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PART ONE

THE RESEARCH SETTING
Introduction

This book has been written for the growing numbers of people who are interested in the process of learning from a foreign country. Foreign study has a long and honorable tradition.* As long as there have been universities students have come from foreign lands to seek them out and to study in the specialized subjects which they could not pursue at home. After World War I many countries looked to foreign study as a means for promoting understanding and good will between nations, and there was much activity to facilitate the exchange of students. It was during this period that universities in the United States acquired sufficient international prestige to begin attracting students from abroad. These tendencies were further strengthened after World War II, when the western nations again faced the task of trying to rebuild international understanding, and when the United States emerged as the dominant western power. Travel and study abroad were utilized on a large scale as a means for bringing the people of various nations closer together.

The introduction of political and cultural objectives has greatly modified the old pattern of foreign study. Originally the decision to study abroad was an individual one, made for personal reasons. The student left his home and went to live abroad for a year or so to enjoy special cultural advantages, to broaden his horizon, to experience a change, or even to get over a love affair. This pattern still exists, of course. There are, as well, many larger and more highly organized arrangements. The student now may come as part of an exchange program, in which universities of different countries enter into give-and-take agreements with one another. He may come as a special scholar or fellow selected and financed by a special fund such as those for Rhodes or Fulbright scholars. When he arrives at the foreign university, he will often find an International House or other agency whose purpose is to help him and his fellow visitors find their way around in a strange environment.

*For a complete report on the historical origins of foreign exchange programs see the paper, EXCHANGE OF PERSONS, prepared for the Social Science Research Council by Guy Metraux.
The biggest change, however, is the establishment of many non-university programs. Thus, the technical assistance program, initiated by the Economic Cooperation Administration and continued by the Mutual Security Agency and the Foreign Operations Administration operates quite independently of the universities. It has brought hundreds of visitors a year to the United States to study conditions in particular industries, and it has sent many American experts abroad to provide on-the-spot technical assistance. This program is directed toward sharing America's technical and industrial knowledge, and operates in the industrial rather than the academic setting.

Similarly, the re-education programs, sponsored by the United States Government after World War II for visitors from Germany and Japan, went beyond academic confines. Young people's programs were set up for visitors of high school age and younger, who were carefully placed in American families for one year of participation in the whole range of American life. Specialist programs brought groups of professionals to America for intensive study in their fields of special interest, emphasizing consultations with other professionals rather than academic study. Visitors' programs tried to bridge the gap between the academic and professional worlds. The participants were young men and women at the transition point between academic study and professional careers, and the programs combined study at a university with field travel and professional internships.

This expansion into non-academic areas has extended opportunities for cross-cultural education to whole new sections of the population. No longer is it only young university students who travel abroad. The visitors may be children or well-established adult professionals. They may come from the ranks of business, labor, or government, as well as from the universities.

The responsibility for receiving and helping the visitors has also been extended to new groups of people. Education is no longer the exclusive responsibility of university faculty members. Experts in a variety of fields find that foreign visitors are coming to learn from them whatever they have to teach. People in many different government agencies, industrial plants, and local communities are called upon to take the role of host. Cross-cultural education has become a process of interaction which occurs in many settings, between people of many different backgrounds and occupations.

This broader conception of education brings with it new problems and ways of learning. When an individual chooses to travel abroad to study medicine or philosophy from a world-
renowned master, there is no problem of willingness to learn. The subject matter is generally considered acultural: It is not the specific property of any one nation or historical tradition. A special field of discourse is created in which professor and student meet together as individuals to explore their area of common interest.

In the case of large-scale organized efforts to take selected groups of people abroad for special training the situation is quite different. Here the objective is to maximize the impact of one culture upon another. Thus, in the case of political re-education programs, the objective has been to strengthen the forces of democracy in recently anti-democratic countries; that is, to make Germany and Japan more like America. Similarly, the objective of technical assistance programs is to build up the industrial potential of other nations to be more like that of the United States. Such programs have to be considered from the perspectives of anthropological knowledge about cross-culture contact and culture change, as well as from the point of view of psychological knowledge about individual learning. Their impact will depend upon conditions within each of the participating countries, as well as upon the particular learning experience of foreign visitors. We have chosen, therefore, to use the term cross-culture education in referring to any learning experience in which people from one country must learn from the representatives of another country.

Individual and cultural factors both will operate in cross-culture education, but their relative importance will vary from one situation to another. Cultural factors, as we have said, will be less important in cases of individual foreign study than in cases of mass efforts at re-education. There will also be differences depending upon the relationships between the two countries involved. In the case of the United States and Canada, for example, culture differences are small enough and international relations good enough so that cultural factors are relatively unimportant. As the differences between countries become greater or the state of international relations becomes poorer, the importance of cultural factors increases. Thus, a visitor from Red China or from the Soviet Union would find it difficult to react to things in America in an objective way. His reactions would be conditioned by pre-existing convictions about what he would find. Similarly, the visitor from an underdeveloped country finds difficulties in learning from American industrial enterprise; he must redefine American ideas to fit his situation at home before they become useful to him.

There are several different ways in which cultural influences can affect the learning experience of the foreign visitor.
His background and past experience provide the context for assimilation of new ideas. He brings both values and knowledge from his own country, and if something new is to be acceptable to him, it must be consistent with both. He also brings certain expectations about the host country, and about what he will like or dislike there. He will seek to confirm these expectations. If there is conflict between the two countries he will look for evidence which proves his country right, and he will try to protect himself from criticism. If there are wide differences between the two countries, he probably will experience considerable personal tension in trying to relate himself to both cultures simultaneously; and yet this dual relationship is precisely what is required of him as a foreign visitor.

Thus there are important theoretical reasons for undertaking a study of cross-culture education. The social psychologist and the social anthropologist are interested in knowing more about the process by which one culture succeeds in influencing another, and also about the reactions of individuals who are intermediaries in this process: What kinds of influence is it possible for the visitor to accept, and what kinds of things remain unchanged? Do changes which occur while a visitor is abroad persist after he returns home? Are foreign visits effective as a means for bringing about change?

