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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Cross-cultural experiences and their effects on mental health have become a focus for research over the past 35 years. In an extensive review of sojourner adjustment, Church (1982) compiled a bibliography with almost 300 citations. The term "sojourner" refers to many types of travelers and expatriates, including students, trainees, technical assistants, tourists, businessmen, military personnel, missionaries, foreign service officers, teachers, and others. Essentially, sojourners are people who have moved from their native country to an alien culture with plans to return to their own country. Reflecting the emphasis in the literature, the majority of the studies examine the adjustment of college students to a host country culture. The most common type of study involves having foreign students at an American university complete a problem check list. Also frequently found are studies on American college students during a Junior Year Abroad program. Again, a problem check list appears to be commonly used.
Some of the research, however, examines the adjustment of sojourners other than students. Peace Corps volunteers, missionaries, and businessmen have been studied. While the populations cited are extremely diverse in most respects, they share at least one common element: each person has left his or her homeland voluntarily. This is not necessarily the case with all sojourners, specifically the school-age sons and daughters of U.S. businessmen and women and government workers stationed abroad---a group of sojourners not typically researched. There are about 1,750,000 Americans living abroad. Of this number, exactly how many are children is not known. However, the vast majority of expatriate executives are male, between the ages of 30 and 45. A large percentage of them would be married and a majority would have children (Harvey, 1985).

The present study asks how adolescent U.S. expatriates are faring in foreign lands. Specifically, the study was constructed to examine the students' levels of anxiety, depression, and self-esteem. Of particular interest will be discovering if there are any differences between boys' and girls' adjustment, and between students who have lived abroad for more or less than one year. Of further interest will be whether levels of adjustment vary by the foreign culture in which the students are currently residing.
**General Background**

Few specific variables have been consistently researched that would give a predictive picture of a sojourner likely to adjust well to a foreign culture. Open-mindedness (Detweiler, 1975) and adaptability, acceptance, emotional maturity, and cooperativeness (Howard, 1980) are some variables that make intuitive sense.

Genuine adjustment to another culture, as reflected in personal adjustment, however, tends to vary by individual over time (Oberg, 1960). Much of the research from some of the earliest studies (Lygaard, 1955) to the most recent (Torbiorn, 1982) supports this concept of adjustment to an alien culture as a process which occurs over time. An initial period of elation in a new culture is followed by a period of depression, which in general eventually gives way to a period of good adjustment. Exposure to a different culture and all that that entails is initially enticing to most travellers, and it is equally enticing to most sojourners (Brein & David, 1971). At some point in a sojourn, however, a backlash of sorts tends to occur. What was once experienced as exotic becomes problematic; once positive reactions to a new culture become negative; the novelty of a new way of living becomes drudgery. The sojourner experiences culture shock. Although "homesickness" is certainly one part of culture shock, more is included in the term.
The sojourner is confronted not only with a lack of extended family and close friends, he is also bombarded by a language he often does not understand, cultural cues he cannot interpret, and customs he cannot appreciate. As Cort and King (1979) and others delineate, anxiety and depression rise and self-esteem often falls.

Some degree of culture shock—a period of relatively poor psychological adjustment—occurs with virtually all sojourners. A certain percentage return prematurely to their home culture. Those who remain in the host culture, however, tend to move from this period of maladjustment to one of improved adjustment over time.

Numerous studies describe individual personality constructs as well as actions that can be taken in order to moderate the negative effects of culture shock. Benson (1978) lists perseverance, patience, courtesy, and engaging in reinforcing activities as important. Participation with host country nationals (Oberg, 1960; Golden, 1973) and language facility (Smailley, 1963; Golden, 1973) and a tolerance of ambiguity (Cort & King, 1979) complete other studies' lists.

These factors clearly vary considerably from study to study, and what has a moderating effect on adjustment in one study is not always effective in another. What helps the foreign student at a U.S. college may not be helpful to a Peace Corps volunteer. And none of these factors may be
appropriate to the focus group of this study, U.S. adolescents reared outside the U.S.

**The Current Investigation**

United States fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students residing in Japan, Venezuela, and Switzerland completed test instruments to assess their levels of anxiety, depression, and self-esteem. Each student’s gender, current country of residence, and the length of time the student had lived in the current country were recorded to assess what role these variables appeared to have in relation to the student’s overall adjustment.

*Gender* is a possible mitigating factor that has received little attention in the literature. Church (1982) reports that surprisingly few studies have examined sex differences in adjustment. Fong and Peskin (1969) suggest that special problems may exist for female sojourners to the U.S. if they come from cultures where women’s roles are more restricted than in the U.S. The reverse may be true as well. Social, educational, and occupational opportunities that exist for women in the U.S. may not be as varied in other cultures, particularly in Latin American and Far Eastern cultures (Bankert, 1985). Will the more traditional roles accepted by women in these cultures adversely affect the adjustment of the U.S. school girls being reared in these countries?
The concept of "machismo", typical in Latin American cultures, and the status afforded male offspring there and in Eastern cultures may also affect adjustment. Will boys in this study adjust more readily to other cultures due to their increased status and possible consequent increased self-esteem?

Regardless of any cultural variation, possible developmental differences between the sexes may prove to play an important role in the adjustment of these fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students.

That some sojourners find it easier to adjust to some cultures than to others has been a frequent focus of investigation. Those cultures most similar to home cultures would appear to provide the fewest barriers to adjustment (McEvoy, 1968). Torbiorn (1982) describes similarity as a continuum based on three factors: language, religion, and economic development. In his study of Swedish, adult expatriates, he found cultural similarity correlated significantly with adjustment. The three cultures chosen for the current investigation (Western European, Latin American, and Far Eastern) vary considerably on each of Torbiorn's major factors. It will be of interest to determine if U.S. students demonstrate varying degrees of adjustment based on the cultural distance of these countries. Using Torbiorn's criteria of language, religion, and development, the Western European city chosen is most
culturally similar to the U.S.: German, Protestant, industrialized. Next most similar is the Latin American country selected: Spanish, Roman Catholic, developing. Least similar is the Far Eastern country: Japanese, non-Christian, industrialized.

Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) found also that Fulbright grantees sojourning in Europe tended to score higher on a satisfaction index than did those in the Near or Middle East or in Latin America. Communication problems and value dissonance were suggested as explanations.

Whether these factors play an important role with adolescents has not been determined. Younger sojourners may adapt differently (perhaps more readily) to new cultural standards. Certainly age plays a role in the ease of learning a new language. Whether culture has an effect and if so, how it affects adjustment will, therefore, be considered.

The final factor under investigation in this study is time. Researchers disagree on the factor of time and its relation to adjustment. Lysgaard’s (1955) U-curve of adjustment suggests an initial elation in the host country, followed by a dip in adjustment, and a gradual return to higher adjustment levels. A number of investigators supported the U-curve hypothesis, while others were unable to confirm it (Hull, 1978). Even those studies which do support the U-curve show substantial differences in the time
involved (from nine months to four years.) Foster (1965) suggests that a few first-time, long-term sojourners recover from the culture shock experience in less than six months, but the time period can be from three to twelve months.

For this reason, the sojourners' length of stay in a given culture will be explored as it relates to adjustment. Most research suggests that the period of maladjustment occurs within the first twelve months, and that recovery generally begins after this period. The subjects of this study will be divided into two groups: those with less than twelve months in the host culture and those with more than twelve months, and appropriate comparisons will be made.

The current investigation measured the psychological factors of anxiety, depression, and self-esteem in the children of non-military U.S. expatriates residing in three diverse cultures. The investigation's focus was to determine what effect gender, culture, and time had on the aforementioned three factors.

Significance of the Study

Poor adjustment to the environment has consequences on personal, social and occupational/educational levels. These consequences may be exacerbated by residence in an alien culture. Individuals experiencing culture shock often have lower self-esteem and higher levels of anxiety and depression. Responses to culture shock vary, but most often
coincide with expected reactions of a person in psychological turmoil. For school-aged children, these difficulties appear with family and friends, as well as at school. The sojourner experiencing culture shock is frequently unaware of why he feels, thinks, and reacts as he does.

Premature returns to the U.S. by employees of multinational corporations are approximately 33% (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985). One primary cause of premature return is not lack of adjustment of the employee himself, but poor adjustment of a spouse or child (Baker, 1984). At an average cost estimated at over $100,000 per family move (Harris & Moran, 1979), poor adjustment to a new culture can be expensive to a multinational corporation. Perhaps an even greater hidden cost is the lack of effectiveness of the employee on the job site secondary to family conflict (Conway, 1984).

Given that culture shock has such negative consequences in the adult expatriate population, findings of culture shock reactions in the minor dependents of this population might help to explain the inordinately high premature return rate. Factors which appear to moderate the severity of the reaction in adolescents may prove helpful to corporations, schools, families, and to the young sojourners themselves.
Purpose_of_the_Study

This investigation was an attempt to study adjustment in the previously unresearched population of U.S. primary school students in international schools outside the U.S. Based on the results of prior research, this investigation considered three variables thought to moderate adjustment to an alien culture. Adjustment, a psychological process, was measured using instruments which assess anxiety, depression, and self-esteem.

In summary, the present study attempted to address several questions: Is adjustment a problem for minor U.S. expatriates? Is gender related to adjustment? Is host country culture related to adjustment? Is length of stay in the new culture related to adjustment?

Limitations_of_the_Study

The general purpose of this study was descriptive rather than predictive. The generalizability of these results to other populations and other settings must, therefore, be considered with caution.

The subjects in this investigation were primarily from families involved in business, industry, and non-military government service. Children of missionaries, Peace Corps volunteers, and military personnel may react differently to a cross-cultural experience. The schools selected for this study were international, with English as the language of instruction, and no more than 50% of the
students were from U.S. backgrounds. Although these characteristics are common among schools of attendance for minor U.S. expatriates, they are not, for example, common characteristics of Department of Defense schools (where the student body may be almost exclusively U.S.). Nor would an identical experience be anticipated for U.S. students attending local, host country schools. Each of the schools chosen was also situated in a large, urban area. International schools certainly do exist in less industrialized, rural areas, and adjustment patterns may be different.

The sample size (N=68) was small. Not all students who met the criteria for inclusion in this investigation were tested. Some parents in each school refused to give their consent. A teacher in one school and a counselor in another who were responsible for distributing and collecting consent forms appeared to not have completed the task perfectly. (Teachers in three of the four institutions confided to the investigator that some of the students the teachers considered most poorly adjusted were omitted in one of these manners from the sample.) There is no group of female students from the Far Eastern culture. Preliminary approvals at this school did not ensure admission to the school on the testing days. Finally, one large school refused to participate, citing too many requests for research as its reason.
The students tested were all fourth, fifth, and sixth graders, and instrumentation for the age group of this study is limited. Time constraints were a factor in selecting the instruments used, as the investigator assured school officials that all testing would be completed within one hour. Better validity and reliability for all tests utilized would have improved this study.

Perhaps the most injurious aspect of the instruments used, however, is that all measures were self-report and none of them had a validity scale. The investigator's directions stressed honesty in responding, and methods of maintaining confidentiality of responses were detailed. Nevertheless, no method of verifying subjects' honesty was included.

Certainly a longitudinal design would have confirmed or refuted the validity of the results of this study. Testing sojourners before they leave their home culture and at various points during their sojourn would better control for both within group variance as well as between group variance secondary to premature return.

**Summary of the Following Chapters**

Chapter II reviews the pertinent literature on sojourner adjustment. This chapter begins with background information on culture shock and general information about the age group under investigation. The next section details the procedures utilized by many multinational corporations
to select and train their executives chosen for service abroad. The ramifications of the expatriate experience, specifically depression, anxiety, and self-esteem are delineated next. Finally, the literature related to effects of the sojourner's gender, the length of time he or she resides abroad, and the actual culture of residence are considered.

Chapter III discusses the research design and its implementation. Specifically, this chapter will outline the methodology, instrumentation, and statistical design for the analysis of the data. A description of the subjects participating in this study is also included.

Chapter IV presents the results of analysis of data and relevant discussion for the research hypotheses and additional findings. Chapter V concludes the paper with an overview of the study, and a summary of the findings. Theoretical, methodological, and practical implications of the data follow, and finally, suggestions for further research are delineated.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

The purpose of the current investigation was to examine the relationships among the variables of gender, culture, and length of stay in a foreign country to the adjustment of minor U.S. sojourners. Before a review of the literature related to these variables, however, some preliminary information will be presented in order to more fully examine the difficulties faced by the students who are the focus of this study.

The first section, Background Information, will begin with a discussion of relevant theories of adjustment to an alien culture. Following in this section will be a general description of the effects of a move on the age group (9 to 13 year olds) of the current investigation. As little has been written on this age group's move to another country, the material included in this section will primarily deal with the effects of a domestic move. As the cause of a move out of the U.S. is most often a result of the promotion of the child's father, the next section will detail the methods of selection and training for foreign positions by
multinational corporations (MNCs). This section will highlight the considerations given the employee's spouse and children by the MNCs.

The second section will examine research which investigated changes in anxiety, depression, and self-esteem of adult sojourners. These are the three psychological factors which were measured in the current investigation.

In the third section of this chapter, studies related to each of the independent variables of gender, culture, and length of stay abroad will be discussed. Relevant theories and research for each of these variables will be presented and critiqued.

Background Information

Culture Shock. Most of the literature related to culture shock describes the phenomenon as a series of related psychological reactions developing over time with continued exposure to an alien culture (Cort, 1979). The psychological reactions associated with culture shock include fear, anxiety, a feeling of helplessness, longing to be back home, and a feeling of frustration (Oberg, 1954). Oberg (1960) maintains that culture shock is precipitated by anxiety, which is a result of losing all of the familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. It is these signs or cues that people use to orient themselves to the situations of daily life. A language difference, of course,
is one of these signs. Also included, however, are personal space, new foods (and ways to eat), time schedules, sleeping customs, and affective responses. Spradely & Phillips (1972) describe culture shock in greater detail:

When a change in residence takes place from one socio-cultural system to another, those skills which enabled participation in the former system are, to varying degrees, inadequate in the new cultural situation. The individual is faced with the task of adjusting to cultural values, role expectations, and behavior patterns for which he was not socialized. Objects and events are culturally defined and the meaning he has learned are not often shared by others with whom he must interact. His behavior is based upon the meaning he attributes to the new situations and this often results in responses others judge inappropriate. (p. 520)

Although Lygaard’s (1955) U-curve theory of adjustment will be discussed more fully later in this chapter, Oberg’s stages of culture shock are similar to the U-curve theory in that they also progress through time. Brain & David (1971) delineate Oberg’s stages most succinctly. Stage 1 (the honeymoon phase) may last from a few days or weeks to six months, depending on circumstances. It is a period of incubation during which time the sojourner may feel highly elated. Sights, sounds, tastes and smells, as well as language and customs are all new and frequently exotic and exciting. Some sojourners (brief vacationers, for example) return to their own cultures never having moved beyond this phase.

The more permanent sojourner, however, generally does become less enthralled with his adopted culture. Stage 2
(the hostile phase) is often characterized by a hostile and aggressive attitude towards the host country. This crisis stage may result from the genuine difficulties the sojourner begins to encounter in a different culture. The sojourner regresses as the home environment suddenly becomes tremendously important.

Smalley (1963) considered the sojourner’s inability to communicate in the host country language to be the primary cause of culture shock because of the importance of language as a medium of communication. Without language, the sojourner cannot display his education and intelligence, very possibly two symbols which gave him status and security in his homeland. Other researchers (Oberg, 1960; Howard, 1980) believe that the easiest way to get over culture shock is to get to know host country nationals. To do this, the sojourner must learn the local language.

If the sojourner survives the traumas of Stage 2, he may move into Stage 3, (the initial recovery phase) a period of recovery. As he becomes more adept at the local language, he is better able to understand the verbal and nonverbal cues of the host culture. Concurrently, his mood begins to normalize. Stage 4 (the adjustment phase) is characterized by complete or nearly complete recovery in which the sojourner accepts his experiences in the host culture, even though he may not be enamored with the culture.
The final phase, Stage 5, occurs when the sojourner returns to his native land. It is a culture shock in reverse, though generally less severe than the original shock.

Adjustment. Over time, then, the sojourner's attitudes about the host culture, as well as his mood and often his actions move from positive/high to negative/low, and back up toward positive/high. The final positive/high is considered "adjusted." Adjustment, in most of the research considered, is the respondents' subjective reports on their feelings of satisfaction with different aspects of their stay (Lysgaard, 1955). It is a personal reaction to the social-cultural environment (Deutsch & Won, 1963).

With premature return rates in business, government, and religion at approximately one-third, it is assumed that not all U.S. sojourners successfully adjust to life overseas. A number of researchers have delineated factors they believe to be crucial to expatriates' adjustment. The business family should be able to: withstand physical changes; adapt to a new environment; accept new views and ideals, cultures, clothes, and food; possess the ability to respect others' culture; cooperate and be emotionally mature; find good local people for friends. (Howard, 1980). Successful Peace Corps volunteers were best discriminated from unsuccessful ones by perseverance; patience, tolerance;
courtesy; interest in nationals; knowledge of the subject; and reliability (Benson, 1978).

