
Chicano	1	Pakistani	2
Chinese	120	Panamanian	1
Chinese-Amer.	1	Persian/Iran	8
Creole	1	Polish	1
Croation	1	Portuguese	2
Danish	1	Russian	1
Dutch	2	Scandanavian	2
Eastern	1	Sikh	1
Ecuadorian	1	South/Georgia	1
European	1	South Indian	1
Filipino	2	Spanish-Asian	1
Finnish	1	Swedish	1
French	5	Swiss-Italian	1
German	3	Taiwanese	3
Hawaiian	1	Thai	3
Hindu	2	Trinidadian	1
Hisp/Sp/Lat	23	Ukranian	1
Indian	12	Vietnamese	63
Indonesian	2	W.European	1
Irish	1	Yugoslavian	1
Israeli	1		
		Total	366

Note: Some responses reflect a different interpretation of "identifying" with cultures.
Some said they did not identify with another culture. Others did identify but did not specify
Some responses suggest misunderstanding.

74

I have taken a class that emphasizes cross-cultural relations.

Class Identification	Number
AA 25	1
AAS 33A, 33B	8
AAS 33A	3
AAS 13	2
AEA Communication	1
AF AM	1
AF 125	1
African Anthropology	1
African Political Science	1
Afro-American 194B: People of Color	1
Afro-American	1
Afro-American Culture	1
Afro-American History	1
Afro-American Studies	5
American Stud...	2
Analysis and Design of Complex Organizations	1
Ancient Asian History	1
Anthropology	4
Anthropology and Religion	1
Anthropology of Modern Japan	1
Art Appreciation	1
Art of Asia	1
Asian-American Culture	6
Asian-American History	4
Asian-American Studies	19
Asian Cultures	2
Asians and Americans	1
Business	1
Business 146	3
Business and Professional Ethics	2
Business Languages	1
Business Management 160	2
Changing Majorities (AF-AM 1A, 1B, 25)	4
Chang Maj: Power & Ethnicity in America	1
Chicano Culture	1
Child Development	2
Child Dev 162: Soc of Modern Family	2
Childhood and Adolesc. in a Multicult Soc.	1
Chinese	1
Chinese 10A, 10B, 140A	1

75

Chinese 102	1
Chinese Culture	1
Chinese Cultural Studies	1
Civil Affairs (Military)	1
Comm.	1
Comm 20F	4
Comm 160—Intercultural	1
Communication and Culture	1
Communication 174	2
Comparative Management	1
Comparative Politics	1
Critical Thinking (English 7)	7
Cross-cultural Communication	6
Cross-cultural Perspectives	2
Cultural Anthropology	1
Cultural Aspects of Food	1
Cultural Communication	1
Cultural Diversity	1
Cultural Interaction	1
Cultural Pluralism	20
Dance—World Cultures	1
Deaf Education and Culture	1
Death, Dying, and Religion	1
Different Culture Relationships	1
Eastern Religion	3
English 1A	2
Equal Job Opportunities	1
Ethnic Studies	2
Ethnic Women in the U.S.	1
European Culture	1
Foreign Languages	1
French	6
French-American Cultural Studies	1
Geography	1
Geography 101	1
German	1
Global Marketing Management	1
Hispanic-American Culture	1
Hispanic Culture	1
History	1
HP 135	1
Hu 67	1
Hum 1A, 1B	1

Indian	1
Intercultural Communication	41
Intercultural Studies (DeAnza)	10
Interculture/Intercultural	2
International Business	14
International/Comparative Management	9
International Economics	1
International Marketing	9
International Relations	1
Interpersonal Communication	2
Intracultural Studies/Communication	2
Japanese	2
Japanese 1A, 1B, 2, 3, 5A	1
Japanese Behavior and Culture	1
Japanese Culture	1
Japanese Culture Studies	1
Japanese Literature	1
Jazz in America	1
La Mujer	1
Language and Personality	1
Leadership	3
Legacy of Asia	1
MAGS 130: Mex-Amer and the Family	1
Management	1
Mexican American Society	1
Mexican American Studies	1
Mexican Art	1
Middle East Studies	1
Modern Family	1
Music in World Cultures	2
Multicultural	1
Multicultural Health	1
Multicultural Literature	1
Multicultural Work Force	26
NUFS 135	1
Native American Studies	1
100W	1
Oral Communication	1
Occ. Ther. 135	1
Pol. 1	2
Portuguese	1
Religion 163	1
Religions in America	1

77

Religious Studies	3
Religious Studies 70A	1
Small Group Communication	2
Social Science	1
Sociology (Intro. to)	1
Sociology	3
Sociology 21	1
Sociology of Minorities	1
Spanish	3
Spanish 1 & 2	2
Spanish 1-4	1
Strategic Management Skills	1
Study of Women	1
Third World Cultures	9
U. S. Political Thought fr Black Perspective	1
Valuing Diversity	1
Vietnamese	1
Vietnamese-American Culture	1
Vietnamese Culture	4
Western-Asian Cultures	1
Western Cultures	1
Western Religions	2
World Civilizations	1

Note: Several students checked "yes" to having taken a course; however, they did not list a course.