There are also practical reasons for wanting to know more about cross-culture education. A great deal of money has been spent on programs which bring visitors to the United States. The success of these programs needs to be evaluated as a basis for making decisions about further expenditures. Even more important, perhaps, is the help which research can give in improving the programs. The people who work with cross-culture education in one capacity or another want to know how they are doing. Are their efforts bringing results? Are there ways of doing a better job, and if so, what are they? What makes the difference between a "good" program and a "poor" one?

This convergence of theoretical and practical interest has resulted in a number of research projects in recent years. The present report brings together objective data and subjective insight derived from work with a small number of German visitors at the University of Michigan. We have tried to go beyond the particular population studied to some more general understanding of the process of cross-culture education. We present our results, not as a definitive research report, but rather as an invitation to the reader to think with us about the problem. We have some facts and we have tried to analyze these and see what they mean. The reader may or may not agree with our conclusions. We hope that at least he will be stimulated by them.
An Overview of the Study

The Visitors

Most of this study was done in conjunction with a German visitors' program which the Political Science Department of the University of Michigan conducted. Three successive groups of German visitors participated. In the first group there were seven men and five women who arrived in the fall of 1949 for a stay of twelve months. The second group, nine men and one woman--came in the fall of 1950 for a stay of six months, and the third group of seven men arrived in the spring of 1951, also for a stay of six months. Altogether twenty-nine persons participated.

Each of the groups at Michigan was part of a larger group of German visitors selected and financed by the U.S. State Department, and distributed among several different U.S. colleges and universities. The first group belonged to what was called a "German Leader Program," and its members were selected for interest in fields of opinion leadership, such as teaching, radio, and newspapers. Members of the subsequent groups were part of a Governmental Affairs Program, for people beginning careers in government service.

In the first group, the people were about to finish their academic and professional training; only one or two had actually begun to work in a full-time professional capacity. The second and third groups were drawn from the German civil service, and most of the participants had some official position before their visit to America. In general, however, this connection had been of short duration; most were still beginners. The age range for all groups centered in the range of 25 to 30, with a few as young as 22 or 23, and a few as old as 35 or 36.

We do not know very much about the kind of recruitment and selection procedures employed in Germany. It was reported that one of the final criteria was whether the visitors would fit into American university life, and, actually, most of the visitors could pass without too much difficulty as graduate students. Other criteria of selection were political, and presumably designed to locate people who would be receptive to democratic
ideals. American officials took responsibility for the screening.

Over time, there was a gradual transfer of responsibility for recruitment from American to German personnel. Members of the first group, who came to America in the fall of 1949, were recruited and selected by action of Americans in Germany. Those in the third group, who came in the spring of 1951, were generally nominated by their immediate superiors in the German civil service and some were kept on the payroll during their visit. They came backed by their employer's vote of confidence with assignments to investigate American technical operations in comparable civil service jobs.

Along with this change in recruitment procedures and program emphasis there was a change in the motivation of persons selected. Visitors in the first group generally had some strong personal interest in America, or perhaps in general travel abroad. Visitors in later groups felt, beside this interest, an obligation to take back a certain amount of professional information. The focus of attention shifted from a general emphasis upon the attractiveness of America to a more limited view of the American trip as a means toward professional and personal goals located in the home situation. All groups included one or two people who were interested primarily in academic study.

The Training Program

A full time coordinator was appointed to take charge of the program for each group of visitors. Under the sponsorship of the State Department, its aims presumably were to increase good will toward and understanding of American democracy. The coordinator, however, was free to implement these objectives in whatever way he saw fit.

The general plan was for the visitors to begin with a period at the University, during which they could attend or audit courses and also participate in a core seminar under the direction of the coordinator. A number of short field trips were taken during this period. Then there was a longer field trip to New York, Washington, and other points of interest. The last part of the visit was reserved for individual internships, during which the visitor could work with some professional office resembling the one where he worked at home; or, if he preferred, he could visit around at several different agencies. Thus the learning experience of the visitors was a mixture of academic training, field observation, and specialized professional activity.
Within the general limits of this plan there was room for some individual variation. Individuals could pursue subjects of special interest during their free hours at the University, and they could arrange internships to fit in with their particular professional interests.

There was also some difference from one group to another. The first group, which was in America for twelve months, spent two full semesters at the University. The visitors attended classes, took course examinations, and lived in the dormitories. Internships were scheduled for late spring and early summer. The major part of the summer was spent in travel, with an automobile trip starting in Michigan, going east to New York and Washington, south to Tennessee and Texas, and west to California. From California they returned directly to Ann Arbor, New York, and Germany.

The second group arrived near the beginning of the fall semester and spent three months on campus. They did not officially register for courses, but they could audit if they wished. They took part in two political science seminars conducted by the project coordinator, a six-week extension course in citizenship, and a series of six sessions of training in human relations. They lived in small rooming houses rather than dormitories. They took short field trips during their stay at the University, and a longer trip to Washington and the TVA during Christmas vacation. A three-week internship followed the end of the semester, and brought the official program to a close. However, some individuals stayed on longer at their own expense for further travel in the United States.

The third program got off to a delayed start because of difficulties in admitting German citizens to the United States at that time. Visitors arrived in April too late to join classes in the spring semester, and too early for the summer semester. During their three months on campus, they took part in a seminar run by the coordinator, and in various field trips. The rest of their time was free. Like the second group, they lived in small rooming houses. The core seminar was planned as it went along with attention focused on American government, American life in general, and the planning and discussion of field trips. There was a trip to the east coast and Tennessee Valley Authority in late July and early August. This was followed by a month which some spent in internship positions and some used for a trip to California. The program ended in September.

Training in human relations was part of the official program for the second and third groups. A complete report and an analysis of its results will be presented in Chapter 9. The
visitors in the second group were asked to meet with some Americans one evening a week to discuss questions of human relations. Two groups were organized, each consisting of five Germans, three Americans of comparable age and experience, and three American staff members. Of the staff members, one was discussion leader; one was a "feedback observer," working with the group to help it understand its own processes; and one was a research observer, using pre-coded observation sheets. All meetings were transcribed. Each group held six meetings, in which discussion ranged from broad questions of how to stimulate civic activity among people in general, to an exploration of German-American differences, to a discussion of specific behavior occurring within the training group.