Adjusted U.S. Navy personnel stationed in Japan were distinguished from those less adjusted by the following criteria: language ability; initiative; mobility; cross cultural friendliness; readiness for new experiences; culinary adaptability; acceptance; appreciation of customs; equanimity in the face of criticism; and cultural understanding (Benson, 1978). Golden (1973) believes that a number of factors appear to affect adjustment, including age, language facility, similarity of the foreign culture to the native culture, and the degree of participation with the people of the host culture.

Cort & King (1979), studying travellers to Africa discovered that those people less tolerant of ambiguity experience greater culture shock, and that internal/external control of feelings did not correlate significantly with culture shock. Their results also indicated that travel experience does not correlate significantly with culture shock; however this variable was confounded with age in their study. (The older tourists in their sample had more prior travel experience, but it was the older tourists who experienced the most culture shock.)

Olson & Tucker (cited in Benson, 1978) used language ability as one criterion of overseas adjustment, and found that conversational host country language ability was
positively correlated with a variety of measures of adaptation for Navy personnel. Major (cited in Brein and David, 1971) reported that with foreign students in the U.S., confidence in their use of the language had a greater influence on adjustment than did actual facility in the host language. There is anecdotal evidence that clearly suggests that the role of the family is important in overseas adjustment, but research needs to be done to determine if the dimensions of adjustment differ between single and married individuals (Benson, 1978). The most striking characteristic found in well adapted Peace Corps volunteers was the extent to which they engaged in a wide variety of reinforcing activities (Benson, 1978). Golden (1973) stated that there have been very few studies employing psychological techniques to evaluate what are essentially psychological phenomena (i.e., measures of adjustment.)

From a review of the literature, Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) list four dimensions that emerged as components of the expatriate adjustment process: 1. self-oriented dimension; 2. others-oriented dimension; 3. perceptual dimension; and 4. cultural toughness dimension.

The self-oriented dimension includes activities and attributes that serve to strengthen the expatriate’s self-esteem, self-confidence, and mental hygiene. The three subfactors of this dimension include stress reduction techniques, technical competence, and reinforcement
substitution. The ability to deal with stress has been demonstrated to be important to expatriate adjustment by numerous researchers (Abe & Wiseman, 1978; Graham, 1983; and cited in Mendenhall and Oddou, 1985: Bardo & Bardo, 1980; Ratiu, 1983). Well adjusted expatriates seem to have "stability zones" where they can retreat if host culture conditions become overly stressful to them according to Ratiu (cited in Mendenhall & Oddou, 1983). Reinforcement substitution is most easily exemplified by the expatriate football fan who becomes an avid soccer fan on his sojourn.

The others oriented dimension includes a willingness to communicate and relationship development. It should be recalled that the sojourner's perception of his language ability is more important to adjustment than is actual ability.

The perceptual dimension includes the belief that the well-adjusted expatriate makes "looser" or less rigid evaluations about why other behave as they do (Detweiler, 1975).

The cultural toughness dimension, which will be discussed in greater detail later in the final section of this chapter, suggests that how well an expatriate adjusts to his or her overseas experience seems to be in part related to the country of assignment (Torbiorn, 1982; McEvoy, 1968).
Interestingly, Lygaard (1955) found in his study of Norwegian Fulbright scholars that adjustment in one area is generalized to another. He reported that his subjects who were considered well adjusted in the personal-social area were also considered well adjusted in the professional-educational area, and vice versa. He further reported that although good adjustment tends to be generalized, it is not specific to any given item of adjustment.

Discussing expatriate college students, McEvoy (1968) reported that the dimensions directly related to adjustment problems include: duration; congruence of experience (i.e., the degree to which the primary cross-cultural activities are ones that are familiar); congruence of milieu (the degree of cultural difference); congruence of expectation; geographical functional relationship (is the sojourner alone or in a group); and the relationship of the participant to the program administration.

McEvoy believes that the most common factors in students' gross maladjustment abroad are developmental immaturity and a rigid personality structure. He also writes that there are distinct modes of adjustment. The first of these is over-identification, commonly referred to as "going native." However, because a person cannot readily abandon values and attitudes that have developed over a period of years without creating great internal tension,
this mode is considered maladaptive. The second mode of
adjustment occurs when the participant rejects all of the
values of the host culture and avoids interaction with it.
The result of this mode may be profound guilt, associated
with a disappointment in self. A third mode is
immobilization. Among college students the incidence of
immobilization is low. When it does occur, though,
premature return is likely. McEvoy’s fourth mode is viable
integration. Fortunately, this is the most common; it
consists of choosing judiciously among the values and
practices of one’s native culture and those of the host
culture. This fourth mode is, of course, considered good
adjustment.

Thompson & English (cited in Brein and David, 1971)
reported that adjustment problems constituted over 60% of
all prematurely returning Peace Corps volunteers prior to
1963. Problems of adjustment are seen to range widely in
extent. They include the sojourner’s relationship to
himself, to others, to the environment, and to his
activities within the host culture.

Writing about the families of U.S. executives who
experience frequent domestic transfers, Gaylord (1979)
believes that when deprived of significant community ties, a
person begins to merely exist rather than live a rich,
purposeful life. She maintains that the "impact of
uprooting is thus not episodic, idiosyncratic, or singularly
pathological, but a general problem that is far more extensive than has been admitted thus far" (p.187).

**Children's Overview.** The students so far described have been of college age. Adolescents and preadolescents (the focus of the present study) have not been researched as extensively in relation to overseas adjustment. Some research has, however, been conducted on academic achievement as it relates to domestic mobility. The conclusions of these studies will be discussed after some brief comments on preadolescence in general.

St. Hall (cited in Kohen-Raz, 1971) described the typical physical condition of preadolescents:

The ages between eight and twelve represent a specific period of human life. The brain has reached its adult size and weight, health is optimal, and the activity of these youngsters is greater and richer than it ever has been and ever will be during the whole life. They excel in vitality, resistance to stress and fatigue, etc.

Kohen-Raz (1971) contends that the preadolescent's central tendency in psychosocial development is the striving toward freedom from parental control and, concurrently, the attempt to gain status and emotional security among one's peers. While for the first time defying parental authority, the child may willingly accept orders from peer group leaders. The climax of the preadolescent's establishment of a sense of social identity and self-esteem will occur at the first stage of puberty.
In grades four to six, relationships between students become deeper and more stable. The relationships are based on mutual long range interests, and tend to be of a more permanent nature than they had been previously. Consequently, they become more individualistic. The entire peer group, though, continues to be of considerable influence as a source of public opinion and normative values (Kohen-Raz, 1971).

The preadolescent can be viewed as standing in two worlds: one, the parental home; the other the outside world. In the outside world of school, social status depends to a large extent on school achievement. Good students are prospective "stars," and weak students may be socially isolated. At this age, students begin to be fully aware of class and race differences as well. Peer groups are often composed of children of like ethnic and socioeconomic origin.

Rauach (1961) contends that the peer group serves as an "auxiliary ego" which helps the preadolescent free himself from excessive dependence on his parents, and achieving normal social development. Abnormal development is characterized by an inability to create this bipolar relationship between parents (as security) and peer group (as a challenge). Gaylord (1979) believes that to be deeply rooted in a place that has meaning is the best gift a child can have because peer acceptance and confirmation of the
individual are necessities for proper emotional and intellectual growth.

If stability and strong peer group relationships are necessary to normal psychosocial development, what happens if a move occurs during these years? Gaylord (1979) contends that the issue of a transfer of identity may therefore be crucial for adolescents whose families are planning to move. The move will entail losing both friends and community life, both necessary for feelings of well-being and security. Gaylord's article discusses moves within the U.S. Phillips (1974) discussed international moves.

The other [consideration] is the mental and emotional health of the child who has been summarily yanked out of the school, the home, the town to which he is accustomed, and has been dropped like a parachuted package into a strange community. He finds few who speak his language or dress in a like manner. He experiences a strange climate where it may snow in July and boil at Christmastime. He finds his daily life bereft of intelligible movies, or TV, or radio...his buddies, his girlfriend. (p.9)

Kelly (1974) furthers Phillips' concerns by adding that the expatriate student is isolated from traditional American experiences closely allied with American education. In addition to few interscholastic activities, school social events are limited. Another hardship faced by some expatriate students is that they become class conscious in some environments. Americans in the same neighborhood may
socialize depending on their fathers' management level (Howard, 1980).

In a study on the children of Navy personnel, Gabower (1960) found that of the children who dislike moving, the need to change friends was given as their major objection. Wallach & Metcalf (1982) maintain that many children go through a grieving period, mourning the loss of friends and a familiar environment. They caution parents anticipating an international move that younger children may regress, while older ones may become extremely negative and evidence changes in school performance and activity levels. As the parents are going through some of the same changes themselves (Wallach & Metcalf, 1982) or become too absorbed in new adult contacts (Kelly, 1974), they have less energy and patience to deal with their children—perhaps at a point when parents are most needed.

Gabower (1960) found that already existing emotional problems of some children in her study were intensified while they lived overseas, and in some instances, the emotional problems first appeared during the sojourn.

The majority of studies related to childhood mobility research academic variables after domestic moves. Bourke & Naylor (cited in Lacey and Blane, 1978/79) reviewed 28 studies and found conflicting results. Twelve studies found lower achievement after a move; 5 found higher achievement; 11 showed no effect. Blane (cited in Lacey & Blane,
1978/79) investigated the apparent improvement in attainment in the children of military personnel as the children grew older. Rather than attributing it to age, Blane attributes it to attrition. Families that do not succeed in the service leave the service. The children of the remaining families were most likely well adjusted in the first place. Blane and Spicer (1978) concluded that children from low SES group might well be considerably disadvantaged academically and socially by changes of school. However, there appeared to be few problems for children from other SES groups, and some children even appeared to benefit from mobility. Other researchers (Whalen and Fried, 1973) by controlling for SES found that mobility exacerbated already existing academic differences. The simple assumption made by many that more geographic mobility necessarily means an impairment of academic attainment can be shown to be erroneous.

Unfortunately, there are no major studies describing the effects of mobility on psycho-social variables of preadolescents. Even if there were, the literature questions whether business, government, and social agencies would consider the results of these studies when assigning employees and their families to foreign posts. The next section will discuss the selection and training of employees and their families for overseas duty.
Selection and Training. Toffler (1970) describes people in professional positions as the most mobile of all Americans. The number of employees transferred by their companies in 1977 remained constant from the year before, at a level of 22% of all salaried employees (Gaylord, 1979). How many are transferred to overseas positions is not documented, but almost one-third of those families transferred out of the U.S. return prematurely (Tung, 1981).

Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) have concluded that the field of selection and training currently suffers from two basic problems: First, there is inadequate understanding of the relevant variables of expatriate acculturation. Second, inappropriate selection and training methods are utilized. According to these authors, personnel directors have consistently employed rigid and simplistic methods in choosing and training managers to be sent abroad.

In a study by Adler (cited in Tung, 1984) only 3% of expatriate managers in a sample of 686 U.S. and Canadian firms were women. "Wife" is commonly used to designate the unemployed spouse in the expatriate couple, and "husband" the employed spouse.

While husbands believe themselves to be the initiators of the transfers, wives often feel themselves to be helpless victims. It appears that husbands have the least trouble adjusting to a new (domestic) environment; a much greater hardship is placed on wives and children
Gaylord, The same is most likely true for international transfers.

Numerous researchers have delineated factors that are crucial to the expatriate executive's success abroad. Tung (1981) lists (in order of importance) technical competence on the job; personality traits or relational abilities; environmental variables; and the family situation. Harvey (1985) states that the family as an influencing factor has not been given careful consideration in the selection process by many multinational corporations. He adds that this one element, the family, may hold the key to selection of successful expatriates. Researchers and practitioners are becoming increasingly cognizant of the importance of this factor to effective performance overseas (Tung, 1981). Three years later, Tung (1984) wrote that while the majority of personnel administrators recognize the importance of the family situation, few firms actually take it into consideration in the selection decision. Reasons for premature return, in descending order of frequency are: the inability of the employee's spouse to adjust to a different physical or cultural environment; the employee's inability to adapt; other family related problems. Various managerial problems constitute the remaining four reasons. Baker (1984) lists the executive's family's failure to adapt to the foreign culture as the second most frequent cause of premature return. Since the family situation factor is one of the
primary reasons for failure, U.S. multinationals should assess the suitability of the spouse and children for living abroad (Harvey, 1985).

Initial selection interviews could help screen clearly unsuitable employees and their families from consideration (Conway, 1984). However, Tung (1981) reports that for management positions, 52% of the companies interviewed both the candidate and spouse, 47% interviewed the candidate only, and 1% interviewed no one. Baker (1976) found that 69% of the companies surveyed reported that they took into account the personality and interests of the executive's wife before deciding whether to send him abroad. As already noted, the preponderance of expatriate executives are male. The age of these men is between 30 and 45, and a large percentage of them would be married and a majority of them would have children (Harvey, 1985). Yet, according to Baker (1976) only 47% of the companies surveyed even required a medical examination for children about to be sent abroad. Only one respondent in five confirmed that it administers a psychological test to the wife of a candidate for an overseas assignment. Sieveking & Marston (1978) argue that as spouses are a primary cause of early returns, they should be evaluated as thoroughly as their husbands in terms of the stresses they will face.

Howard (1980) cautions that a woman's identity as a person apart from being a wife, mother, or homemaker is
rarely transferable overseas. Gaylord (1979) agrees that the wife pays the greatest price for a family's move. In addition to giving up friends and a sense of self-worth and identity in the community, wives may also give up close contact with relatives and a career. She adds that the women's complaints of increased loneliness, problems with the children, career frustration, and identity confusion may be by-products of a faulty adaptation to the move.

Some multinational corporations would appear to be courting failure if for no other reason than the advance notice given for an international move. Baker (1976) reports that the typical length of time varies greatly by company. However, 13% allowed less than 30 days on the average, 40% allowed 30 to 60 days, and another 33% allowed 60 to 90 days. Just 14% permitted their overseas selectees more than 90 days. The stress of expatriation is complicated when little notice of transfer occurs (Harvey, 1985).

In addition to little advance notice and possibly unwise selection processes, companies also appear to be failing at predeparture training. Baker (1984) states that foreign language and cultural training are becoming increasingly important for American government and business policy makers, but that such training is in fact declining. In his survey, only 24% of the companies responded that they offer predeparture training programs. Tung (1981) reports
that 32% of her respondents indicated that formal training programs existed in their corporations. Baker (1984) adds that only 14% of the companies even explain anything about the overseas program to the wives personally.

From their review of the literature, Mendenhall & Oddou (1985) conclude that most MNCs send the expatriate abroad without any acculturation training whatsoever. A variety of reasons were given by personnel directors, primarily their beliefs that the programs are ineffective or that the time between selection and departure is too short. Baker (1984) reports, though, that of those companies that do offer such programs, duration of these programs is only 2 to 5 days for the majority of firms. Programs of such short duration are most likely ineffective (Baker, 1984).

The model for training for cross-cultural living has been designed by the Peace Corps and it consists of four phases: staging, pre-service, in-service, and close-of-service training. The staging is an assessment tool used to select, screen and help place candidates in assignments according to hardships and adaptability. Pre-service training is a group activity which lasts from 10 to 14 weeks and takes place in the host country. In-service training occurs 6 to 12 months after a volunteer has been assigned to a country, and is designed to enhance both technical and language skills. Close-of-service training is a two-day workshop a few months before departure to the U.S.
and introduces the volunteer to the network of returned volunteers (Barnes, 1984). While it may be unreasonable to expect MNCs to adopt the Peace Corps model, it does seem almost foolhardy that of the companies surveyed by Baker (1984) only one even mentioned that specific family concerns were covered in training.

Sieveking & Marston (1978) claim that the family should be provided with accurate and detailed descriptions of the culture, climate, living conditions, and the job. Orientation could also train for basic language skills and caution families to anticipate adjustment problems, as well as give them ways of preventing and coping with them. Even lists of cultural do’s and don’t’s would help for initial adaptation.

Expatriate failure rates have fluctuated from 1964 to the present from 25% to 40% (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985). Conway (1984) contends that few subjects have been viewed with such alarm by U.S.-based multinationals as the failure rates of their overseas personnel. Added to those who return prematurely are an undetermined number who remain on the job for the expected term, but perform at levels below their abilities or their companies’ expectations. The costs of premature returns vary by position and by country, but average from $50,000 to $150,000 (Harris & Moran, 1979). Some estimate the cost at even higher: up to $250,000 (Tung, 1984).
Baker (1984) maintains that until an emphasis is placed on predeparture and foreign language training, U.S. business firms will not achieve success in the international business arena. Harvey (1985) believes that the problems generated at work spill over into the home just as what occurs or does not occur in the family affects the performance and success of the job. This is magnified in the international setting as a distinct line between home and work becomes blurred.

Clearly, any move may cause change and disruption for all members of a family. But the degree of disruption is magnified when the transfer is to a foreign country (Harvey, 1985). It would seem that the more rigorous the selection and training procedures used, the lower the failure rate (Tung, 1981).

The Sojourn Experience and Psychological Variables

Researchers agree that these emotions or some combination of these emotions will be temporarily increased in most sojourners. Klineberg (1970) warns that the occurrence of a period of depression is a sufficiently common phenomenon to warrant the most careful concern. Yet, a temporary period of depression occurs so frequently as to be almost normal.

Howard (1980) concludes that depression occurs as a result of the removal of reinforcing situations; anxiety is the result of the presentation of aversive situations. Spradley & Phillips (1972) believe that anxiety is a stress response. It is an accommodation to a change in cultural environment which involves reorganizing cognitive maps, learning new rules for interaction, changing previously learned definitions of experience, and acquiring skills needed to perform in the new situation. More obvious disruptive factors include: loneliness, boredom, isolation as a result of lack of language skills, separation from extended family, and in some cases, constant sickness (Howard, 1980). Of all the stressors, Spradley & Phillips (1972) maintain that in the three groups they surveyed (returned Peace Corps volunteers, Chinese students studying in the U.S., and college students reporting no intercultural experience) language was the most important. Further, the degree to which language requires more readjustment than any other factor was significant. They concluded that the more
difficult aspects of adjusting to a new culture involve unlearning the norms and rules acquired during socialization in one's own culture, and that adjustment is more difficult when the range of appropriate behavior is less restricted in the host culture.

Anxiety and depression are common maladies of the expatriate, often for the reasons cited. Sieveking, Anchor, & Marston (1981) contend that stress may be more severe for some family members than others, specifically spouses and children of expatriate employees. The employee (generally male) moves from a stateside office to a foreign one and is able to maintain some semblance of continuity in his life. Wives and children are frequently not as fortunate.

Klineberg (1970) has found that cases of psychological maladjustment occur more frequently among foreign students than in a comparable sample of natives. In groups as disparate in other respects as Americans in Paris and Nigerians in London, there is considerable need for psychological assistance. Golden (1973) reported that depression in U.S. college students abroad occurred at the beginning of the program year, and a second peak occurred prior to the Christmas vacation break. However, by the middle of the academic year, most students were psychologically healthy.

Having discussed the necessary background information and the common effects of a move to a foreign culture, the
following section will detail research completed on the variables considered in the current investigation.

Length_of_Stay, Culture, and Gender

Length_of_Stay. Two major studies which consider time as a crucial factor in adjustment to an alien culture will be discussed in detail. Both researchers are Scandinavian, as are their subjects. Lygaard's (1955) population was two hundred Norwegian Fulbright scholars who were interviewed on their return to Norway after a stay in the United States. Torbiorn's (1982) study population is comprised of 1,111 Swedes employed in forty different countries who answered a comprehensive questionnaire.

Lygaard's early research gave rise to the "U-curve" theory of adjustment. His data gave evidence of stages of adjustment characterized by good initial adjustment, followed by an adjustment crisis, after which good adjustment was again achieved. It is important to note that all interviews were conducted after the subjects' return to their native country. Hence, they were asked to recall their subjective experiences at various points in their sojourn. It is perhaps even more important that the typical U-shaped relationship between adjustment and duration existed among those who did not, as well as those who did change their original plans for length of stay. Lygaard
found that poor adjustment was reportedly manifested at the intermediary duration period across all age groups and academic status groups. His group's mean age of 30 was comprised of students from under age 20 to academicians over age 60, and their stays lasted from less than six months to three years, with an average stay of about one year. In general, however, adjustment appears to have been good among those who resided in the U.S. for less than six months or more than eighteen months. Scholars who left the U.S. after a stay of twelve to eighteen months appeared to have been less well adjusted.

Other studies support these findings regarding duration. It appears that like Norwegians, Americans also require varying periods of time to adjust to new cultures (Gullahorn & Gullahorn, 1960) and that a typical one-year grant may be unrealistic in some countries in terms of the sojourner and host achieving maximum benefits. Most of these subjects believed they were just becoming really effective as the year's end approached. Foster (1962) reported that few longer-term sojourners recover from the culture shock experience in less than six months. He added, however, that it is not uncommon for the process of readjustment to last for as long as a year—or for as short as only three months. Benson (1978) also cautioned that in measuring adjustment after entering a foreign culture, the time at which criterion measures are administered must be
considered. Likewise, Gullahorn and Gullahorn (cited in Cort & King, 1979) suggested that culture shock should not be studied over too short a time span. Their findings indicated that some sojourners need more than a year to experience and manifest the full range of symptoms of culture shock. Klineberg & Hull (1979) concurred that sojourner attitude toward host culture may be a function of time. Their research maintained that the expatriate's need to conform to host culture standards varies with length of stay. Expatriates with a long residence exhibit a lesser need to conform than do those with a shorter residence. They suggested that this may be secondary to attitudinal aggression which resulted from frustration in conformity. Deutsch & Won's (1963) study of U.S. A.I.D. trainees tended to support the U-curve hypothesis as well.

Various studies were unable to strictly support Lysgaard's U-curve hypothesis. Included in this group are: Klineberg and Hull, 1979; and Golden, 1973. All of these researchers studied students, however, and found that peaks and valleys of adjustment corresponded with stages of the academic year.

Clearly, there is no suggestion that length of stay alone determines adjustment. Though not particularly germane to the current study, Fong & Peskin (1969) contended that citizenship or the prospect of citizenship can affect the time necessary for adequate adjustment. They maintain
that a personal commitment to a new society can be achieved by the full granting of that society's legal guarantees and that this may be relatively independent of actual time of residence.

Torbiorn's (1982) comprehensive survey of expatriate Swedes is perhaps the largest of its kind, and it clearly supports the U-curve hypothesis. It is of note that his subjects were not students, and therefore not tied to an academic year. His findings suggest that irrespective of other factors, length of stay in the host country is crucial to adjustment. (Other variables, particularly those inherent in a given culture and country, are also important and will be discussed in the next section.) Torbiorn's subjects (639 males and 472 of their wives) were primarily in their thirties, had two children, and had lived abroad for a few months to more than ten years. Most planned to return to Sweden within four years, and most reported being happy in their current post. Torbiorn concedes that although premature return could conceivably account for the rise in general satisfaction of life abroad after one or two years, it cannot account for the general drop in satisfaction which occurs after a few months' stay in the host culture. Lysgaard's (1955) study, of course, defended the concept of a full U-curve when interviews were conducted with all subjects after their return.
Age appeared to be a factor in expatriates' initial response to a new culture. In general, younger expatriates reported a higher initial level of satisfaction than did their older counterparts. However, at the six-month drop (culture shock) age was no longer a significant factor. Reported dissatisfaction was equal across age groups and the upward climb to regained satisfaction (one to two years) was also unaffected by age.

Torbiorn considered the U-curve to be the expression of basic psychological adjustment mechanisms, and found that it applied to all general categories of overseas employees (across age, gender, civil status, host country, and background experience.) Although the level of the adjustment varied, he found the shape of the curve to be roughly the same.

While the shape remained essentially unchanged (i.e., peak-trough-peak), differences in level were manifested by general area of host culture. Torbiorn's geographic groups were: 1. Central Europe; 2. Latin America and Southern Europe; 3. Africa, the Middle East, and the Far East.

**Culture.** While Torbiorn's geographic groups were compiled for his study of Swedish expatriates, the rationale for a country's inclusion in a particular grouping appears to be equally appropriate for U.S. citizens. Criteria for a country's placement in one of three groups was based first,
of course, on geography. Additionally, language, religion, and level of development also were factored into his groupings. American citizens and Swedes both come from primarily Germanic-based, Christian (Protestant), industrialized nations. Torbiorn found that Swedish expatriates rated themselves most satisfied in cultures most similar to their own (on these three dimensions) and least satisfied in cultures most different from their own. His subjects reported being most satisfied in Switzerland (German/Protestant/industrialized), moderately satisfied in Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador (Indo-European language/Catholic/developing), and less satisfied in Japan and other areas of the Far and Middle East and Africa (Non-Indo-European languages/Non-Christian/various stages of development). Torbiorn's three groupings have been compressed from his initial twenty-six. In rank order, Switzerland was first, Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador was sixth, and Japan was twenty-fourth. He cautioned, however, that the expatriates in his study do not appear to be ill-adjusted in any country in an absolute sense. A seven-point Likert scale was used to assess satisfaction/adjustment. His Swedish sojourners rated Switzerland 6.38, Venezuela, Colombia and Ecuador 6.07, and Japan 5.36. A rating of four or below would have indicated lack of adjustment.

Mendenhall and Oddou's (1985) review of the literature suggested also that expatriate adjustment seemed
in part to be related to the country of assignment. Cultures are, in fact, different in terms of the adjustment problems they pose for sojourners (Jones and Popper, cited in Benson, 1978). These authors did not, however, look at the Peace Corps Volunteers they studied in terms of individual differences to see if certain "types" are more or less likely to succeed in certain cultures. The degree of difference between a sojourner's home and host culture has been considered to be of major importance by Brein and David (1971) as well.

Torbiorn's breakdown of culture into three fundamental aspects of language, religion, and living standard appears to have the most intuitive validity. Language encompasses both verbal and nonverbal aspects as well as oral and written components. The roots of English being Germanic, one might expect Americans, like Swedes, to most readily understand Germanic languages. Their alphabets are virtually identical and nonverbal considerations are similar. The U.S. sojourner to a country where another Germanic-based language is spoken can read signs and newspapers, watch television, and attend movies without as much difficulty as a sojourner to Asia, for example. Other Indo-European languages (notably the Romance languages) are the next most easily understood. Similar alphabets and many cognates may aid the U.S. sojourner in Latin America. Nonverbal aspects such as rate of speech and personal
distance of some of these languages (Hall, 1959) are different.

Though religion, per se, may not greatly affect the ease with which one adjusts to a new culture, the actual religious dogma is not all that needs to be considered. Torbiorn maintained that the general manifestations of a particular fundamental religious view pervades a society. One need only look to the Middle East to grasp the significance of religion's effect on society. As U.S. sojourners, like Swedes, come from a Christian (Protestant) culture, one might expect the transitions to a like culture to be easier than the transition to a vastly distinct religious culture. Torbiorn's subjects did report greater adjustment in other Christian (Protestant) cultures. They were next most satisfied in Christian (Catholic) countries, and least adjusted in the non-Christian cultures of Africa, and the Far and Middle East. Such a comprehensive study of American sojourners has not been published. One could hypothesize a similar rank ordering for Americans abroad as well.

Torbiorn's final consideration was living standard. As none of his subjects resided in Second World nations, there are only two categories: Industrial/developed, and agrarian/developing. The Swedes were, for the most part, more adjusted to life in other industrial nations than they were in developing countries.
A simple familiarity with "how things work" may explain why the transition is easier to an industrial than a non-industrial culture. Clearly, language, religion, and living standard must all be considered simultaneously. Torbiorn's research indicated that the fewer and smaller the differences, the easier the adjustment.

Other researchers suggested that different variables need to be taken into consideration when predicting successful adjustment of sojourners. Morris (1960) has noted that a student sojourner's view of his home country in relation to the host country plays a significant role. The student who views his home country as having lower status than the host country will have a completely different coping process than if the reverse situation is true. Turner and Mo (1984) suggested that self-image is to some extent culturally-derived, and that teens of Western cultures are, on average, very similar in self-image. They maintained that Chinese teens, like those of India, have lower self-image secondary to the extended family system, strong ties to traditional values, and the social repression of sexuality according to a study by Argarwal.

Still other research suggests that cultural differences have little or no effect on ease of adjustment. Galtung's (1965) retrospective study was arranged in a 3 X 3 format. Indian, Iranian, and Egyptian students were interviewed on their return from the U.S., the United
Kingdom, and West Germany. Her general conclusions were that explanations for adjustment differences should be found in differences from the *home* rather than the *host* countries. Specifically, she maintained that there is a certain range of cultural difference within which cultural contact can be made. Beyond that range, however, "impact is neither sought nor achieved" (p. 268) except under extraordinary circumstances. In her sample, the Indian students (who also tended to be older than either the Egyptians or Iranians) appeared to choose not to fully expose themselves to the foreign cultures. She further found that the less educated (and younger) the sojourner, the more likely he was to alter his personal habits to fit more comfortably in the host culture. Additionally, the assumption was made that a sojourner's ascribed status as belonging to a distinct, foreign culture inhibits him in his attempts to socialize with persons defined as distinctly different. Like Morris (cited in Klineberg and Hull, 1979), Galtung believed that the higher the prestige of one's home country status, the less likely the acceptance of and socialization to another culture. Finally, as geographical proximity increases the likelihood of cultural similarity, and distance increases the likelihood of a culture developing independently, physical distance should also play some role in the ease or difficulty of sojourner adjustment.
It is not surprising that Galtung's and Torbiorn's results are so disparate. The latter studied a single cultural group in distinct cultures, while the former studied distinct cultural groups in relatively similar cultures. Perhaps equally important in analyzing the differences between these two studies is the fact that Torbiorn's research was conducted while his subjects resided in the host culture, while Galtung's subjects were back in their home cultures. Recalling level of satisfaction/adjustment months or years after a sojourn is possibly distinct from relating one's feeling as it occurs.

Nevertheless, one can hypothesize considerable adjustment differences due to differences among the three host cultures under consideration in this study. Spradley and Phillips (1972) suggested that difficulties in adjustment may be secondary to the feeling that host country nationals are violating norms learned in one's native land. In addition to possibly broader normative distinctions, the U.S. sojourner to Asia can rarely appear to blend in as a local. Smalley (1963) reported that the culture shock of non-Caucasian Americans may be particularly acute. Americans of the Mongolian race in East Asia may feel a kinship with the host country nationals, only to discover that their American cultural characteristics are the more important fact to the locals. The Caucasian-American sojourner to East Asia, on the other hand, will always
appear to be different, and may automatically be identified with a higher class of society.

Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) reported that results similar to Torbiorn's (i.e., that greater cultural barriers were reported by sojourners to Africa, and the Far and Middle East) were also found by Tucker and Schiller (1975) in their study of U.S. Navy personnel. Brein and David (1971) noted that in order to save face, the word "no" is rarely used in Oriental cultures. The Oriental "yes" may mean "maybe" or "no." The American sojourner might interpret this cultural norm as lying.

Women's roles in Japan are regarded more traditionally by Japanese men (Bankart, 1985). The male respondents endorsed a separation of men's and women's activities. Wives are generally excluded from social affairs in Oriental nations (Baker, 1975) and this serves to alienate the American wife from her husband's life.

Harris and Moran (1979) reported that in the context of social relations, Japanese tend to be clean, polite, and disciplined, but publicly with strangers, they can be pushy and inconsiderate. The difference between public and private actions of the Japanese may add to sojourner dissatisfaction in that country. The self-control generally displayed often disguises the highly emotional quality of the Japanese character and relationships. Harris and Moran (1979) further added that relationships are familial and
group oriented rather than the individualistic relationships more common among Americans.

In addition to the language and religious differences considered earlier, the sex-role image and relationship differences, as well as the American's inability to physically integrate into the Oriental society may make adjustment in Japan exceedingly difficult.

In their early study of Peace Corps volunteers, Thompson and English (1964) noted that volunteers had a more difficult adjustment to Latin America than to any other area. While these findings dispute Torbiorn's rationale for ease of adjustment (i.e., Venezuela is a Catholic country where an Indo-European language is spoken), Thompson and English's sample size was much smaller. Though there are perhaps more similarities between U.S. and Latin American cultures than there are between U.S. and Asian cultures, distinctions do clearly exist.

Harris and Moran, (1979) suggest that "personalismo" and "machismo" are two cultural differences of which all sojourners to Latin America must be aware. "Personalismo" is a Latin's concern for himself. It means that in order to reach a Latin, everything must be related to him, his family, his country, and his personal pride. "Machismo" is a concept implanted in both sexes early in childhood and requires that a man demonstrate self-confidence, leadership, and forcefulness at all times. In contrast to the more
androgenous current "ideal" of a U.S. male, these differences can be startling and hinder adjustment to Latin American cultures. Additionally, Harris and Moran suggested that South American nations tend to be more conservative and more formal than the U.S. culture. As they are in Japan, cultural faux pas are easily committed in Latin America.

Northern European cultures (notably Swiss for this study) appear to be most similar to that of the U.S. One measure of adjustment frequently used is that of interaction with host country nationals. Major (in Brein and David, 1971) found that while sojourning in the U.S., European students had more social interactions with Americans than did their Asian counterparts. American students in Europe reported more social interaction with host nationals than did Americans in Asia. Similarly, Gullahorn and Gullahorn (1963) found that American grantees in Europe were better adjusted than those in the Near and Middle East or Latin America. The authors assumed the students encountered fewer communication problems and less value dissonance in Europe than in other parts of the world.

It must be realized, however, that culture shock occurs for Americans even in England where language and customs are extremely similar. Cultural differences can be viewed on a continuum, with satisfaction/adjustment higher in relation to cultural nearness.
Gender. Although both length of stay and cultural diversity have been examined extensively in the sojourner adjustment literature, studies of the effect of gender on adjustment are almost non-existent. Fong and Peskin (1969) maintained that sojourners can be expected to carry with them the "culturally ingrained, emotional meaning of essential social roles." (p. 563) Where sex role expectations are vastly different than what has been previously experienced, satisfaction may co-vary. The gender variable may then be dependent upon cultural norms. For example, females may be less satisfied than their male counterparts in Japan, due to the females' more restricted roles.

Regardless of societal norms, Oberg (1960) postulated culture shock affects wives more than it does husbands. While he has not done research to support his hypothesis, his choice of words makes his concept plausible. Husbands employed by MNCs move from stateside offices to offices abroad. Wives often must fend for themselves in their new roles in a new culture. If the wife were the MNC employee, the adjustment differences would conceivably be reversed.