With the third group the human relations part of the program was expanded. A social psychologist from the staff of the Research Center for Group Dynamics worked with the program coordinator in conducting the core seminar. There was an attempt to place emphasis throughout the program upon group discussion and group decision-making. This attempt backfired, however, and the emphasis upon group planning became a target of heated criticism. The resentment of the German visitors was reflected in their relations with research and training staff members, and also in the departure interviews.

The Training Program through German Eyes

Comments in interviews taken at time of departure and again after return to Germany suggest the following conclusions:

Most of the visitors felt that their expectations had been met or exceeded. The first and second groups were virtually unanimous in this; the third group shared this feeling while in this country, but after return were more critical.

The visitors placed great emphasis upon getting into America; families. The first group praised the opportunities which they had found; the second and third groups were divided between approval of the opportunities available and regret that there had not been more.

A desire for widespread travel in the United States came second only to the interest in American family life. The first and third groups, who had had an opportunity to go to the west coast as well as the east coast, were pleased; the second group was divided, with some satisfied and some feeling that there should have been more travel. Their interest in travel reflected both an uneasiness about evaluating an entire nation on the basis of one atypical
university town, and their general interest in geography as a determinant of national character.

Germans, as well as Americans, expected too much from the internship and thus were doomed to disappointment. They hoped to combine, in four short weeks, the intensive experience of full membership in American society with the extensive gathering of information about American institutions in general or in their particular field. Reactions were generally favorable but at the same time regretful about the things which were not done. Some wanted more specialized professional opportunities; some wanted longer and more varied experiences; some felt there was too much emphasis upon vocational specialization. These comments reflect the variety which actually existed in types of internship experience: Each satisfied some needs, but none could do everything.

University experience was valued if flexible and voluntary. Those in the first group, who registered for courses and did all work except the final exams, criticized the rigidity of university requirements. Those in the third group would have liked more opportunity to attend courses. Only the second group was really satisfied, and its members were permitted to sit in on courses if they felt like it without assuming any responsibility for meeting the course requirements.

The training in human relations, or "group dynamics," was bewildering. The second group reported some additional insight into differences between Germans and Americans, but no learning about general social or administrative skills. The third group reported only irritation.

There were grievances concerning the staff and the program. These were of two kinds: first, concerning requirements of university courses and dormitory discipline (for the first group), and (for the third group) the request by the Research Center for Group Dynamics that the visitors work together as a group.* The second kind of difficulty appeared at points where the demands placed upon interpersonal relationships were too great. Thus, there was difficulty on the California trip with the first group, and on the TVA trip with the third group. Also, with the third group there was tension about the special aspects of the program, with both staff and visitors feeling that they had a great deal at stake, and that the others were blocking the achievement of common goals. Strain and irritation developed also between visitors and the home owners with whom they were staying.

*This is described in detail in Chapter 9.
There was some dissatisfaction with other members of the German group. Sometimes it was asserted that the group was incompatible, or too heterogeneous; sometimes there was criticism of selection procedures for not grouping together more similar people. This hostility toward fellow group members, like hostility toward the staff, was higher in the first and third groups than in the second. The second group was either under less strain, or else less free in expressing hostility. Certainly the interviews showed less personal criticism.

The Research Project

Professor James K. Pollock, chairman of the Political Science Department at the University of Michigan, suggested that some research be undertaken to discover what impact the training program had on the visitors, and also to investigate possible ways for improving the program.

Staff members of the Research Center for Group Dynamics met with the first group of visitors to discuss the possibilities for research. They explained that they were interested in obtaining information about both the good and bad aspects of the program, and also in finding out what kind of results were being achieved by this effort of the American government. They asked whether the visitors would be interested in participating in such a research project.

The visitors said they would, and a lively discussion of research possibilities followed. It was agreed that the first step should be to interview each person immediately, and then to interview him again at the end of his visit. Later, arrangements were made for additional follow-up interviews six months after return to Germany.

The research staff proposed using some paper-and-pencil measures of attitude and opinion, and the visitors agreed.

The visitors then raised a question about their own honesty, asking whether or not they could be depended upon to give truthful answers. The Americans tried to be reassuring about the confidentiality of all records, and the complete separation of the research staff from the State Department. The visitors, however, suggested that it might be well to obtain some projective measures which could not be falsified. So arrangements were made for obtaining Rorschach records from the visitors on a voluntary basis.
The general plan developed in this discussion set the pattern for research with all groups. The following data were collected:

**Interviews** Each visitor was interviewed shortly after his arrival in Ann Arbor, at the time of his departure from the United States, and six months after his return to Germany, except for members of the second group with whom the initial interview was omitted. All interviews were conducted in English, with the interviewer keeping either a verbatim record or a mechanical transcription. Interviews lasted about four or five hours, and typically required two sittings.

**Questionnaires** Several different kinds of attitude questionnaires were tried in early work with the first group, but were then discontinued.

**Sentence Completion Test** A sentence completion test was given to all visitors at the beginning and end of their stay in America.

**Records of Group Meetings** Transcriptions and interaction observation records were available for the six special training sessions of the second group. All official meetings of the third group were transcribed, and interaction observation records were obtained for a sample of these meetings. In addition to the formal records of the meetings, the staff obtained many insights directly from their participation in the training process.

**Rorschach Protocols** Rorschach records were obtained from 8 of the 12 people in the first group, and from all people in later groups. These data have not been analyzed for inclusion in the present report.

In this project, then, there is information about two different topics. First there is the question of what attitudes the German visitors brought with them, and how these changed or failed to change during the course of their American visit.
Information on this question comes from the three sets of inter­views, conducted at times of arrival, departure, and six months after return home, and from the sentence completion tests. The second question concerns the process by which learning occurs in a foreign culture. Our information here comes both from the interviews, and from our own experience as trainers. The question of what is learned will be discussed in Part II of this report, and the question of how learning occurs will be dis­cussed in Part IV.

Areas selected for consideration in the study of attitude change included feelings about Germany and about America, ideas about democracy, ideas and attitudes related to democratization and the initiation of social change, and relationships with people at home. There was also some interest in ideas about family and sex roles, attitudes toward peers and toward authority, and the set of attitudes which have come to be labeled "authoritarian."