Nevertheless, in their literature review, Mendenhall and Oddou (1985) stated that some cultures may be extra "culturally tough" for women. This, they perceive, as secondary to male-dominated value systems within those cultures. Torbiorn (1982) does not view this difference as
genetically governed; instead, he saw it as related to the role and habits of women in the host culture. Useem's findings (cited in Mendenhall and Oddou, 1985) of American women in India supported Torbiorn's findings in this culture.

Baty and Dold (1977) studied the sexual differences in adaptation of U.S. college students living in unfamiliar cultures. Their subjects spent four weeks living with Hispanic, Black, and other culturally diverse families in the Southwestern United States and Mexico. Although limited in scope, their findings were inconsistent with those of Torbiorn (1982) and Useem (cited in Mendenhall and Oddou, 1985). Baty and Dold found that when men and women were both placed in equally unstructured environments, the males reported that the experience was more unsettling for them than it was for the women. The authors suggested two possible explanations: the women displayed a greater adaptive efficiency or the men may have been exposed to a greater number or more intense stressors than the women. The authors also suggest that males and females may exhibit different learning styles. In their study, Baty and Dold concluded that women may be more skilled in adapting to new situations in which they are required, for a time, to be dependent. This initial dependency, for the males, may be more threatening and, hence, stressful to the males. The added stress may then lead to poorer initial adjustment. As
the students' stays were of relatively brief durations, definitive conclusions cannot be drawn.

Summary

Culture shock has been described as a series of related psychological reactions developing over time with continued exposure to an alien culture. Some common reactions are anxiety, depression, and a decrease in self-esteem. Most research suggests that these psychological ailments occur between the 6th and 12th month in a new culture. Adolescents may be particularly vulnerable to the symptoms of culture shock due to their developmental stage. At a point when independence from family generally occurs, minor expatriates may be forced to depend increasingly on their families for emotional support.

Even though 33% of U.S. expatriate families return to the U.S. before the scheduled termination of their foreign assignments (at great costs to the multinational corporations that placed them abroad), few multinational corporations consider the family when making an international assignment. Yet, lack of adjustment of the employee's family is a major cause of premature return to the U.S.

The literature suggests that length of stay is an important factor in adults' adjustment to another culture. If the sojourner remains in the new culture through the difficult culture shock phase, good adjustment appears to
follow. Research also suggests that cultures more like one's home culture are somewhat easier to adjust to than are those drastically different from one's home culture. No definitive studies on the relation between gender and adjustment to another culture have been completed. Likewise, there is a paucity of research focusing on adolescents' cultural adjustment.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no relationship between gender and adjustment.

2. There is no relationship between length of stay and adjustment.

3. There is no relationship between host culture and adjustment.

4. There is no relationship between gender, length of stay, host culture, and adjustment.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This investigator obtained a measure of adjustment in fourth, fifth, and sixth grade American students residing outside the United States. The variables—mood, anxiety, and self-esteem—which are thought to measure the degree of adjustment experienced were assessed. In this chapter, the subjects, procedures, research design, and statistical analysis used in the investigation are described.

Subjects

Selection. The investigator contacted the headmaster or superintendent of four international schools and briefly explained the research study. Sites of the schools chosen to participate in this investigation were determined by the investigator to represent three distinct cultures (i.e., Asian, Western European, and Latin American.) A letter of introduction which described the study in detail and a copy of the instruments were then sent to each of these individuals or their designates (a counselor or teacher). A copy of the letter is contained in Appendix A. After recontacting the headmasters by phone or letter and after receiving their approval, the investigator made specific
arrangements with the headmasters or their designates for
data collection.

It was not possible to randomly select the subjects, therefore all those who met the criteria were invited to participate. The selection criteria included status as a fourth, fifth, or sixth grade student attending an international school outside the United States; U.S. citizenship or at least one parent with U.S. citizenship; and no status as a military dependent. All subjects who met these three criteria and whose parents signed a consent form were included in the study.

Description. The subjects (N=68) were currently registered as full-time students in the fourth (n=25), fifth (n=24), and sixth (n=19) grades. Forty-one of the subjects were male and 27 were female. Seventeen resided in Asia, 24 in Western Europe, and 27 in Latin America. The subjects ranged in age from 9 to 13. Sixty-three per cent of the subjects’ mothers were U.S. citizens; eighty-four per cent of their fathers were U.S. citizens. Fourteen subjects had lived in the current host culture for less than one year and 54 had resided in the current culture for more than one year. Ninety-three per cent of the subjects had lived in at least one other country (including the U.S.) while 7%, although meeting the selection criteria, had only lived in the current culture.

The number of years the subjects had lived in
countries other than the current host culture varied from 0 to 11, with a median of 8 years. Subjects had lived in a maximum of five other countries with a mean of 1.5. All but three of the subjects claimed to speak some of the host countries' languages, with 19 rating themselves as "fair", 22 as "good", 14 as "excellent" and 10 as "native". When asked where they would ideally choose to live with their families, 63% listed areas in the United States.

Setting. All of the schools were private and international, with no more than 50% of the students from American backgrounds. All classes with the exception host country language (and in one site, host country social studies) were taught in English. At all schools, host country nationals also attended classes, although at School D their numbers were few. All schools are day schools, so all subjects tested live with their families off campus.

School A (n=17) is located in an Asian metropolis. It follows an American curriculum from grades K through 12. Although it is a religiously-affiliated (Roman Catholic) boys' school, it accepts boys of all creeds. Its total enrollment is approximately 800, of which approximately 200 are American. There are 85 faculty members (77 full time; 8 part time) of whom 28 are U.S. citizens.

Schools B and C are located in a medium-size Western European city. School B (n=6) is the smallest of the four institutions used in this study. Its enrollment in grades N
(nursery) through 7 is 90. Of these 90 pupils, approximately 30 are American. There are 7 full time faculty members and 13 part time; 8 are U.S. citizens. Class sizes are small.

School C (n=18) is located in a suburban area of the same city as School B. In grades N through 7 there are approximately 300 students, about 40 of whom are American. There are 22 full time faculty members and 5 part time. How many are American is not known.

School D (n=27) is located in a large South American metropolis. There are about 850 students in grades N through 9. Almost 400 are of American descent. While there are few local students enrolled in this institution, about 40% of the pupils are from other South and Central American countries. Though English is the language of instruction, both Spanish and English are heard in the hallways. Of the 51 faculty members, about half are U.S. citizens.

There is little difference among the schools in terms of tuition costs. With the exception of School B, all of the institutions have their own gymnasiums and athletic facilities. (School B uses nearby, local facilities.) Again, with the exception of School B, all schools are relatively new and large. School B is housed in a converted mansion. All schools' classrooms and hallways are decorated with student works of art and literature. In none of the schools do students remain with a single teacher for the
entire day. Specialized classes in foreign and local languages, physical education, art, and music are common. Administrative support staff and many faculty members are bilingual.

Procedure

After securing approval from the headmaster at each school, the investigator set a date and time for distribution of parental consent forms (Appendix B) and data collection. Parental consent forms were delivered to the schools two to seven days prior to the date set for data collection. Students and faculty members were reminded that unless a consent form were returned, the student could not participate in the study. Students were also reminded that participation was voluntary, that no known risks were involved, and that all data would be kept confidential.

On the designated day for data collection, the investigator met with small groups (ranging in size from 3 to 15 subjects) over the course of several hours. The following instructions were given to each group:

My name is Tim Lawler and I am working on my Ph. D. at Loyola University of Chicago. In order to meet the requirements for graduation, I am conducting a study of American fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students in international schools outside the United States. I am interested in finding out how you think and feel about yourself in this country.

I am going to ask each of you to fill out a questionnaire and then four tests. The best thing about these tests is that there are no right or wrong answers. It will take anywhere from 25 minutes to one hour to complete all five forms.
All of your answers will be kept secret. You'll write your name on the first questionnaire. On the other tests, you won't write your name at all. I'm going to give each of you a special code number, and that's what you'll use on the rest of the tests. And to make even more certain that your answers are kept secret, when I get back to Chicago, I'm going to put your test answers into a big computer, but I'm not going to put your names in that computer. Instead, your names are going to go into my own small computer.

You do not have to answer any questions which you think are weird or funny. You can also stop taking the tests at any time. However, if you don't take all of the tests, I won't be able to use the ones you do take.

In order to get Mr. (Headmaster)'s permission to test at this school, I did have to promise that I would send the results of the entire group's tests to him. That will give him an idea of what all of you are thinking as a group. But he knows I'm not going to send anyone's individual test results to him.

I'll be here in the room to answer any questions you might have. Are there any questions that need to be answered before we begin?

After these instructions, the demographic questionnaires were distributed. The investigator read each question aloud and answered subjects' inquiries. When all questionnaires were completed, code numbers were assigned and the questionnaires were collected.

Pre-testing indicated that because each instrument was formatted differently (true-false, forced choice, and Likert-type scale), the questions about each were different. Therefore, tests were given in the same order to all subjects at all facilities. Each completed instrument was collected before the next was distributed. Directions for each were read aloud by the investigator, a sample question was completed, and subjects' questions regarding the format were answered. The investigator remained in the room to
respond to any additional inquiries. While the subjects were completing one test, the investigator looked over the previous tests to make certain that they had been correctly coded and that the instructions had been properly followed. The order of the tests was as follows:

1. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children;
2. Children's Depression Inventory;
3. How I See Myself Scale;
4. Family Environment Scale.

Because the Family Environment Scale is the only instrument not designed specifically and solely for children, the investigator read all 90 true-false questions aloud for each group. Words such as "spontaneous" and phrases like "let off steam" typically had to be redefined by the investigator.

When all questionnaires were completed, the investigator asked the group if there were any questions about the individual instruments or about the research process. After responding to each question, the subjects were thanked and they returned to their classrooms.

In School A, subjects were tested in three groups. The first group (sixth graders) was tested in one of the sixth grade classrooms just after lunch time. They were tested during their classes' physical education period. The next two groups were tested in the school cafeteria (after
the lunch period and after it had been cleaned.) Both of these groups were comprised of fourth and fifth graders and these subjects were released from classes their teachers considered "non-essential."

In School B, tests were administered to the subjects (fourth- and fifth-grade girls) in the fourth-grade teacher's room. Class members who did not fit the subjects' criteria were taken to the library. This testing occurred in the morning.

At School C, testing took place in a single afternoon session. Subjects of all three grades and both sexes met in one of the sixth grade classrooms. The areas of instruction missed by each subject varied. Because of the large n, this group's testing period was the lengthiest at 60 minutes.

At School D, the investigator spent the day before the data gathering day arranging testing times with each of nine teachers. The subjects were tested in five different sessions in the morning and afternoon with group size varying from n=3 to n=9. The tests were administered in recently constructed study carroll rooms. During one session, subjects were permitted to eat their lunches between tests.

On the day of data collection, the headmaster or his designate took the investigator to each classroom or brought all subjects to the investigator and introduced him. In all schools and for all administrations, the instruments were
completed in the sixty minutes allotted for in the parental consent form.

Pilot study

In an attempt to identify possible reading level problems with the instruments and the populations chosen, the investigator conducted a pilot study. The questionnaires were administered to fifth and sixth grade students enrolled in U.S. schools (N=5).

The investigator assessed the amount of time it took the five participants to complete each questionnaire. The investigator also inquired whether there were any problems regarding the vocabulary or concepts used in the instruments.

The pilot study indicated that the instruments (excluding the demographic questionnaire) could be completed in 20 to 45 minutes. The pilot study also revealed that the time needed to complete the Family Environment Scale varied considerably. Therefore, it was decided to read this instrument's questions aloud to better ensure that subjects would not omit answers to questions with difficult vocabulary words.

As the subjects in the pilot study were not living abroad, and therefore do not meet all the criteria, their results were not statistically analyzed.

Instrumentation

The variables studied in this investigation were
anxiety measured by the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (Spielberger, 1973), mood measured by the Children's Depression Inventory (Kovacs and Beck, 1977), self-esteem measured by the How I See Myself Scale (Gordon, 1959), and family environment measured by the Family Environment Scale (Moos and Moos, 1981). The variables of gender, country of residence, and length of stay in current host culture were assessed by items on the demographic questionnaire.

State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children. The STAIC was initially developed as a research tool for the study of anxiety in elementary school children. It is comprised of separate self-report scales for measuring two distinct anxiety concepts: state anxiety (A-state) and trait anxiety (A-trait). The inventory consists of 40 questions—20 pertaining to how the child feels at a particular point in time, and 20 pertaining to how the child generally feels. The A-state scale is designed to measure consciously perceived feelings of apprehension, tension, and worry. The A-trait scale measures relatively stable individual differences in anxiety proneness. For purposes of this study, only the A-trait scale was administered.

Scoring the STAIC Form C-2 (A-trait) involves calculating an anxiety scale score. In scoring the 20 items, the response checked must be transformed into a numerical score. The respondent receives one point for
answering "hardly ever", two points for answering "sometimes", and three points for answering "often". The total score can range from 20 (low anxiety) to 60 (extremely high anxiety).

The test-retest reliability coefficients for elementary school children on Form C-2 are .62 for males and .71 for females. Retesting was completed after an eight-week time interval. The alpha (internal consistency) reliability of the STAIC A-Trait scale was .78 for males and .81 for females.

Internal consistency of the A-Trait scale is reasonably good and the test-retest reliability (stability) is moderate. Concurrent validity of the STAIC A-Trait scale is evidenced by its correlation of .75 with the Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale and .63 with the General Anxiety Scale for Children (Spielberger, 1973).

Children's Depression Inventory. The CDI developed by Kovacs and Beck (1977) is the most widely used self-report measure of childhood depression. The instrument has been devised for use with eight to thirteen year olds, and is based on the Beck Depression Inventory for Adults. It consists of 27 forced-choice items with three choices for each. The item choices are keyed from zero to two in the direction of increasing symptom severity. Total scores, therefore, can range from 0 to 54. As an example, Question 1's choices read:
Once in a while

many times

every time.

Approximately half of the items begin with the choice reflecting the greatest symptom severity; for the remainder, the sequence is reversed.

The CDI's internal consistency for normals is a coefficient alpha of .87 (Friedman and Butler, 1979), an acceptable level. Miezitis et al. (1978) reported that test-retest reliability over a nine-week period yielded a coefficient of .84. Over a reasonably short time period, the CDI’s test-retest reliability is acceptable.

The concurrent validity of the CDI was determined against two other self-rated scales that quantify constructs relevant to low self-esteem. Green (1980) found that self-rated depression correlated with low self-esteem as measured by the Coopersmith Inventory. The correlations are $r = -.72$ for girls; $r = -.67$ for boys. Friedman and Butler reported that scores from the CDI and the Piers-Harris Children’s Self-Concept scale correlated at .66.

**How I See Myself Scale.** The How I See Myself Scale is a self-report inventory intended for research purposes with groups or classes. The Elementary Form is designed for use with students in grades 3 through 6. The five scales are titled:
a) Teacher-School;
b) Physical Appearance;
c) Autonomy;
d) Academic Adequacy;
e) Interpersonal Adequacy.

The Elementary Form consists of 40 pairs of descriptive statements, each pair separated by a five-point, Likert-type scale. The respondent is asked to circle the number closest to the statement that describes him or her "most of the time." The format for question 1 is as follows:

Nothing gets me too mad

1 2 3 4 5 I get mad easily and explode

Of the 40 items, 17 have been randomly reversed on the Elementary Form.

The Teacher-School sub-scale contains six items, with possible scores ranging from 6 to 30. The Physical Appearance sub-scale is composed of eight items, with total scores ranging from 8 to 40. The Interpersonal Adequacy sub-scale contains 17 items and possible total scores from 17 to 85. The Autonomy sub-scale uses nine items, with scores from 9 to 45 possible. Finally, the Academic Adequacy sub-scale contains six items, with possible scores ranging from 6 to 30.

Means and standard deviations are presented for each
scale by grade, sex, and race. Reliability data for the various sub-scales are not reported at the elementary level, but they are for the total score. The test-retest correlation is .89 for fifth graders over a brief (nine day) period (Yeatts, 1967).

Validity scores have not been published. Regarding content validity, however, the author states that,

The items in the How I See Myself Scale are based on responses described by Jersild (1952) as meaningful on the basis of children's responses to open-ended questions about themselves. Each are found by Jersild to yield a meaningful percentage of pupil responses was translated into a scale item.

**Family Environment Scale.** The FES (Moos and Moos, 1981) is made up of ten sub-scales that measure the social-environmental characteristics of all types of families. There are nine items for each of the sub-scales; the entire instrument, therefore, consists of 90 true-false questions.

The ten sub-scales assess three underlying domains:

a) Relationship dimensions;

b) Personal growth dimensions;

c) System maintenance dimensions.

Each subscale has an approximately equal number of items scored true and scored false.

The Relationship dimensions are measured by the Cohesion, Expressiveness, and Conflict subscales. The Cohesion Subscale assesses the degree of commitment, help and support family members provide one another; the Expressiveness Subscale assesses the extent to which family
members are encouraged to act openly and to express their feelings directly; and the Conflict Subscale assesses the amount of openly expressed anger, aggression, and conflict among family members. Scores on the Relationship dimensions can range from 0 to 27.