Data collection began with the first interviews in the fall of 1949, and continued through the last follow-up interviews in the summer of 1952. Inevitably, the research staff thought of ways to improve each research instrument each time it was used. Since our interest was in getting the best available information rather than in compiling precise statistics, we decided to utilize many of these ideas for improvement. Hence, although the same general topics were discussed with each group, the questions and answers were often not exactly comparable from one group to the next. Our conclusions are based upon evidence of general trend, rather than upon precise and rigorous statistics.

American Comparisons

The major objective in the study of attitude change was to determine what kinds of change occurred during or after the visit of Germans to America. As we thought about this, we concluded that the greatest pressures toward change would exist at points where Germany and America were different. There would be certain values and beliefs common to all of Western civilization; these we would not expect to change. There would be other values and beliefs which differed from one country to the other. The German visitor would find these challenged by his visit to America, and he would be presented with an alterna­tive approach. One might expect change here.

We therefore wanted to measure the initial discrepancy be­tween the Germans and the American peers with whom they would be in contact. This would serve as an indication of the potential stimulus to learning offered by the American visit.
A careful investigation of the discrepancy between German and American ideas, of course, would require a large research project in each country. Such an effort was beyond the scope of the present study. However, it was possible to obtain information from several small groups of Americans. First a sample of twelve Americans was developed which was as nearly as possible comparable to the first group of Germans. Comparability was defined in terms of age, sex, occupation, religion, education, and experience abroad. These people were interviewed in the same way as the Germans had been, except that where Germans were asked about Germany, Americans were asked first about America and then about Germany. The Americans also took the sentence completion test which had been administered to the Germans, and a shortened version of the attitude inventory.

A second comparison group of Americans was obtained from a political science class at the University. Twenty-three sophomores took all the paper and pencil tests which had been given to the Germans in the first group. Their answers were instrumental in the decision to drop most of these measures, keeping only the sentence completion test.

The Americans who participated in the human relations training sessions with the second group of Germans took the same sentence completion tests as the Germans did, thus providing further comparisons.

There were no direct comparisons with the third group of Germans.

Results from the American interviews and tests are presented in the Appendix along with the German results. Comparisons between the two have been made, and at times seem highly provocative. However, there is no evidence for assuming that either the Germans or the Americans are representative of their fellow-countrymen. Thus, any generalization of the results to describe the larger populations from which our subjects were drawn would be unwarranted. The information reported here may serve to raise questions, but it cannot answer them.

The Discarded Attitude Inventory

One result of the comparison of German and American results was the decision to discard two paper-and-pencil tests: an attitude inventory composed of 100 agree-disagree items and a multiple-choice questionnaire. The inventory included statements
of value and opinion which had been collected from several dif-
ferent sources: the California F and E scales;¹ the study of
prejudice conducted by Allport and Kramer;² and an ideology test
developed at the National Training Laboratory in Group Develop-
ment;³ and some new items written especially for this study.
Items from all four sources were scrambled in the final inven-
tory. The subject was asked to respond to each statement on
a scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree."
Since this method of attitude measurement is widely used in
America today, we shall report briefly on our reasons for dis-
carding it.

The attitude inventory, together with other measures, was
given to the first group of Germans and to twenty-three Ameri-
can sophomores. Our first concern was to find out whether the
inventory discriminated between the Germans and Americans.
Examination of the total scores over 100 items showed that the
Americans had a wider range of scores than the Germans.
American scores ranged from -40 to +158, while German scores
ranged only from -1 to +123. We concluded that the Americans
were more dogmatic in their answers, stating their convictions
with greater emphasis, but that their convictions were not neces-
sarily different.

We then divided the 100 items into twenty-two sub-scales for
comparison of average scores. Nineteen of these sub-scales
showed no difference between Germans and Americans. The
only indications of difference were that Germans showed more
repressive and conventional loyalties to parents and friends;
they showed more tendency to place their faith in strong "natural"
leadership, and they were more opposed to authoritarian leader-
ship in small groups. The findings on repressive conformity
were not conclusive, since other items placing the same kind
of question in a different context showed no difference. The
findings on leadership suggested that when the Germans could
see a "right" answer, as in the specific questions about small
group situations, they gave it. However, when the questions

¹. Adorno, T.W.; Frenkel-Brunswik, Else; Levinson, Daniel J.;
Sanford, R. Nevitt: THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONALITY. New York:
². Allport, Gordon W., and Bernard M. Kramer, "Some Roots
³. Jenkins, D. H., "An Analysis of the Valence of the Group and
University of Michigan, 1952.
were more abstract and metaphysical, then they gave authori-
tarian answers. This difference could mean either that the
Germans were trying to give the answers which the Americans
wanted, or that they felt a commitment to democracy which was
not sufficiently well developed to extend beyond obvious and
specific situations.

After the publication of THE AUTHORITARIAN PERSONAL-
ITY* the items from the F-scale were scored in terms of
sub-scales recommended by the authors. This method of scor-
ing showed the Germans to be consistently more authoritarian
than the Americans. Thus, there is further support for the
idea that authoritarianism was expressed in terms of metaphysi-
cal generalities, but not in terms of questions about specific
behavior.

When work started with the special sample of twelve Ameri-
cans, twenty-two items were selected from the original 100 to
make up a revised form of the attitude inventory. Answers
from Germans and Americans were then compared by a means
of scale analysis. This approach tries to discover what items
are considered to belong together by a particular group of re-
spondents, thus providing information about the manner in which
ideas are organized. We found that Germans and Americans
each grouped the items into four scales, which might be labeled
as follows: submission to superior power (religious); submis-
sion to superior power (non-religious); denial of individual im-
pulses; and absolutism. The only difference between the two
national groups was that the Germans placed many items on the
religious submission scale which Americans grouped either with
non-religious submission, or with denial of individual impulses.
In other words, Americans made their decision using a more
sectarian and pragmatic point of view; the Germans were more
metaphysical.

All findings from this instrument were consistent. They
suggested a kind of metaphysical authoritarianism, counter-
balanced by scrupulous affirmation of democratic alternatives
in questions about specific situations. Whatever the meaning of
the discrepancy between responses to specific and "obvious"
items and responses to more metaphysical items, it seemed
clear that if authoritarianism existed it could be tapped only by
relatively projective and ambiguous questions. This conclusion
was supported by reports from the Germans themselves, who
said that they had given false answers to many of the questions
on the first tests. We therefore decided to concentrate our

attention on the sentence completion test, which forced the respondent to create his own answers, and to discard the attitude inventories and questionnaires which offered choices among fixed alternatives.

In summary, then, two kinds of material are included in this report. The first half attempts to evaluate the effects of the German Visitors Program, as represented by a small sample of people under the supervision of the Political Science Department of the University of Michigan. This evaluation rests upon interviews taken at time of arrival, departure, and six months after return to Germany, together with supplementary material from a sentence completion test. There is some comparable data from American interviews and sentence completion tests. Also included is a detailed examination of our experience in trying to offer the German visitors training in human relations.

The second half of the report examines the psychological meaning of cross-culture learning. Our experience in training activities with the Germans and the interview data serve as source materials for an analysis of the learning problems of the foreign visitor.
PART TWO

IMPACT OF THE GERMAN VISITORS' PROGRAM
Sources of Emotional Tension: Defensiveness and Authoritarianism

The visitors found that their stay in America raised problems of hostility, both with respect to the staff and with respect to each other. Both their own comments and staff observations confirm this fact. Reports from other foreign visitors also indicate a level of dissatisfaction which seems out of keeping with their actual experience and which interferes with positive learning and with satisfactory interpersonal relationships. The visit to America apparently released hostilities which bewildered and alienated the American personnel working with the visitors. Some of the hostility probably was caused by the behavior of the Americans. They may have been smug or self-righteous, busy or indifferent, overly directive or non-helpful. The explanation must also be looked for, however, in the tensions generated by the simultaneous membership in two different cultures. In particular, there was the problem of protecting oneself and one's nation from invidious comparison. There are several factors which might create or intensify such protectiveness:

Perception of Actual or Implied Inferiority of the Visitor's Nation

For the German visitors, there were at least three areas in which America had the advantage over Germany. The first was military strength: Germany lost World War II and America was on the winning side. The second was the high standard of living. Germany once had and valued a relatively high standard of living, but war damage considerably reduced it. The third advantage was our long democratic tradition, and a casual expertise in the practice of democracy. It was possible for the visitors to deny either the desirability or the importance of these attributes, but it was not possible to assert German superiority with respect to them.
Feelings of Discomfort with Unfamiliar Values and Behavior Patterns

There are many differences between Germany and America which do not necessarily imply judgments of inferiority or superiority. There is always the possibility that difference will be interpreted automatically in terms of evaluative comparison: If some country is different from mine, it must reflect unfavorably upon one or the other of us (and I hope it's not me). This is particularly true for countries with a history of strong national pride. On the other hand, it often happens that perception of difference provokes explanation in terms of historical sequence or national character: Things are as they are, and comparisons are irrelevant. This avoidance of evaluation may be considered either as a defense against possible negative judgments, or as a genuinely non-evaluative approach to difference.

Regardless of what values are placed on difference, there is always the problem of living with it. If the new values and patterns of behavior are congenial with the old, the process of adjustment is relatively easy. If they are not congenial, the adjustment is difficult. Social anthropology has shown us that personality and culture are closely tied together, with each influencing the other to maximize compatibility. The person who must suddenly adjust to a very different culture will have difficulty not only because of unfamiliarity, but also because he is psychologically unready to feel and behave in the ways that are expected of him. In this case, one would expect him to react with hostility and resentment. One of the critical questions about motivation, therefore, concerns the extent to which the visitor is psychologically equipped to live according to the standards of the host culture.

Resistance to Unwarranted Attempts at Influence

Another set of difficulties centers around the problem of accepting influence. In general, the extent of difficulty depends upon the degree to which the influence is seen as consistent with or contrary to one's own desire. It is virtually impossible to accept ideas which flatly contradict everything else we know. Similarly, a suggestion or correction coming from a close friend is much easier to accept than one coming from a known enemy. Thus, there are at least two dimensions along which acceptability varies: the familiarity of the idea and the closeness to or distance from oneself of the person doing the influencing.
Both dimensions offer some difficulty for the visitor in a foreign country. Each idea and practice originates in a different context from the one that exists at home, and is likely to require reworking before it is ready for acceptance and transfer. If the hosts insist upon acceptance in their own terms, they will only emphasize the distance between themselves and the visitors. Acceptance can occur only when the visitor is encouraged to formulate things in his own terms.

On the second dimension, the elements which contribute to distance between the person being influenced and the one doing the influencing are clear. To the visitor it may look like this: The host is nationalistic; he is interested in promoting the ideas and interest of his nation, and these may be contrary to the best interest of my nation. There is a gulf between us in national interest. Germany and the United States, for instance, were recent enemies on the field of battle. Or, the host is ignorant and unprepared to help: He doesn't understand my country and the things which are needed there, or which are possible there. Therefore he cannot be of help to me. Or, in the case of those particular members of the host culture in contact with the visitors: They are unfriendly; they don't like me, and therefore anything they want me to do is probably an expression of their hostility toward me.

If problems exist in relation to accepting influence, the easiest thing for the visitor to do is to define the situation in such a way that there will never be a contest between himself and the host. Thus, if the American is an expert on America, fine; he will learn everything which the host has to say about America. On the other hand, he himself is an expert on Germany, and will remain so; if possible, he will try to share his knowledge with his American hosts. Thus each is assigned his area of competence, and these are considered non-overlapping. The German reserves his right to judge things by his own standards, but he is willing to listen to what the American has to say about America. There is not much difficulty in accepting influence because the Americans talk only about things toward which the Germans have little commitment--the nature of Americans and the American point of view.

This use of compartmentalization to avoid direct influence situations was by no means characteristic of all the Germans. However, it was frequent enough to suggest that it was the preferred way of handling matters if there was any danger that influence attempts would become threatening. Unfortunately, it is a technique which effectively obscures the extent of the problem. We cannot tell much about the extent of resistance to
influence, except by indirect inference from the analysis of what things were learned and what things were not learned. We shall postpone our discussion of resistance to influence, therefore, until a later time.

With respect to the other two difficulties, however, there is considerable evidence available both from the interviews and from the sentence completion tests. We shall present that evidence in the two sections which follow.