The Personal Growth dimensions are measured by the Independence, Achievement Orientation, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Active-Recreational Orientation, and Moral-Religious Emphasis subscales. The Independence Subscale assesses the extent to which family members are assertive, are self-sufficient, and make their own decisions. The Achievement Orientation Subscale measures the extent to which activities (such as school and work) are cast into an achievement-oriented or competitive framework. The Intellectual-Cultural Orientation Subscale measures the degree of interest in political, social, intellectual, and cultural activities. The Active-Recreational Orientation Subscale assesses the extent of participation in social and recreational activities. The Moral-Religious Emphasis Subscale measures the degree of emphasis on ethical and religious issues and values. As the Personal Growth dimensions consist of five subscales, scores can range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 45.

The System Maintenance dimensions consist of only two subscales: The Organization Subscale, measuring the degree of importance of clear organization and structure in
planning family activities and responsibilities; and the Control Subscale, which assesses the extent to which set rules and procedures are used to run family life. The minimum score for the System Maintenance dimensions is 0, and the maximum is 18.

Test-retest reliability over an 8-week interval varies from a low of .68 for the Independence Subscale to a high of .86 for the Cohesion Subscale. Over a 12-month interval, correlations varied from a low of .52 on the Independence Subscale to a high of .89 for Moral-Religious Emphasis.

Validity measures are not listed in the manual, except for some results on construct validity with correlations ranging from $r=.62$ to $r=.39$.

**Design and Statistical Analysis**

The present investigation is considered descriptive research. A "one-shot" case study design was employed (Kerlinger, 1973). No variables were manipulated. Rather, groups of subjects were asked at one point in time to complete five questionnaires. These psychometric instruments measured the variables of anxiety, depression, self-esteem, and family environment, as well as gender, host culture, and length of stay in current host culture. Due to unequal cell sizes, and the fact that most of the data are nominal and ordinal, correlations, multiple regression and general linear model analyses were utilized. Although
statistics for the various dependent variables will be reported individually as well, an Adjustment Index was also computed for each subject, in part to control for effects of multicollinearity. The scores of the Children’s Depression Inventory (CDI), State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC), and the How I See Myself Scale (HISMS) subscales were all normalized. Twenty per cent of each of the five HISMS subscales, Teacher-School (TS), Physical Appearance (PA), Interpersonal Adequacy (IA), Autonomy (AU), and Academic Adequacy (AA) was added to the single-scaled CDI and STAIC to arrive at an Adjustment Index (AI).

Multiple regression analyses were used to analyze the relationships among gender, culture, length of stay, and each of the dependent measures. When analysis demonstrated no significant differences across gender, this variable was then suppressed and some of the data reanalyzed using only host country and length of stay as independent variables. Interaction effects were then also analyzed. The level of significance for all statistical procedures was the .05 level.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview

This chapter will provide information regarding the results of the study and an analysis of the data. Preliminary and supplementary analyses of statistical procedures that were performed to clarify the findings will be discussed, as will possible explanations for the findings. Data will be summarized in tabular form where appropriate. For all statistical procedures reported, the sample group of students was composed of 68 subjects. Of this total, 41 were male and 27 female; 14 had lived in their current country of residence for less than one year, and 54 for one year or more; 17 were residents of Japan, 24 were residents of Switzerland, and 27 were residents of Venezuela. The average subject was 10 1/2 years old, had lived abroad for approximately 6 1/2 years, and had lived in an average of 1 1/2 cultures. The average subject's parents were both U.S. citizens, the father was employed by a U.S. corporation and the mother was a homemaker. The subject had 1.3 brothers or sisters, and in the vast majority of cases, the siblings were living with the subject.
This chapter will be arranged in three sections. The first section will be a preliminary comparison of subjects classified as either "high" or "low" on the Adjustment Index. Perceptions of their family life will be compared using the Family Environment Scale (FES) to determine what role family factors play in adjustment to another culture. The second section will be an analysis and discussion of the tests of hypotheses. Gender, length of stay, host culture, and their interactions will be analyzed for their significance to adjustment abroad. The third section will analyze the results of the individual instruments which comprise the Adjustment Index to determine if any variable particularly affects the outcome of the tests of anxiety, depression, or self-esteem. Also included in this final section will be an analysis of scores on the Family Environment Scale (FES) by subjects with more or less than one year in the current host culture, as this length of stay variable proved to be the most crucial in determining scores on the Adjustment Index.

Before beginning the preliminary comparisons, however, some general statements about the data will be made. A correlational matrix of the dependent variables is found in Table 1. Low scores on the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI) and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children (STAIC) represent adjustment, while high scores on the How I See Myself Scale (HISMS) suggest adjustment.
## Table 1

**Correlations among Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAIC</th>
<th>CDI</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAIC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.708***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>0.564***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>0.265*</td>
<td>0.435***</td>
<td>0.314**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>0.346***</td>
<td>0.525***</td>
<td>0.623***</td>
<td>0.560***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.326***</td>
<td>0.383**</td>
<td>0.450***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
<td>0.576***</td>
<td>0.367**</td>
<td>0.474***</td>
<td>0.526***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-0.878***</td>
<td>-0.909***</td>
<td>0.630***</td>
<td>0.512***</td>
<td>0.664***</td>
<td>0.406***</td>
<td>0.419***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

N=68

- .05 = •
- .01 = **
- .001 = ***
Hence, there are negative correlations between the depression and anxiety measures, and the self-esteem scales. Intercorrelations among the HISMS subscales range from .314 to .623. Although significantly correlated as expected, separate factors do appear to be measured by this instrument. The greatest correlation between purportedly independent factors is that between the CDI and STAIC (.708).

Each factor appears to be highly correlated with the Adjustment Index as well, ranging from -.909 to .406. These correlations show the Adjustment Index to be a reasonable factor to use, then, to test hypotheses in the multiple regression analyses.

However, concern with such high correlations is noted: Are the variables which comprise the Adjustment Index in fact separate factors? As will be demonstrated in the third section of this chapter, even though these variables appear to mimic each other, the multiple regression analyses suggest that each operates as a separate construct.

Preliminary Comparisons

A preliminary analysis of the data was conducted in order to determine if family variables were related to degree of adjustment reported.
Using a mean split by normalized scores on the Adjustment Index, a series of comparisons was made between the two groups on the ten FES scales. The subjects reported significant differences on five of the ten scales, suggesting that perceived difference among families exist. Table 2 reports $F$, $p$, and $R^2$ values for all scales.

Significant differences ($p < .05$) were recorded on four scales: Conflict, Active-Recreational Orientation, Organization, and Control. A significant difference ($p < .001$) was found on the Cohesion scale. The groups, labeled High Adjustment and Low Adjustment were not intended to represent relative adjustment in any absolute sense. Scores from the continuous Adjustment Index variable were simply categorized in order to examine the possible impact of perceived family distinctions on relative adjustment.

Sojourners in the Low Adjustment group reported significant differences on two of the three Relationship Dimension scales. They perceived their families as less cohesive, suggesting that family members provide each other with less help and support than in the High Adjustment group. They also reported a greater degree of conflict, suggesting that anger and aggression were more openly expressed in their families than in those of the High Adjustment group. No significant differences were reported on the Expressiveness scale.
Table 2

ANOVA Results on Normalized FES Subscale Scores by Mean Split (High versus Low) on Adjustment Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>.0005***</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Cultural</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active-Recreational</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.035*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Religious Emphasis</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df 1,66 for all tests

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
On the Personal Growth Dimension, no significant differences were found on the Independence, Intellectual-Cultural Orientation, Achievement Orientation, or the Moral-Religious Emphasis scales. The Low Adjustment group did, however, rate their families as lower than the High Adjustment group on the Active-Recreational Orientation scale, suggesting that both individually and with family members, the Low Adjusters participated in fewer social and recreational activities.

Finally, on the System Maintenance Dimension, significant differences were discovered on both of this dimension's scales: Organization and Control. The Low Adjustment Group reported less organization in their families, suggesting that less importance is placed on structure and organization in planning family activities and responsibilities than was perceived by the High Adjusters. The Low Adjustment group also perceived greater control in their families, suggesting that family life is run by more steadfast rules than is the family life in the High Adjustment group.

Again, caution must be used in attributing meaning to these data, particularly as the sojourners were not maladjusted in any absolute sense. Further analysis of FES results will be made in post_hoc comparisons to determine if perception of family differences appear to have any relationship to other variables.
Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: There is no relationship between gender and adjustment.

As reported in Table 3, the correlation between gender and adjustment was -.010. This nonsignificant correlation suggests that a sojourner's gender has no practical relationship to the degree of adjustment experienced. In fact, correlations between gender and each of the dependent variables which comprise the Adjustment Index (i.e., depression, anxiety, and self-esteem) were all individually nonsignificant as well.

Table 4, a stepwise multiple regression for the Adjustment Index, further amplifies the nonsignificant findings of the correlation matrix detailed in Table 3. In order to be entered into the regression equation, variables had only to meet a .1500 level of significance. While other variables readily met this criterion, gender was not among them. The regression equation derived from the statistical procedure detailed in Table 4 does not include gender as a critical factor in determining level of adjustment.

On the basis of these results, there is no evidence to reject the null hypothesis. In this study, the students' gender clearly did not appear to have any effect on the degree of adjustment reported.
Table 3

Correlations between Gender and Adjustment (total and subscales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAIC</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

No correlation significant at <.05 level.
Table 4

**Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Adjustment Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Length of Stay</th>
<th>R² = 0.11</th>
<th>c(P) = 8.56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1759.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13578.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 8.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.0047 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Country</th>
<th>R² = 0.22</th>
<th>c(P) = 2.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3329.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15338.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 9.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.0004 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-8.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>14.608</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-6.332</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
While these results are not in the expected direction, it is important to note that speculation, more than a broad research base, supported acceptance of gender as a factor in adjustment. Baty and Dold (1977) hypothesize that women may adapt more readily than men to a situation in which they are required to be dependent for a time. Their conclusions suggest women exhibit greater adaptability and, therefore, experience less stress (hence, better adjustment) than their male counterparts.

Other studies (notably, Useem, 1966) which suggest women have a more difficult adjustment, compare adjustment between husbands (i.e., overseas employees) and wives (i.e., overseas dependent spouses). This research is not a true study of gender differences in adjustment. It is more appropriately classified as one of more versus less supported roles in an alien culture.

Nevertheless, the results of the current investigation cannot support either view. They must, however, be considered with some reservation. The age of the students in this study may be an important factor. It is certainly conceivable that 10 to 12 year olds may be too young to be seriously affected by different sex role expectations placed upon them by an alien culture.

Second, and perhaps more important, is a flaw in the data collection. There were no female respondents in the Far Eastern sample. Although preliminary approval for
testing in a girls' school had been obtained, the investigator was refused admission to the school at the time of the study. Data from female students in Japan may have altered the results somewhat.

As the data stand, however, gender and degree of adjustment do not appear to be at all related in this investigation.

Hypothesis Two: There is no relationship between length of stay and degree of adjustment.

The correlations between length of stay and the subscales of the Adjustment Index, as well as the total adjustment score are reported in Table 5. An inspection of this table reveals that three of the seven subscales and the total Adjustment Index are significantly correlated with length of stay.

Considering the strength of the correlations between the Adjustment Index and its component parts, a positive correlation between length of stay and the Adjustment Index ($r = .339, p = .005$) is not unexpected. While four of the five subscales (Teacher-School, Physical Appearance, Autonomy, and Academic Adequacy) of the HISMS are not significantly correlated with length of stay, Interpersonal Adequacy, CDI, and STAIC scores are significantly correlated.

Again examining Table 4, it is noted that length of stay is the first variable entered into the multiple regression equation. Of the total variance, 11% is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAIC</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>.007**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
accounted for by length of stay. With 1, 66 degrees of freedom, $F=8.55$ and $p=0.0047$. These highly significant results suggest that length of stay may be the single most important factor related to the sojourners' Adjustment Index score, and appear to partially support prior research (Torbjorn, 1986; Lygaard, 1955) and others who defend the U-curve hypothesis. In their first year in a new culture, the adolescents in the current investigation appeared significantly less well adjusted in comparison to their peers who had been in the current country for more than one year. The null hypothesis, that there is no relationship between length of stay and adjustment, cannot be accepted.

Of particular interest is the magnitude of the correlation for sojourners of less than one year's duration and depression (as measured by the CDI). Heightened depression scale scores in the first year also offer little surprise. This highly significant correlation ($r=0.323$, $p=0.007$) suggests that depression decreases over time. The twelve-month minimum stay for a subject to be placed in the "more than one year" category may have allowed the sojourner to develop friendships, better establish his or her identity, and begin to better accept life in the host culture, and, thus, lower his or her score on the CDI.

Those students with less than 12 months in their current country of residence were much more likely to admit to signs and symptoms of depression than were those students
with more than 12 months in country. This finding is in the expected direction and supports earlier investigations done with adults (Klineberg, 1970; Golden, 1973).

It should be noted that in addition to statistical significance, the mean score of the less-than-one-year group may be clinically significant, too. The mean score for the normative group of school children was 9.28. The mean score of the sample with more than one year was 6.9. Mean scores of the normative sample diagnosed with Major Depressive Disorder was 11.7; those diagnosed with Dysthymic Disorder scored a mean of 12.8. The mean for the current investigation’s sample of those with less than one year was 11.8, a mean score falling between the means of the normative sample’s clinically diagnosed mood disorders.

The standard deviations (ranging from 5.3 to 7.3) of the various groups make diagnosis impossible from test scores alone. However, the less-than-one-year group’s mean approximates those of diagnostically significant groups and is in the direction expected by previous research.

As reported in Chapter II, some degree of depression is encountered so often among adult sojourners as to be considered normal (Klineberg, 1970). Being uprooted from familiar surroundings and an emerging support group appears to affect adolescents as it does adults. In addition to testing for mood, the CDI also tests for vegetative signs of depression (e.g., insomnia and appetite changes). Again, it
is not surprising that these symptoms are, presumably, more often endorsed by the more recently arrived group. The new food, sights, and sounds of an alien culture can be expected to have some bearing on these signs. Length of stay, therefore, appears to be a particularly important factor in explaining depression in minor U.S. expatriates.

Anxiety, as measured by the STAIC, also appears to decrease with length of stay ($r=-.241, p=.048$). Although the correlation's magnitude and significance are somewhat less than that of depression, it is in the expected direction. Factors similar to those affecting depression may come into play.

The results of the study suggest that anxiety decreases with time in a new culture. As a primary symptom of culture shock, anxiety was expected to manifest itself in those sojourners with less than one year's residence in the host cultures.

As the students adjust to their new culture, the unexpected becomes normal and anxiety can be expected to lessen. While there appears to be a decrease in anxiety over time in the host cultures, it is important to note that the students in the current investigation cannot be considered anxious in any absolute sense. Although not significantly different from the mean scores of the normative group, the sample group's mean scores were, in fact, slightly lower than those of the norm group. In other
words, the sojourners reported slightly less anxiety than their U.S. counterparts at less than one year in country, and their anxiety level appeared to drop even further after 12 months in country.

Scores on only one of the five self-esteem subscales were significantly correlated with length of stay. The significant, positive correlation ($r=.373$, $p=.002$) suggests that scores of the factor labeled Interpersonal Adequacy increase over time. Allowing that these students are confronted with a new foreign language on a daily basis, feelings of interpersonal adequacy are understandably affected. As the sojourner becomes more accustomed to the new language, his sense of interpersonal adequacy appears to increase as well.

Although foreign language competence is not specifically measured by the HISMS, items such as "I learn new things easily" and "I control my feelings well" are included on this subscale. These items may well tap into an initial inability to effectively communicate in a second language, and its accompanying frustrations.

Mean scores of the other four subscales were not significantly affected by length of stay. The first of these is the Teacher-School factor. For the most part, all subjects appeared to be comfortable with their roles as students and expressed a usual degree of satisfaction with their teachers and their schools. A possible explanation
for no apparent initial discomfort is that the student aspect of their role abroad is perhaps the most supported and unchanged of their various roles. Classes are taught in English and curricula are primarily American. Furthermore, each of the schools is accustomed to a changing population, and staff members may be more attuned to putting new students at ease. Frequent moves may also lessen the students' own negative reactions to a new academic environment.

The Autonomy scale was also virtually unaffected by length of stay. The HISMS test manual (Gordon, 1959) cautions that the label "may convey more than is warranted" (p.15). The high scorer on this scale may, in fact, be seen as more task than group oriented. The scale items key into individual talents, and an ability--rather than a preference--to act alone. This ability appeared to be relatively unaffected by length of stay.

The two remaining scales, Physical Appearance and Academic Adequacy, were not affected by length of stay. As discussed in Chapter II, research on academic achievement vis-a-vis mobility is for the most part inconclusive. That research, however, utilized objective rather than subjective scales. The grades of the adolescents in the current investigation may have dropped after their move to an alien culture. What has not suffered is their perception of their academic ability. Additionally, prior research (Blane and
Spicer, 1978) has suggested that for children from low SES environments, a move has a negative impact on academic achievement; but for those from other SES backgrounds, moves do not affect academics. The students of the current investigation are all from at least middle level socio-economic status. Therefore, no dramatic drop should have been predicted.