German Defensiveness

We were concerned with two aspects of defensiveness: first, whether the Germans perceived differences between Germany and America which might threaten German prestige and thus their own self-esteem, and second, whether or not they defensively exaggerated German strength and American weakness.

Envy of America

Germans in the first group and the comparable sample of Americans were asked in the interviews to talk at length about both Germany and America. Their comments were then examined to see what kinds of criteria or dimensions they had used to organize observations about the two countries. Thus, we looked for indirect evidence about attitudes toward the two countries, rather than for answers to direct questions. The Germans in this group were more highly pro-American than those in later groups, and some allowance must be made for this before generalization to any larger population. Nevertheless, the difference between Germans and Americans is too striking to be explained away entirely. Almost without exception the German statements expressed criticism of the German people and admiration for the Americans; the American statements showed equal criticism of the two countries.

The Germans were much concerned about the tendency of German people to be submissive to authorities in power, and easily manipulated by them. They referred to this weakness more often than the Americans did, and they identified this weakness entirely with Germany. When speaking of Americans, they spoke in contrasting terms of the American democratic tradition, and the fact that Americans would not submit.

The Germans were also impressed by the extent of American experience in getting things done. They commented on
American maturity, knowledge, and experience, and contrasted this with the lack of experience in Germany. Americans tended to recognize German difficulties in this area, but they did not make such a clear statement about their own strength.

The two salient comparisons for the Germans, then, involved German submissiveness and inexperience, and American autonomy and experience in getting things done. There were other less frequent contrasts. Americans were said to be friendly and Germans unfriendly. Americans were described as flexible, and Germans as rigid. Reference was made to the strong constructive motivation characterizing Americans, but in this case there was no complementary comment about Germany. Always the same pattern was maintained: Negative criteria were used in referring to Germany, and positive ones in referring to the United States. The comments seemed to show that the Germans had internalized the American point of view on both democracy and dictatorship. They took note of German weakness and inexperience resulting from a long authoritarian tradition, and they gave Americans credit for a positive and democratic approach to life. Clearly, then, there is evidence for the presence of that attribute which the Germans call Neid, and which is translated both as "envy" and "grudge."

The Americans did not discriminate in favor of either America or Germany. They criticized Germans for being inflexible and ignorant or inexperienced; they criticized Americans for anti-social motivation, and occasionally for ignorance and inexperience. They made almost no positive comments about either country. The salient dimensions used in evaluation of each country concerned capacity for change and self-improvement, rather than the type of change desired. The whole approach seemed to reflect concern for solving whatever problems exist. This contrasted sharply with the German approach, which made comparisons in terms of black and white. For the first group at the beginning of their stay, the white was America and the black Germany. It is possible to imagine an easy reversal, in which America would become black and Germany white, but in which the characteristic manner of making black and white comparisons would remain unchanged.

Defensiveness with Respect to Germany

The negative evaluations of Germany reported above were identified only indirectly. Interviews were examined to see what frame of reference was used for describing the people in the two countries, and then to see what evaluation of the people was made within this frame of reference.
Answers given by the Germans to direct questions about Germany and America offered quite a different picture. Defensive praise and explanation characterized the statements about Germany, whereas hostile criticism was expressed toward America. These tendencies were highest in initial interviews with members of each group, and declined progressively through the second and third interviews. (Tables 1 and 2)

The characteristic view of Germany stressed the extent to which she was abused, victimized, and misunderstood. Specific elaborations of this point of view are the following: Germans have had a bad experience under the Nazis so that now they are unable to have faith in anything or commit themselves to action of any kind. They are also handicapped because they have no democratic tradition to guide them. Germany suffered greatly as a result of the war, through bombing, the influx of refugees, dismantling, and finally division and occupation. The reason that other countries don't like Germany is that they feel envy (grudge) and misunderstanding; their behavior makes Germany feel rejected, abused, and alone. Now Germany is vulnerable to Russian invasion, and will be the battlefield on which the next war is fought. The major problems facing Germany today are to get people out of the impossible housing conditions, to do something about the refugees, and to end the division and occupation of Germany. Germany can't solve these problems herself; others must take the responsibility.

A second form of defensiveness was to emphasize the stereotyped judgments of German superiority and American inferiority. Thus, we heard that Germans, as compared to Americans, are more concerned with ideals and basic principles; they are more emotional and they think with their blood; they are less superficial, more thoughtful; they are more cultured and less materialistic. In short, they are persons of depth and character whereas Americans are superficial materialists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments about Germany</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany is abused</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany is superior</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral comments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of Germany</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A discussion of the weak points in America and American democracy brought out a similar tendency to criticize America at the points where Germany is seen as strong. America is
weak because the range of incomes is too great and social se­
curity is inadequate. Or, America is weak because of inactive
citizenship and low voting participation. People in the United
States make a mistake in that they don't understand the dangers
of Communism; or, they are to be criticized for being puritani­
ical. Attached to all these criticisms was the unspoken reminder
that Germany does better: Germany doesn't have such a spread
between rich and poor; Germany has a high voting turn-out; Ger­
many understands Communism; Germany is not puritanical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criticism of America</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticism implying German superiority</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criticism</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these defensive reactions declined between the first
and the last interview. (Tables 1 and 2) Also, direct criticism
of Germany increased during this period. German characteristics
which were omitted or reported without evaluation in the early
interviews came to be more openly criticized. These in­
cluded authoritarian attitudes; suspicion, hostility, and egoism;
rigidity of class structure and lack of respect for the individual;
inability to compromise, and citizen apathy. It was hard to
know how to interpret this increase in direct criticism of Ger­
many. It might indicate either a change in conscious criticism
of Germany, or a change in feelings of freedom to express
criticism. In either case, it was consistent with the major
point which we are making here: Defensiveness was high early
in the visit, and declined over time.

**German Attitudes and Character Structure**

Social scientists have frequently used the concept of authori­
tarianism to organize their observations about German national
character. The concept is a somewhat unsatisfactory one, both
because it refers to a variety of different attributes, and be­
cause it is so often used evaluatively rather than descriptively.
Nevertheless, the widespread interest which it has provoked, and
the equally widespread desire to see the Germans become "less
authoritarian," make it inevitable that our study should give the
topic some attention.

Our efforts were directed, first, toward finding out whether
the Germans could be shown to be more authoritarian than
comparable Americans, and second, toward finding out whether the visit led to any reduction in authoritarianism. Briefly, there was evidence indicating the presence of several authoritarian attitudes, but there was almost no evidence of change. To the extent that the Germans were authoritarian, they were just as much so when they left as when they arrived.

If authoritarianism does not change, then it must be considered as more than a cluster of cognitive attitudes. Rather, it must be seen as a deep and well integrated part of the personality. As such, it was a part of the psychological environment of the German visitors during their entire visit in America. Thus, specifically, it must have made it difficult for the Germans to accept or understand contradictory American values, and generally, it must have influenced their reactions to the whole American scene. Our findings on authoritarianism, therefore, become part of our picture of the emotional pressures acting upon the visitors during their visit in America.

We indicated earlier that it was not easy to measure authoritarianism. The Germans were quite well informed on American views about democracy and authoritarianism. They knew that Americans expected them to be authoritarian, and they wanted to prove this expectation wrong. Some were genuinely convinced that democracy was better than dictatorship, and anxious to say so whenever they could find the opportunity. Others were more cynical, determined to play safe and give the right answers, but not at all sympathetic to democracy. There were always some who responded positively to our request for an honest answer, but we could not assume that this was true of everyone. In fact, the Germans themselves told us that they had not all answered the first attitude tests honestly. Most of our information about authoritarianism, therefore, comes from the sentence completion test. This was by no means a perfect or complete measure of the set of attitudes called authoritarianism, but it did provide some interesting information.

We were able to distinguish three different attitudes within the general area of authoritarianism. The German visitors showed ambivalence about leadership, hostility toward peers, and reliance upon externalized systems of reward and punishment. We shall report upon each of these in turn.

Ambivalence about Leadership and Submission

Sentence completion items indicate that the Germans both desired and resented strong leadership. They would have liked to have some all-knowing and all-powerful person give them the right answers. They preferred to have individuals in positions of leadership who were strong and sure. On the other hand,
they did not want to be ordered around and told what to do. Their ambivalence emerged as a longing for submission to some great inspirational leader, and a resentment of being asked to submit to the wishes or commands of any other actual human being. (Table 3)

Ambivalence about submission is well understood psychologically and it is an important element in authoritarianism. The individual with a strong need to submit is in an untenable position. On the one hand, he has some conscious or unconscious feeling that if he could just find the right authority to submit to, his problems would all be solved. The "good father" would take care of everything. At the same time, there is a feeling that such submission would mean personal annihilation: His own individuality would be completely destroyed. He must therefore fight against his own need to submit. This fight is carried on as a fight against actual or potential authorities. He looks for and exaggerates their weaknesses, and he rejects their demands upon him. Thus, he preserves his own precarious independence.

Further evidence on the problem of submission comes from questions having to do with compromise and disagreement. (Table 4) The Germans placed a high value on giving their "true opinion" uncompromisingly, even if it might lead to difficulty. They were likely to say that a dissatisfied group member should flatly disagree with things he didn't like. The Americans, on the other hand, were more likely to say that one should try to influence the group or to go along with the majority. But giving up one's opinion, or compromising with someone of a different opinion, seemed to the Germans to mean submission, and was to be scrupulously avoided.

It is easy to see how conflict over submission and independence created special strain for the German visitor in America. He was under pressure to maintain, not only his independence as an individual, but also his German identity and his resistance to American influence. It is conceivable that every important experience in America became a test of his own power to resist domination.

The sentence completion test indicates some relaxation by the end of the visit here. Strong, confident leadership was not so necessary and not so strongly resented. However, the shift was not enough to suggest any significant change in attitude.

Uneasy Interpersonal Relationships

There were several different indications that interpersonal relationships involved more tension for the Germans than for the Americans. At the projective level, there were the responses
to the following incomplete sentence: "As you get to know more about human nature, you discover that people generally...." Negative answers were given by 58 per cent of the Germans, but by only 22 per cent of the Americans. The answers of the Germans did not change over time. (Table 5)

There were other indications of a fearful and suspicious attitude toward people. The Germans were more worried than the Americans about finding friends who were trustworthy, or who were similar to themselves. In answering a question about what might create a worried, nervous feeling, the Germans were more likely than the Americans to feel nervous and apprehensive about other people.

In the interviews there was some discussion of group situations, and of human relations problems. The German approach to these problems seemed to demand clear structure and strong leadership as a means for avoiding the eruption of interpersonal tension. When asked what might cause difficulty in a group situation, the Germans mentioned difficulties between people, and the Americans mentioned individual resistances. The Germans saw the difficulty provoked by interaction; the Americans, by lack of interaction. If one accepted the German premise, the only way to avoid difficulty was to avoid interaction. Thus, structure and restraint as a means of control were considered more appropriate in a small group situation than in any other situation. General problems of democratization and social change could be met through education and individual initiative, but small group problems required that strict restraints be placed upon individuals. Opposition should be brought into line, and the right ideas should be made to prevail.

The interview questions showed no great difference between Germans and Americans in approach to general problems of social change. However, there were some sentence completion items which picked up differences relevant to this point. In talking about desirable characteristics of a president for Germany, the Americans gave answers which stressed his relationship to people: He should be able to relate well to the German people, or to the world. The Germans were more likely to think only of his purpose and sympathy: He should be a man whose sympathies were with Germany.

Similarly, in reacting to the idea of a democratic leader, the Americans said that he should be someone who could take criticism; the Germans said only that he should be elected and have limited powers. In both cases, the Americans saw interaction as something positive and to be sought after; the Germans
thought mostly in terms of the individual himself, and what aims he had or what restrictions were imposed upon him.

There is further evidence on German insensitivity to interpersonal factors. In answering a question about what might be wrong in a situation where employees wouldn't stay on the job, the Germans spoke in terms of objective working conditions; the Americans talked about human relations problems. Thus, although the Germans were quick to talk of the difficulties of interpersonal relations when the question came up, they also thought in terms which might help to prevent it from arising.