Also as mentioned in Chapter II, Whalen and Fried (1973) demonstrated that geographic mobility exacerbated already-existing academic differences. Those students with pre-existing academic deficiencies may have been selected out of the current investigation by remaining in the U.S.

Physical Appearance scale scores also showed no statistically significant differences by length of stay. Again, there is no body of research to suggest that scores on this aspect of self-esteem can be expected to drop during a sojourn to an alien culture. Speculation to that effect would probably be tied into culture and the degree of physical difference from the host population. These comments are more appropriately addressed in the following sections.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no relationship between country of residence and adjustment. The results of the statistical procedures used to test this hypothesis revealed that the country of residence did, indeed, appear to have an effect on the degree of adjustment reported.
As reported in Table 6, the correlation between adjustment and country of residence was \(-0.258\). This correlation, significant at the \(p < 0.05\) level, suggests that the U.S. sojourner's expatriate nation has some relationship to the degree of adjustment experienced.

Examining Table 6 more fully, the single significant component of the Adjustment Index to country is the STAIC. The positive correlation \((r = 0.367, \ p = 0.002)\) between STAIC and country indicates that the level of anxiety expressed in fact varies by country.

The multiple regression analysis detailed in Table 4 shows the variable "country" is the second to be entered into the equation, accounting for an additional 11% of the variance \((F = 9.01, \ p = 0.0004, \ d.f. = 2,65)\).

While the overall explanation of this variable does not allow acceptance of the null hypothesis, further evaluation of the data help to clarify the results. In the preceding analysis, "country" was considered as a continuous variable, representing greater or lesser distance from the U.S. culture. Table 7 breaks down the variable "country" into the three cultures under investigation. The only country appearing to have a significant \((p < 0.05)\) impact on the Adjustment Index is Japan. The data suggest that adjustment is negatively affected by life in this culture \((r = -0.286)\). Switzerland and Venezuela appear to play no significant role in overall adjustment.
Table 6

Correlations between Country of Residence and Adjustment (total and subcales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAIC</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
Table 7

Correlations between Actual Country of Residence and Adjustment (total and subcales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAIC</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>-.282**</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.225</td>
<td>.345**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>-.286*</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
When the Adjustment Index is divided into component parts by individual country, only the STAIC scores are significant. Looking at these scores, however, both Japan and Switzerland are significantly correlated with anxiety. The positive correlation ($r=.342$) between Japan and STAIC scores suggests anxiety is significantly higher among the group of expatriate students in Japan than in the other countries. The negative correlation ($r=-.282$) between Switzerland and anxiety suggests that sojourners are significantly less anxious in Switzerland than in the other countries under investigation.

As with the correlation tables, the significance of "country" can be more fully explained in the regression analysis by entering each country individually. As Table 8 indicates, length of stay is still the first variable entered accounting for 11% of the variance of the Adjustment Index. As in Table 4, when "country" is broken down, however, the second and only other variable entered is Japan, accounting for an additional 9.5% of the variance. Results of a forward selection multiple regression procedure produce similar results and are presented in Appendix C, Table 20. Using Torbijn’s (1982) measure of cultural distance, of the three countries in the current investigation, Japan was most distinct from the U.S., Switzerland the most similar, and Venezuela fell somewhere
Table 8

**Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Adjustment Index with Each Country of Residence Entered Individually**

Variable entered: **Length of Stay**  \( R^2 = .11 \)  \( c(P) = 7.79 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1759.70</td>
<td>1759.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>13578.70</td>
<td>205.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 8.55 \quad p = .0047^{**} \]

Variable entered: **Japan**  \( R^2 = .205 \)  \( c(P) = 2.17 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3145.15</td>
<td>1572.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>12193.25</td>
<td>187.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 8.38 \quad p = .0006^{***} \]

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-16.678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>13.050</td>
<td>10.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-10.433</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 68 \]

\[ .05 = * \]
\[ .01 = ** \]
\[ .001 = *** \]
between the two. Anxiety scores were highest in Japan, lowest in Switzerland, and moderate in Venezuela.

Although not statistically significant, depression scores resulted in the same pattern: highest in Japan, lowest in Switzerland, and moderate in Venezuela. Of course CDI and STAIC scores were highly correlated ($r=0.708$) in this investigation, as were the component scores and the Adjustment Index as a whole. Nevertheless, although only the Adjustment Index for Japan is statistically significant, scores fall in the same order. Irrespective of gender or length of stay, cultural distance appeared to moderate or exacerbate adjustment. The multiple regression analysis (Table 4) suggested that country of residence accounted for 11% of the variance in Adjustment Index scores.

Most previous research has been conducted on adults. While findings were similar to those of the current investigation, measures were often made using non-psychological instruments (e.g., a "satisfaction index") and were often completed after a return to the sojourner's homeland (Lygaard, 1955; Galtung, 1965). The findings of this investigation tended to support the hypothesis that ease of adjustment is, in part, determined by cultural similarity to the sojourner's home culture.

Somewhat surprisingly, country of residence did not appear to significantly affect measures of self-esteem. The Teacher-School and Academic Adequacy scores were not
expected to vary dramatically. As with length of stay, all students appeared to be appropriately adjusted to their educational environments. Although after-school activities may be fewer than would be expected in U.S. schools, teachers, classes, and buildings are not notably distinct from what would be found in the U.S. Clearly, each school has an international flavor; however, compared to other areas of the sojourner's life, the school environment is probably closest to life "back home."

Physical Appearance scale scores were expected to vary by culture. In very general terms, Americans' body builds, coloring, facial features, and size are most similar to the Swiss, then the Venezuelans, and least similar to the Japanese. Results of the Physical Appearance scale scores did not fall in this order. One possible explanation is that although noticeably different in appearance, the sojourners did not compare themselves with host country nationals. American cultural standards of beauty may be well-enough ingrained by adolescence that the sojourners did not change their standards according to local custom. Also, American (tall, blond-haired, blue-eyed) models are frequently seen on billboards and magazine advertisements in all countries included in this study. Rather than considering themselves an unattractive minority, the students may view themselves as an attractive ideal. The
stares and attention often paid to the sojourners by the local population may be ego enhancing.

Scale scores on Interpersonal Adequacy also did not fall in the expected direction. As previously stated, however, foreign language competency is not measured by this scale. Furthermore, many of the scale's items are directly related to academics and school activities. Compared to the host cultures in general, the school settings represent a fairly isolated enclave substantially distinct from the cultures themselves. A more cross-culturally specific instrument may have led to results in the anticipated direction.

Autonomy scale scores were the only self-esteem factor to be significantly affected by country of residence. Respondents in Venezuela rated themselves substantially higher on this factor than their counterparts in Japan or Switzerland. Caution about inferences from the factor label "Autonomy" have already been made: task versus group orientation may be a more accurate descriptor. Even with this caveat in mind, a clear explanation for the differences was not developed. Actual cultural distinctions (e.g., machismo) may have affected the outcomes, but a definitive answer is not supported in the literature.

These results suggest the host culture does, in fact, play a role in adjustment and the null hypothesis cannot be
accepted. These findings support earlier research in the area, notably Torbiorn, 1986.

Hypothesis Four: There is no relationship between gender, length of stay, country of residence, and adjustment.

Table 9 presents the results of correlations between the Adjustment Index and the variables of gender, length of stay, and country, as well as higher-order interaction correlations. Although adjustment, as measured by the Adjustment Index, is significantly correlated with length of stay ($r=.338, p=.005$) and country ($r=-.245, p=.044$), the Adjustment Index correlations with gender and all interactions of gender, length of stay, and country are not significant.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was run on the Adjustment Index using all three independent variables and the three two-way interactions as well as the one possible three-way interaction. Results are presented in Table 10. As in Table 4, length of stay is still the first variable entered, accounting for 11% of the total variance. The factor country was entered next, and explained an additional 10% of the variance. The third-order interaction (gender * length of stay * country) was the next variable entered, and an additional 9% of the variance was explained. The fourth variable entered was gender, and it accounted for
Table 9

Correlations between all Independent Variables and Their Interactions and the Adjustment Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Residence</td>
<td>-.245</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Length</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Country</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length * Country</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Length * Country</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
Table 10

Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Adjustment Index
by Independent Variables and Their Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Length of Stay</th>
<th>R2 = 0.11</th>
<th>$c(P) = 17.16$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$SS$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>319.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 8.51$</td>
<td>$p = 0.005^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Country</th>
<th>R2 = 0.21</th>
<th>$c(P) = 10.01$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$SS$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>283.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 8.85$</td>
<td>$p = 0.0004^{***}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Gender<em>Length</em>Country</th>
<th>R2 = 0.30</th>
<th>$c(P) = 4.31$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$SS$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>253.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 9.06$</td>
<td>$p = 0.0001^{***}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Gender</th>
<th>R2 = 0.33</th>
<th>$c(P) = 3.38$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$SS$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>119.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>360.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 7.76$</td>
<td>$p = 0.0001^{***}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable removed: Length of Stay</th>
<th>R2 = 0.32</th>
<th>$c(P) = 2.15$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$df$</td>
<td>$SS$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>244.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 10.11$</td>
<td>$p = 0.0001^{***}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>-2.131</td>
<td>5.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.769</td>
<td>24.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender<em>Len</em>Country</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 68$  
$.05 = *$  
$.01 = **$  
$.001 = {***}$
3% more of the variance. The fifth and final step was the removal of length of stay, the factor responsible for more variance than any other. This left country, gender, and the three-way interaction to account for a total of 32% of the variance.

A comparison of Beta weights for each of the three final variables (each of which was significant at $p < .05$ level) with the correlations between the Adjustment Index and each variable revealed that although the Beta weights and their component correlations shared the same direction, the nonsignificant correlations of gender and the interaction with the Adjustment Index reveal gender and the interaction to be moderator variables. Although both variables are significant to the multiple regression model, in practical terms they are meaningless.

A second stepwise multiple regression was done on the Adjustment Index, this time using the individual countries as separate variables. The other variables (gender and length of stay) remained the same. Using each country individually, nine second-order interactions and one third-order interaction were produced. Table 11 presents the correlations and Table 12 the regression itself. Four of the interactions are significantly correlated at the $p < .05$ level. They are the Adjustment Index with: length of stay * Switzerland ($r = .238$); gender * Japan ($r = -.281$); gender *
Table 11
Correlations between All Independent Variables, Their Interactions and the Adjustment Index (with Countries Considered Individually)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.896</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length * Japan</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length * Switzerland</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length * Venezuela</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Japan</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Switzerland</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Venezuela</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Length</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Length * Japan</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Length * Switzerland</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Length * Venezuela</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.028*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68
.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
Table 12

**Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Adjustment Index with Interactions and Each Country of Residence Entered Individually**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>R² = .11</th>
<th>F = 8.36</th>
<th>p = .005**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td>40.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>319.14</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>R² = .20</th>
<th>F = 8.11</th>
<th>p = .0007***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>287.76</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Length * Japan</th>
<th>R² = .26</th>
<th>F = 7.56</th>
<th>p = .0002***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>265.54</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-4.341</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length * Japan</td>
<td>3.401</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

N = 68  .05 = *  .01 = **  .001 = ***
Venezuela ($r = .266$); and gender * length of stay * Venezuela ($r = .266$).

As with the previous multiple regression table (Table 10), length of stay was entered first and accounted for 11% of the variance. Adding Japan, an additional 9% was accounted for. The final variable to meet the .15 significance level for entry into the model was the interaction of length of stay * Japan, and this interaction accounted for 6% more of the variance. The Beta weight of this variable (Beta = 3.40) and its correlation value to the Adjustment Index ($r = -.067$, $p = .586$) have opposite signs. Furthermore, the correlation is not significant. It must therefore be considered either an indeterminant or a pure moderator variable, and as such, carries no practical meaning, even though it is significant to the multiple regression model. A forward selection multiple regression procedure with all dependent variables and their interactions is included in Appendix C, Table 21. Although the results are somewhat different, no interaction is significant except as a moderator to the regression model.

To further control for any statistical anomaly created by use of a stepwise procedure, an additional analysis was completed. A General Linear Models procedure, a cross between multiple regression and ANOVA corrected for unequal cell sizes was computed. As gender had not proven to be a variable significantly correlated with the
Adjustment Index or any of its components, and had not appeared as a significant factor in any of the multiple regression analyses, it was deleted in this procedure. Six cells (3 countries by 2 length of stay categories) were created. The countries, length of stay, and their interactions were entered into the model. The results of this procedure are presented in Table 13. Both length of stay ($F=9.71$, $p=.0028$) and country ($F=4.36$, $p=.0169$) are significant at $<.05$ level. The country * length of stay interaction, however, is not significant ($F=2.28$, $p=.1104$).

Considering the results of Tables 9 through 13, then, the significance of any interactions can only be viewed as that of moderator variables: mathematically helpful, but practically without significance. For this reason, there is no evidence to reject Hypothesis Four. The results of the statistical procedures used to test this hypothesis revealed that interaction among independent variables appeared to have no effect on adjustment.

No strong research base supported or refuted these findings. It would seem that the more culturally distant the country, the deeper the fall in adjustment, and the deeper the fall, the more time would be needed to readjust. The results of the current investigation suggested that the first part of that equation is true. Sojourners in Japan expressed greater difficulty in adjustment, as did sojourners with less than one year in any country. The
Table 13

**General Linear Models Procedure for the Adjustment Index**

by Country, Length of Stay, and Their Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97.58</td>
<td>19.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>263.12</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>360.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 4.60 \quad p = 0.0013^{**} \quad R^2 = 0.27 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>PR&gt;F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>( .0028^{**} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.01</td>
<td>( .0169^{*} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length * Country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>( .1104 ) (na)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 68 \]

\[ .01 = * \]
\[ .05 = ** \]
\[ .001 = *** \]
second half of the equation, that additional time is needed to adapt to a more alien culture, did not appear to be true: namely, that no significant interaction results. Even though the Far Eastern culture made for a more difficult adjustment process, recovery time appeared to be approximately equal in all cultures.

These results might have been skewed by utilizing only two length of stay categories. Had the sample been sufficiently large to add a one-to-two-year category, an interaction may have been significant. Another possible explanation is that with this age group, at least, adjustment to any new culture was difficult, but that degree of difficulty in no way affected the average time required to achieve a more positive state of adjustment.

A third possible explanation is attrition. Perhaps rates of premature return were higher in Japan. Families of those students who experienced the most severe adjustment difficulties may have returned to the U.S. Their exclusion from the sample could conceivably have obviated any interaction significance.

Torbiorn (1982) did not include interaction effects in his regression analysis. Graphic diagrams (pp. 136-7) suggest that at some point (> more than 4 years) no discernable differences existed by culture on some satisfaction variables, while major differences existed on others. Other comparable, long-term studies were not
available. Definitive answers regarding interactions are not supported in the literature.

Additional Findings

In order to better determine specific aspects of adjustment that were significantly affected by the variables of gender, length of stay, and individual country, multiple regression analyses were run on the STAIC, CDI, and each of the five components of the HISMS. Results of the analyses will be discussed individually for each instrument.

Table 14 is a stepwise multiple regression for the STAIC. In order to be entered into the equation, a variable had to meet the .1500 level of significance for consideration. The first entry was Japan which accounted for 12% of the total variance of the anxiety score as measured by the STAIC. An additional 6% of the variance was accounted for by length of stay. The final variable, Venezuela, accounted for an additional 5%. In total, then, 23% of the variance on the STAIC can be accounted for by Japan, length of stay, and Venezuela. Neither gender nor Switzerland appears to have any significant effect on anxiety. The regression equation is: \( \text{STAIC} = .126 + 1.08 \times \text{(Japan)} - .758 \times \text{(LOS)} + .513 \times \text{(Venezuela)}. \)

Table 15 is a stepwise multiple regression for the CDI. Again, entry into the equation required a .1500 level
Table 14

Stepwise Multiple Regression for the STAIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Japan</th>
<th>R² = 0.12  c(P) = 9.69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 8.72</td>
<td>p = 0.0044**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Length of Stay</th>
<th>R² = 0.18  c(P) = 6.26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 7.22</td>
<td>p = 0.0015**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Venezuela</th>
<th>R² = 0.23  c(P) = 4.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 6.34</td>
<td>p = 0.0009***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>-.758</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>14.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------------------------------------------------------------------

N = 68  .05 = *  .01 = **  .001 = ***
Table 15

Stepwise Multiple Regression for the CDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>R2 = 0.10</th>
<th>c(P) = 5.91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60.03</td>
<td>.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 7.67$</td>
<td>$p = .0073^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Switzerland</th>
<th>R2 = 0.17</th>
<th>c(P) = 3.07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55.87</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F = 6.48$</td>
<td>$p = .0027^{**}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>-.938</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

* = .05  
** = .01  
*** = .001
of significance. Length of stay was the first variable entered and accounted for 10% of the total variance of depression scores. The only other variable which met the entry criterion was Switzerland. This variable accounted for an additional 7% of the variance. It appears that not only do depression scores drop over time, they also appear to drop considerably by virtue of culture. The sojourners in Switzerland, considered most like the U.S. culture using Torbiorn’s (1982) scaling, seem to be significantly lower on severity of depression experienced. It can be argued, then that the similarity of the host culture to the minor expatriate’s home culture is almost as important as the duration of the cross-cultural experience. Noted again, is that the sojourner’s gender appears to have no appreciable effect on his or her CDI score.

The depression score can be predicted with the following equation: Depression = .933 - .938 (LOS) - .532 (Switzerland).

Tables 16 through 18 are stepwise multiple regressions for the five components of the HISMS. Although each of the scales is highly correlated with each other (p < .001) as noted in Table 1, separate factors are considered to comprise this measure of self-esteem. Each factor was, therefore, considered separately.

Table 16 examines the Teacher-School factor of the HISMS. The only variable which approached significance
Table 16

**Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Teacher-School Component of the HISMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered: Length of Stay</th>
<th>R² = .04 c(P) .969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 2.83 \quad p = .097 \]

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68
(p=.097) accounting for variance in this measure was length of stay. At that, it only accounted for 4% of the total variance. Surprisingly, (when compared to the Adjustment Index as a whole) country of residence appears to have no meaningful relationship to this partial measure of self-esteem. Also of interest is that length of stay appears to have such a limited effect. It would appear that at least in this aspect of self-esteem, the sojourners either do not lose or regain their sense of self as related to Teacher-School rather quickly.

Table 17 presents a stepwise multiple regression for the Interpersonal Adequacy factor of the HISMS. The only variable which appears to significantly (p=.0017) effect these scores is length of stay. Secondary to language and cultural differences, this aspect of self-esteem can be expected to plummet with a move to an alien culture. As expected, those sojourners with less than twelve months in the host country score lower on this subscale. Those who have lived in the host culture for more than one year and have, presumably, learned to communicate to some degree in the second language score higher. Those minor expatriates with more than one year's experience in the host country are also more likely to have formed friendships in their new schools and neighborhoods, which could also lead to higher scores.
Table 17

Stepwise Multiple Regression: the Interpersonal Adequacy
Component of the HISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>10.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68

* = .05
** = .01
*** = .001
Table 18 examines the variance in the scores of the Autonomy component of the HISMS. In this stepwise multiple regression, individual country was the first factor entered. Venezuela was the only significant variable of the countries and it accounted for 12% of the variance of Autonomy. From this finding it could be argued that the sojourner sample from Venezuela believes itself to be significantly more autonomous than those of Japan and Switzerland. The Latin American culture appears to allow the students greater independence than either of the others.

An additional 1% of the variance can be explained by length of stay. Although autonomy increasing with time in country is in the expected direction, it accounts for a surprisingly small percentage of the variance. No other variable met the .1500 level for entry into the model.

Multiple regression analyses were computed to examine the remaining two factors of the HISMS: Physical Appearance and Academic Adequacy. None of the variables (gender, length of stay, or country) met the .1500 significance level for entry into the model. An expected significant finding for Physical Appearance with country, particularly Japan and Venezuela, where the students look so different from host country nationals, was not found.

The students' beliefs about their own Academic Adequacy do not appear to suffer with a move to another culture. This appears to be consistent with earlier
Table 18

Stepwise Multiple Regression for the Autonomy
Component of the HISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
<th>R²=.12</th>
<th>c(P)= 2.42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 8.92  \( p = .004^{**} \)

Variable entered: Length_of_Stay  R²=.15  c(P)= 2.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>56.02</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 5.71  \( p = .0052^{**} \)

No other variable met the .15 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 68 \)

\* = .05
\** = .01
\*** = .001
research (Lacey & Blane, 1978/79) on students making domestic moves.

A final post hoc analysis was run in order to determine if perceived differences in family factors could partially explain differences in adjustment. As length of stay appeared to account for the largest percentage of the variance in Adjustment Index scores, as well as the scores of most of the Index's component parts, a general linear model analysis was computed to determine if there were significant differences on any of the ten FES scales by length of stay. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 19.

As indicated by the table, students with more than one year in the host culture and students with less than one year reported no significant differences in their families. In fact, no difference on the ten scales even approached significance. These results indicate that even while the students themselves reported increased anxiety and depression with a concurrent decrease in some aspects of self-esteem, they perceived their families to be exhibiting the same relative degree of health. In other words, the students did not appear to believe that their families were significantly different by time in a new environment. Family factors did not appear to have any confounding effect on individual relative adjustment.
Table 19

**General Linear Models Procedure on Normalized FES Subscale Scores by Length of Stay (More or Less Than One Year)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.7151</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>.6269</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.9809</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.2237</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Orientation</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>.6540</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual-Cultural</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.2683</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active-Recreational</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.2749</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral-Religious Emphasis</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>.6255</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.4594</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.8855</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**df 1,66 for all tests**

**N = 68**
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The final chapter contains an overview of this study, a review of the significant findings in relation to the research questions, and a synopsis of additional findings. The chapter concludes with theoretical, methodological, and applied implications of the data, and suggestions for continuing research.

Overview of the Study

Sojourner adjustment to an alien culture has been the focus of research for over 35 years. Throughout this period, specific research has been conducted on various groups in various locales employing various methods of data collection and analysis. These studies, however, have always been conducted on sojourners who have left their homelands voluntarily. The focus of the current investigation was on U.S. fourth, fifth, and sixth grade dependents of non-military personnel residing outside the U.S.—a sojourner group not typically studied and a group that has often had little choice in moving from the U.S. to another country.
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Lack of adjustment, or culture shock, is described as an expected reaction that occurs secondary to a change in surroundings, support group, language, and cultural cues. It is generally accompanied by an increase in anxiety and depression and often with a concomitant decrease in self-esteem. Adjustment to another culture is seen as a process which occurs over a period of months, and is characterized by an initial period of elation in the new culture, followed by a period of poor adjustment, followed by an eventual return to baseline. The period of poor adjustment is the culture shock phase, and is often responsible for an early return to one's native culture.

The premature return rate of corporate U.S. sojourners to their homeland is approximately one-third, and culture shock is generally regarded as the reason for early return. Lack of adjustment of family members (rather than the employee) is cited as a primary cause of a family's premature return. Yet the vast majority of multinational corporations provides no advance training or in-country support for family members of the employee.

Whether minor expatriates experience culture shock is not addressed in the literature. The current investigation attempted to discover the ramifications of an international move on this population. Psychological instruments were utilized to measure adjustment.
Adjustment to the host culture was assessed by measuring psychological variables of personal adjustment: anxiety, depression, and self-esteem. Anxiety level was determined by use of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Children. Depression was measured using the Children's Depression Inventory. A measure of self-esteem was made with the How I See Myself Scale. This instrument yields five subscale scores in the following areas: Teacher-School, Physical Appearance, Interpersonal Adequacy, Autonomy, and Academic Adequacy. Utilizing normalized scores from these instruments, an Adjustment Index was calculated for each subject.

This investigation then considered whether gender, length of stay, or host country culture had any moderating or exacerbating effects on adjustment. Subjects were divided into groups by sex, whether they had resided in their current host culture for more or less than one year, and by the countries of residence themselves (which were representative of Western European, Latin American, and Far Eastern cultures.)

A standardized administration format was used with all subjects (N=68). Pearson product moment correlations, multiple regression, and general linear model procedures were used to analyze the data. Supplementary statistical analyses included additional multiple regressions and ANOVAs.
Findings In Relation to Research Questions

The hypotheses tested in the study included the following:

1. There is no relationship between gender and adjustment.

2. There is no relationship between length of stay and adjustment.

3. There is no relationship between country of residence and adjustment.

4. There is no relationship between gender, length of stay, country of residence, and adjustment.

**Hypothesis One.** The results of the tests of this hypothesis revealed that gender had no relationship to adjustment either on the individual scales or on the collective Adjustment Index. Therefore, there was no evidence to reject the Hypothesis One.

**Hypothesis Two.** Hypothesis Two was rejected as length of stay appeared to be the single most important factor in determining adjustment to an alien culture. Of the variance in the multiple regression analysis, 11% was accounted for by length of stay. Significant correlations were reported between length of stay and the Adjustment Index as well as scores on the STAIC, CDI, and the Interpersonal Adequacy subscale of the HISMS.

**Hypothesis Three.** Hypothesis Three was rejected, as country of residence appeared to be the second most
important factor in determining adjustment to a new culture. Of the variance in the Adjustment Index, 11% was accounted for by country. Anxiety, as measured by the STAIC, was the single significant component of the Adjustment Index to vary by country, with anxiety among students in Japan significantly higher and anxiety among students in Switzerland significantly lower than in the sample as a whole. These scores were in the expected direction.

Hypothesis Four. Hypothesis Four was not rejected. Although a number of interactions were significantly correlated with the Adjustment Index, their entry into multiple regression analyses added to the explanation of additional variance only as moderator variables. Though as moderators the interactions added to the mathematical meaning of the multiple regression models, their practical significance was never established. A general linear model analysis was computed after removal of the gender variable. Results indicated that while main effects were significant, interactions were not.

Overall, the results of the tests of hypotheses indicate that a period of poor adjustment does occur in minor sojourners. While gender does not appear to significantly effect the outcome, both length of stay and country of residence seem to play a major role. Interaction between length of stay and country of residence does not appear to be a significant factor.
Synopsis of Additional Findings

The Family Environment Scale (FES) was used in order to determine what role perceived family interactions had in relation to adjustment. As the length of stay variable accounted for the largest percentage of variance on the Adjustment Index, a comparison was made on the FES scales between subjects with more than one year in their host country and those with less than one year. No significant differences between the two groups were discovered on any of the ten FES scales. Length of stay in a new environment did not appear to alter the students’ perceptions of their family life.

The sample was also divided by a mean split on the Adjustment Index, and the two groups (High Adjustment and Low Adjustment) were compared on the FES scales. Significant differences were discovered on five of the ten scales. Subjects in the High Adjustment group perceived their families to be more cohesive, more involved in active-recreational pursuits, more organized, and demonstrating less conflict and less control than did the subjects in the Low Adjustment group.

Theoretical and Methodological Implications of the Data

The focus of this investigation has been to study cross-cultural adjustment variables in new settings and with a new population. Both length of stay and country of residence were variables that consistently correlated with
adjustment, and were useful in predicting degree of adjustment expressed by adolescent, U.S. expatriates. In order to more clearly understand the roles of time and culture to cross-cultural adaptation, pertinent theories related to them will be discussed. It should be noted, however, that theoretical bases of cross-cultural adaptation are weak (Breitenbach, 1970).

Since its inception, Lysgaard’s (1955) U-curve theory of adjustment has had its supporters (DuBois, 1962; Gullahorn and Gullahorn, 1963; Jacobsen, 1963; Morris, 1960; Torbiorn, 1982) and its detractors (Klineberg & Hull, 1979; Golden, 1973). Detractors, for the most part, were unable to fit their data to the model, at least in Lysgaard’s time frame of six to twelve months. Nevertheless, a period of maladjustment is common among sojourners, and most seem to recover. Torbiorn’s (1982) study is the most comprehensive to date with a large sample size (N=1,111) of expatriates who have lived out of their native Sweden from one month to over 10 years. Clear patterns on most factors of satisfaction conform to a U-curve.

Critics have suggested that one reason for the upside of the U (i.e., return to an adjusted state) is due to the return home of those sojourners who were most poorly adjusted. In other words, due to attrition, measures of group satisfaction increase although individual satisfaction remains constant. Torbiorn’s research appeared to control
for that partly by measuring a wide range of time periods, and by using time as a continuous variable. Even if attrition were responsible for the upswing, nothing was able to completely account for the initial elation followed by a period of maladjustment recorded in this study.

The current investigation measured psychological factors, and a similar pattern appeared to emerge. Because the sample size was much smaller, the investigator was better able to control for variation in testing situations by administering tests personally. At least partial support of the U-curve was achieved: that adjustment did appear to increase with time. Measurement of psychological variables paralleled results of earlier research using sociological variables, suggesting that the class of instrument used may vary. Survey research, with its inherent lack of control, may also be considered acceptable in support of this theory.

Cultural distance theory was also supported by the results of this study. Cultural determinants appear to have been clearly set by adolescence, the age of the respondents in the current investigation. The more distant the culture, the more difficult the adjustment, even for adolescents. The investigation's results also supported Torbiorn's (1982) methodology for defining cultural distance (a combination of language, religion, and development.)
Applied Implications of the Data

A period of maladjustment appeared to occur in the majority of adolescent sojourners and this maladjustment was characterized by increased anxiety and depression. Given that this lack of adjustment may be partially responsible for the inordinately high premature return rate of U.S. sojourners, it would seem logical that appropriate steps be taken to try to decrease the incidence and/or lessen the severity of the psychological transition period for the mental health of the sojourner as well as the benefit of the MNCs. Actions which could be taken by the international schools, the MNCs, and the students' families will be addressed in this section.

If a rationale is needed for schools to become more involved in their students' psychological well-being, the fact that students learn more easily in periods of psychological adjustment is offered. Increased attention paid to first year students may prove to be a crucial factor. Classroom teachers may not always have the additional time to spare, but the school counselor or psychologist should. Frequent meetings to discuss the student's adaptation to a new school and culture should be considered. In addition to individual sessions, group meetings of all first year students might be advisable. The majority of the new students expressed similar levels of distress, and peer support could prove invaluable.
Assigning "buddies" to the new students from among those students who have adjusted well and can relate some of their own experiences may prove beneficial, as well.

MNCs could ease some of the burden placed on the international schools in a number of ways. Donating salaries for school counselors or psychologists where none exist, or to increase their numbers where they do exist, would be a start. Considering the MNCs' cost of premature returns or the hidden costs of an employee whose family is in distress, this measure could be cost effective in the first year.

MNCs, however, could begin their work before the family ever leaves the U.S. Selection of employees for international positions has been repeatedly criticized in the literature. Improved selection processes, which include spouse and children should be considered. Pre-departure training in language and culture is recommended. This would necessitate more than the current 30 to 60 day average (Baker, 1976) between selection and departure in order to be effective. Semi-annual visits to the family by personnel trained in cross-cultural adjustment might also be in order and, again, could prove cost effective in the first year, especially in areas where more than one family has been assigned.

Finally, the parents themselves can be taught to recognize stages of cultural adjustment. Knowing what to
expect and approximately when to expect it may help avert disaster. One difficulty with this idea, however, is that this investigation suggested that children may be going through reactions similar to those of their parents. Perhaps informal family support groups organized by well-adjusted, established, expatriate families could provide the necessary guidance newly arrived families need.

Suggestions for Continuing Research

The results of this investigation suggest new areas for future research. To date, most cross-cultural adjustment research has been done on adults and college-aged students. The current investigation suggests that younger expatriates experience similar periods of maladjustment in approximately the same time frame as their adult counterparts. Further investigations with various age groups may define an "ideal" age to live outside one's own culture, an age where the ramifications of culture shock would be lessened. Additional research to amplify the results of this study and more precisely define which cultures are "hard" and which are "easy" for American students would be welcomed.

Studies utilizing tests of repeated measures would also be helpful. The majority of the investigations completed have been one-shot case studies. Longitudinal designs could control for premature returns to the U.S.
(i.e., attrition) and, consequently, verify time as the factor responsible for the apparent improvement in adjustment. Repeated measures could also confirm or refute the validity of various methods of selection and pre-departure cross-cultural training.

The continued use of psychological measures to examine psychological factors is recommended. The validity of satisfaction indices and problem check lists as measures of adjustment is questionable. Psychological instruments with validity scales or methods of cross-validating self-report measures are needed.

With larger sample sizes and more nearly equal cell sizes, ANOVAS rather than multiple regressions could be utilized. Controlling for additional variance with this or other designs and statistical procedures is recommended.

Finally, improved validity and reliability as well as broader normative group populations, particularly on instruments used with adolescent sojourners must be addressed.
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APPENDIX A
April 28, 1986

Superintendent
School
Address
Country

Dear Superintendent,

I am a doctoral candidate in counseling psychology at Loyola University of Chicago, and am currently collecting data for my dissertation. Having had college roommates who were American but reared out of the U.S., I became interested in the adjustments people make in adapting to other cultures. As a Peace Corps volunteer in Colombia in the 70s, I gained some first-hand experience. While working on my doctorate, I was employed as a flight attendant for Pan Am and was able to speak with principals and headmasters who supported my research. Unfortunately, our Pan Am layovers in your city were brief and not during school hours, so I was never able to meet with you.

As you’ve probably guessed, I would like to administer some tests to some of your students. As an administrator at an international school, I realize that you receive many such requests. I think, however, that you will find that my research design is solid and my hypotheses are interesting. I am enclosing copies of the four instruments I am using, as well as copies of a parental consent form and cover letter.

As I still receive flying privileges on Pan Am, I would personally come to your city to administer the questionnaires. I have already done so in two other cities, and know that administration of all instruments takes between 25 and 55 minutes depending on the size of the group. All that I would need from you (in addition to your permission!) is a place to test, and for someone to distribute consent forms to your fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students who have at least one parent who is an American citizen.

Thank you for considering my request. I will telephone you next week about possible testing dates in May.

Sincerely,

Tim Lawler
Dear Parent:

I am a graduate student at Loyola University of Chicago’s School of Education, and am conducting my dissertation research on fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade American children living in Asia, Western Europe, and Latin America. Having lived and taught in other countries myself, I am aware that transitions from one culture to another are not always easy.

Although this transition process has been studied extensively in adults, virtually nothing has been written on children. My study proposes to assess the personal and social adjustment of children whose heritage is at least part American, and has the backing of the administration and faculty of your child’s school.

I am quite hopeful that the results of this study will be helpful to you, your son or daughter, and to other parents considering a move out of the U.S. The results may also provide an impetus for certain recommendations to international schools, and possibly to corporations that station Americans abroad.

The instruments will be administered in a group, and answer sheets will be coded to protect your child’s anonymity. The schools that have agreed to allow me to conduct my research will remain anonymous as well.

Would you please read, sign, and return the enclosed Parental Consent Form? It is a requirement of Loyola University, and further assures the respondents’ confidentiality.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Timothy Lawler
Loyola University of Chicago
Counseling Psychology and Higher Education

Project Title: Dissertation Research on Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grade American Students Abroad.

I, the parent or guardian of _______________________, a minor ______ years of age, consent to his/her participation in a program of research being conducted by Timothy Lawler.

Description of purpose and explanation of procedures: The purpose of the study is to identify factors which relate to adjustment of American children studying outside the U.S. Procedures to be followed include meeting with the investigator in a group with other students who have agreed to participate in the study and to complete the research questionnaires. Completing the questionnaires will involve approximately 50 to 60 minutes of time. Questions that the participants have concerning the procedures to be followed will be answered.

Risks and discomfort: Previous studies on sojourner adjustment, and research which has used the present study's questionnaires have indicated that there are no known risks involved in participating in this study. However, should a participant find a particular item objectionable or unduly stress-provoking, s/he has the option of skipping that question. If the participant experiences discomfort while completing the questionnaires, s/he has the option of discontinuing her/his participation in the study. The participant's anonymity and the confidentiality of her/his responses are preserved by:

a) withholding information which would reveal who
participated in the study;
b) using code numbers to represent the participants and their schools;
c) maintaining the security of the list which identifies the participant with her/his code numbers;
d) retrieving all data personally; and
e) reporting the research results in such a way that will not reveal the identity of the participants.

Potential benefits: Participants will learn something about the process of scientific research. Participants will be contributing to knowledge about adjustment in foreign cultures. This information may be helpful to the participants themselves as well as to international schools in general.

Alternatives: Participants have the following options:
a) withholding consent to participate in the study;
b) withdrawing from participation in the study at any time; and,
c) skipping items on the questionnaires which are experienced as objectionable or stressful.

I understand that no risk is involved and that I may withdraw my child from participation at any time without prejudice.

(Signature of Parent)

---------------
Date
APPENDIX C
Table 20

**Forward Selection Multiple Regression Procedure for the Adjustment Index**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>R2 = .11</th>
<th>c(P) = 7.34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>40.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>319.14</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 8.36</td>
<td>p = .0052**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>R2 = .20</th>
<th>c(P) = 2.33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>35.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>287.76</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 8.11</td>
<td>p = .0007***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable entered:</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
<th>R2 = .21</th>
<th>c(P) = 3.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76.71</td>
<td>25.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>282.88</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = 5.79</td>
<td>p = .0016**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .50 significance level for entry into the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>2.140</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>.0016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>-1.914</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.0060**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>-0.6382</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.2972 (na)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 68 .05 = * .01 = ** .001 = ***
Table 21

Forward Selection Multiple Regression Procedure for the Adjustment Index with Independent Variables and their Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>c(P)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>.0052**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>.0007***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Length * Japan</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>.0002***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Gender * Switz.</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.0004***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.0005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.0001***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Length * Switz.</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.0002***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other variable met the .50 significance level for entry into the model.

Source: B Value SS (Type II) F p

Intercept 0.1252 0.24 0.6260 ns
Length of Stay -0.6583 0.910 19.69 .0001***
Japan -7.3135 74.667 0.23 0.6344 ns
Venezuela -0.6676 0.866 6.69 0.0121*
Gender 2.2622 25.375 8.35 0.0054**
Length * Japan 5.2808 31.655 1.24 0.2703 ns
Length * Switz. 1.7940 4.694 8.51 0.0050**
Gender * Switz. 3.7125 32.275 0.20 0.8116 ns

F = 4.98 p = .0002

N = 68

.05 = *
.01 = **
.001 = ***
APPENDIX D
Kida sometimes have different feelings and ideas.

This form lists the feelings and ideas in groups. From each group, pick one sentence that describes you best for the past two weeks.

After you pick a sentence from the first group, go on to the next group.

There is no right answer or wrong answer. Just pick the sentence that best describes the way you have been recently. Put a mark like this X next to your answer. Put the mark on the line next to the sentence that you pick.

Here is an example of how this form works. Try it. Put a mark next to the sentence that describes you best.

Example:

___I read books all the time
___I read books once in a while
___I never read books
Remember, pick out the sentences that describe your feelings and ideas in the PAST TWO WEEKS.

1. ___I am sad once in a while
   ___I am sad many times
   ___I am sad all the time

2. ___Nothing will ever work out for me
   ___I am not sure if things will work out for me
   ___Things will work out for me O.K.

3. ___I do most things O.K.
   ___I do many things wrong
   ___I do everything wrong

4. ___I have fun in many things
   ___I have fun in some things
   ___Nothing is fun at all

5. ___I am bad all the time
   ___I am bad many times
   ___I am bad once in a while

6. ___I think about bad things happening to me once in a while
   ___I worry that bad things will happen to me
   ___I am sure that terrible things will happen to me

7. ___I hate myself
   ___I do not like myself
   ___I like myself

8. ___All bad things are my fault
    ___Many bad things are my fault
    ___Bad things are not usually my fault

9. ___I do not think about killing myself
    ___I thing about killing myself but would not do it
    ___I want to kill myself

10. ___I feel like crying everyday
    ___I feel like crying many days
    ___I feel like crying once in a while

11. ___Things bother me all the time
    ___Things bother me many times
    ___Things bother me once in a while
12. ____I like being with people
    ____I do not like being with people many times
    ____I do not want to be with people at all

13. ____I cannot make up my mind about things
    ____It is hard to make up my mind about things
    ____I make up my mind about things easily

14. ____I look O.K.
    ____There are some bad things about my looks
    ____I look ugly

15. ____I have to push myself all the time to do my schoolwork
    ____I have to push myself many times to do my schoolwork
    ____Doing schoolwork is not a big problem

16. ____I have trouble sleeping every night
    ____I have trouble sleeping many nights
    ____I sleep pretty well

17. ____I am tired once in a while
    ____I am tired many days
    ____I am tired all the time

18. ____Most days I do not feel like eating
    ____Many days I do not feel like eating
    ____I eat pretty well

19. ____I do not worry about aches and pains
    ____I worry about aches and pains many times
    ____I worry about aches and pains all the time

20. ____I do not feel alone
    ____I feel alone many times
    ____I feel alone all the time

21. ____I never have fun at school
    ____I have fun at school only once in a while
    ____I have fun at school many times

22. ____I have plenty of friends
    ____I have some friends but I wish I had more
    ____I do not have any friends

23. ____My schoolwork is alright
    ____My schoolwork is not as good as before
    ____I do very badly in subjects I used to be good in
24. ___ I can never be as good as other kids
       ___ I can be as good as other kids if I want to
       ___ I am just as good as other kids

25. ___ Nobody really loves me
       ___ I am not sure if anybody loves me
       ___ I am sure that somebody loves me

26. ___ I usually do what I am told
       ___ I do not do what I am told most times
       ___ I never do what I am told

27. ___ I get along with people
       ___ I get into fights many times
       ___ I get into fights all the time

The End

THANK YOU FOR FILLING OUT THIS FORM
HOW-I-FEEL QUESTIONNAIRE
STAIC FORM C-2

NAME ___________________________ AGE ________ DATE ____________

DIRECTIONS: A number of statements which boys and girls use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and decide if it is hardly-ever, or sometimes, or often true for you. Then for each statement, put an X in the box in front of the word that seems to describe you best. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. Remember, choose the word which seems to describe how you usually feel.

1. I worry about making mistakes . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
2. I feel like crying . . . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
3. I feel unhappy . . . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
4. I have trouble making up my mind . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
5. It is difficult for me to face my problems . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
6. I worry too much . . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
7. I get upset at home . . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
8. I am shy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
9. I feel troubled . . . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
10. Unimportant thoughts run through my mind and bother me . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
11. I worry about school . . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
12. I have trouble deciding what to do . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
13. I notice my heart beats fast . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
14. I am secretly afraid . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
15. I worry about my parents . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
16. My hands get sweaty . . . . . . . . . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
17. I worry about things that may happen . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
18. It is hard for me to fall asleep at night . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
19. I get a funny feeling in my stomach . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
20. I worry about what others think of me . □ hardly-ever □ sometimes □ often
HOW_I SEE MYSELF

Code Number: ____________ Grade: _______________
Sex: ________________ Age: ________________

1. Nothing gets me too mad 1 2 3 4 5 I get mad easily and explode
2. I don’t stay with things and finish them 1 2 3 4 5 I stay with something till I finish
3. I’m very good at drawing 1 2 3 4 5 I’m not much good in drawing
4. I don’t like to work on committees, projects 1 2 3 4 5 I like to work with others
5. I wish I were smaller (taller) 1 2 3 4 5 I’m just the right height
6. I worry a lot 1 2 3 4 5 I don’t worry much
7. I wish I could do something with my hair 1 2 3 4 5 My hair is nice-looking
8. Teachers like me 1 2 3 4 5 Teachers don’t like me
9. I’ve lots of energy 1 2 3 4 5 I haven’t much energy
10. I don’t play games very well 1 2 3 4 5 I play games very well
11. I’m just the right weight 1 2 3 4 5 I wish I were heavier, lighter
12. The girls don’t like me, leave me out 1 2 3 4 5 The girls like me a lot, choose me
13. I’m very good at speaking before a group 1 2 3 4 5 I’m not much good at speaking before a group
14. My face is pretty (good looking) 1 2 3 4 5 I wish I were prettier (good looking)
15. I’m very good in music 1 2 3 4 5 I’m not much good in music
16. I get along well with teachers 1 2 3 4 5 I don't get along with teachers
17. I don't like teachers 1 2 3 4 5 I like teachers very much
18. I don't feel at ease, comfortable inside 1 2 3 4 5 I feel very at ease, comfortable inside
19. I don't like to try new things 1 2 3 4 5 I like to try new things
20. I have trouble controlling my feelings 1 2 3 4 5 I can handle my feelings
21. I do well in school work 1 2 3 4 5 I don't do well in school
22. I want the boys to like me 1 2 3 4 5 I don't want the boys to like me
23. I don't like the way I look 1 2 3 4 5 I like the way I look
24. I don't want the girls to like me 1 2 3 4 5 I want the girls to like me
25. I'm very healthy 1 2 3 4 5 I get sick a lot
26. I don't dance well 1 2 3 4 5 I'm a very good dancer
27. I write well 1 2 3 4 5 I don't write well
28. I like to work alone 1 2 3 4 5 I don't like to work alone
29. I use my time well 1 2 3 4 5 I don't know how to plan my time
30. I'm not much good at making things with my hands 1 2 3 4 5 I'm very good at making things with my hands
31. I wish I could do something about my skin 1 2 3 4 5 My skin is nice-looking
32. School isn't interesting to me 1 2 3 4 5 School is very interesting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I don’t do arithmetic well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I’m not as smart as the others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The boys like me a lot, choose me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>My clothes are not as I’d like</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I like school</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I wish I were built like the others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I don’t read well</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I don’t learn new things easily</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I’m real good in arithmetic
I’m smarter than most of the others
The boys don’t like me, leave me out
My clothes are nice
I don’t like school
I’m happy with the way I am
I read very well
I learn new things easily
FES

Code Number:__________ Age__________

1. ___T Family members really help and support one another.
    ___F

2. ___T Family members often keep their feelings to
    ___F themselves.

3. ___T We fight a lot in our family.
    ___F

4. ___T We don’t do things on our own very often in our
    ___F family.

5. ___T We feel it is important to be the best at whatever
    ___F you do.

6. ___T We often talk about political and social problems.
    ___F

7. ___T We spend most weekends and evenings at home.
    ___F

8. ___T Family members attend church, synagogue, or Sunday
    ___F School fairly often.

9. ___T Activities in our family are pretty carefully
    ___F planned

10. ___T Family members are rarely ordered around.
    ___F

11. ___T We often seem to be killing time at home.
    ___F

12. ___T We say anything we want to around home.
    ___F

13. ___T Family members rarely become openly angry.
    ___F

14. ___T In our family, we are strongly encouraged to be
    ___F independent.

15. ___T Getting ahead in life is very important in our
    ___F family.
16. ___T We rarely go to lectures, plays or concerts.
    ___F
17. ___T Friends often come over for dinner or to visit.
    ___F
18. ___T We don't say prayers in our family.
    ___F
19. ___T We are generally very neat and orderly.
    ___F
20. ___T There are very few rules to follow in our family.
    ___F
21. ___T We put a lot of energy into what we do at home.
    ___F
22. ___T It's hard to "blow off steam" at home without
    ___F    upsetting somebody.
23. ___T Family members sometimes get so angry they throw
    ___F    things.
24. ___T We think things out for ourselves in our family.
    ___F
25. ___T How much money a person makes is not very important
    ___F    to us.
26. ___T Learning about new and different things is very
    ___F    important in our family.
27. ___T Nobody in our family is active in sports, Little
    ___F    League, bowling, etc.
28. ___T We often talk about the religious meaning of
    ___F    Christmas, Passover, or other holidays.
29. ___T It's often hard to find things when you need them
    ___F    in our household.
30. ___T There is one family member who makes most of the
    ___F    decisions.
31. ___T There is a feeling of togetherness in our family.
    ___F
32. ___T We tell each other about our personal problems.
33. **T** Family members hardly ever lose their tempers.  
**F**

34. **T** We come and go as we want to in our family.  
**F**

35. **T** We believe in competition and "may the best man win."  
**F**

36. **T** We are not that interested in cultural activities.  
**F**

37. **T** We often go to movies, sports events, camping, etc.  
**F**

38. **T** We don't believe in heaven or hell.  
**F**

39. **T** Being on time is very important in our family.  
**F**

40. **T** There are set ways of doing things at home.  
**F**

41. **T** We rarely volunteer when something has to be done at home.  
**F**

42. **T** If we feel like doing something on the spur of the moment we often just pick up and go.  
**F**

43. **T** Family members often criticize each other.  
**F**

44. **T** There is very little privacy in our family.  
**F**

45. **T** We always strive to do things just a little better the next time.  
**F**

46. **T** We rarely have intellectual discussions.  
**F**

47. **T** Everyone in our family has a hobby or two.  
**F**

48. **T** Family members have strict ideas about what is right and wrong.  
**F**

49. **T** People change their minds often in our family.  
**F**
There is a strong emphasis on following rules in our family.

Family members really back each other up.

Someone usually gets upset if you complain in our family.

Family members sometimes hit each other.

Family members almost always rely on themselves when a problem comes up.

Family members rarely worry about job promotions, school grades, etc.

Someone in our family plays a musical instrument.

Family members are not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school.

We believe there are some things you just have to take on faith.

Family members make sure their rooms are neat.

Everyone has an equal say in family decisions.

There is very little group spirit in our family.

Money and paying bills is openly talked about in our family.

If there's a disagreement in our family, we try hard to smooth things over and keep the peace.

Family members strongly encourage each other to stand up for their rights.

In our family, we don't try that hard to succeed.

Family members often go to the library.
67. **T** Family members sometimes attend courses or take lessons for some hobby or interest (outside of school.)

68. **T** In our family each person has different ideas about what is right and wrong.

69. **T** Each person’s duties are clearly defined in our family.

70. **T** We can do whatever we want to in our family.

71. **T** We really get along well with each other.

72. **T** We are usually careful about what we say to each other.

73. **T** Family members often try to one-up or out-do each other.

74. **T** It’s hard to be by yourself without hurting someone’s feelings in our household.

75. **T** “Work before play” is the rule in our family.

76. **T** Watching T.V. is more important than reading in our family.

77. **T** Family members go out a lot.

78. **T** The Bible is a very important book in our home.

79. **T** Money is not handled very carefully in our home.

80. **T** Rules are pretty inflexible in our household.

81. **T** There is plenty of time and attention for everyone in our family.

82. **T** There are a lot of spontaneous discussions in our family.

83. **T** In our family, we believe you don’t ever get anywhere by raising your voice.

84. **T** We are not really encouraged to speak up for ourselves in our family.
85. __ T Family members are often compared with others as to how well they are doing at work or school.
   ___ F

86. __ T Family members really like music, art and literature.
   ___ F

87. __ T Our main form of entertainment is watching T.V. or listening to the radio.
   ___ F

88. __ T Family members believe that if you sin you will be punished.
   ___ F

89. __ T Dishes are usually done immediately after eating.
   ___ F

90. __ T You can’t get away with much in our family.
   ___ F
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:__________________________________________
Age:_________ Grade:___________________________
School:________________________________________

1. How long have you lived in this country? _____ year(s)

2. Have you ever lived in another country? ___ yes ___ no
   If so, which country (countries) and for how long?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

3. Do you speak Spanish? ___yes ___no
   If so, how would you rate yourself?
   Native___ Excellent___ Good___ Fair___

4. Do you have brothers or sisters living at home?
   Number of brothers _____ Number of sisters____

5. If you and your family could live anywhere in the world, where would that be?________________________

6. Mother's nationality____________________________

7. Father's nationality____________________________

8. Father's occupation____________________________
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