The avoidance of interpersonal factors had in it an element of irritation. For example, when asked what kind of people were most irritating, the Germans were more likely than the Americans to mention people who were talkative or over-enthusiastic; that is, people who were not exercising rigid self-control.

The Germans then, were afraid of group situations and interpersonal relationships. They would have liked to keep such situations from arising, either by exercising strong repressive controls in the situation itself, or by keeping themselves unaware of whatever interpersonal tensions did exist. We should not conclude that they were unaware of the possible benefits from good interaction. They recognized the desirability of getting people to listen to one another, or to show positive attitudes of liking and respect. They were impressed with what they saw of tolerance and compromise in America. However, they did not seem to feel that such patterns of behavior could be expected to work in Germany.

Reliance Upon External Systems of Reward and Punishment

Relationships with both authorities and peers involved considerable tension for many of the Germans, as we have seen. Under these conditions, it is not surprising that they turned to external success rather than internal satisfaction as a goal for personal living.

One of the measures administered to the first group of Germans and the twenty-three American sophomores included a list of ten "things which are important to all of us." The object was to discover what values were given high priority by members of each nationality group. The respondent was to indicate the three most important and the three least important areas out of the ten listed. The Germans and Americans agreed in placing
a high value on good health, education, and intelligence. Beyond this, the Americans also placed a high value on being liked and respected, on a good family life, and an enjoyable job. The Germans had no such consensus about sources of satisfaction.

If we look at the negative part of the question—concerning unimportant things—we find the Germans and the Americans chose quite different things to discount. The Americans discounted good social position; the ability to influence many people, and a chance to develop a special interest or hobby. The Germans, on the other hand, discounted job security and religious faith. All these things may be considered pathways to security. For the Germans, security was more likely to require a high position in the hierarchy of prestige and influence, or a change for individual achievement; for the Americans, it was more likely to require a dependable job and a dependable, well-ordered universe (religious faith). One view placed more value on personal achievement; the other, on a happy state of the world.

A similar difference appeared on a sentence completion item about the determinants of success. (Table 6) The Germans stressed the importance of individual purpose; the Americans were more likely to say that success depends upon fate. The Germans placed the individual under a heavier obligation to prove himself in terms of worldly success.

Feelings of failure seemed to be more generalized and overpowering for the Germans than for the Americans. At the same time the Germans had more tendency to excuse or explain away failure. Apparently the emphasis placed upon success and failure meant that stronger defenses were necessary to avoid becoming overwhelmed by one's own inadequacy. A question about work provides further information on methods of maintaining self-esteem. In completing the sentence, "A person who spends all his time working hard will feel....," the Germans described him as feeling satisfied and virtuous; the Americans, as feeling tired and frustrated.

In short, we see the Germans as being under pressure to keep working, to achieve success, and to win recognition. Failure to do this, as in the case of losing a job, is generalized and overwhelming. The Americans, on the other hand, start with greater feelings of security. As long as the world remains ordered and dependable, they will find ways to lead happy and satisfactory lives. Interpretation of these differences, of course, must take into account the fact that the Germans had experienced almost complete devastation of the world they knew, while the world of the Americans remained unharmed.
Discussion

We have indicated some of the possible sources of emotional tension for the Germans who were visiting America. There were problems of defensiveness arising from the nature of the relationship between the two countries. America was the victorious nation; Germany, the conquered one. The object of the training program was to build support for American ideas in Germany. In this context, attitudes toward America were ambivalent. They were both envious and defensively critical. Differences between the two countries were interpreted in black-and-white terms. If America was ahead, there was envy of her success. If Germany was judged to have the advantage, there was attack against America for her inferiority. In either case, the defensive attitudes probably made it difficult for relaxed and productive interaction to occur between Germans and Americans.

The second source of difficulty discussed here was a set of psychological attitudes and orientations which can be roughly classified as authoritarian. There was tension about authority, and particularly about submitting to the wishes or opinions of someone else. There was interpersonal tension, with hostility and suspicion so great that rigid controls were necessary to maintain order. These tensions became focused in individual competition: The successful person was not the one who related well to other people, but he who defeated others through superior achievement and heightened personal power. Such psychological attitudes were presumably manifested in Germany as well as in America, but there were special problems in America created by the discrepancy between cultures. American attitudes, at least in polite academic society, started with different assumptions. Human nature was assumed to be good, rather than bad; sharing ideas and activities with other people was valued rather than feared. Thus, there was room for mutual misunderstanding from the beginning. In addition, there was a kind of unquestioning complacency on the part of Americans which, far from reducing German defensiveness, served to corroborate German expectations. Each side could "see" that the other felt superior and unwilling to admit obvious weaknesses. Thus, again, there was room for misunderstanding.

At this point there is need to repeat one warning. The statements which we have been making about Germans and Americans are only statements of trend. The "German" pattern was shown by more Germans than Americans. However, it was not true of all Germans, and it was true of some Americans. We were interested in examining special problems which Germans had in America, and hence we directed our attention to
those attitudes which, on the average, were different for Germans and Americans. These statements of average tendency, however, certainly do not apply uniformly to all individuals. There were always some people who deviated sharply from the average.

Even recognizing that what we have described as German defensiveness and German psychological orientation did not operate for all the Germans, it is still true that they were important factors influencing the experience of the German training group as a whole. Disturbance felt by some members was shared with others, even when the original point of view was different. Aggression and resistance by a few people could block the activities of many. Also, it was seen by Americans as coming from "the Germans," and thus influenced their reactions to the entire German group.

Granted these initial difficulties, then, what kinds of things was it possible for the Germans to learn in America? What did they look for, and what did they see?
Motivated Learning:
Checking on Preconceptions

Every visitor to a strange country brings with him certain ideas and preconceptions. In general, these are the standard stereotypes of the country from which he comes. They are a compound of information, misinformation, and values. They serve to explain and justify the essential character of each nation, and the present state of relations between two countries. One of the major functions of a visit abroad is to make it possible to test and expand these generalizations.

The motivation behind the testing will be the same as the motivation behind the stereotypes. If relations between two countries are characterized by hostility and defensiveness, as between Germany and America at the time of our study, the motivation will be to find rational support for the hostility. This can best be done by validating negative stereotypes, and discounting positive achievements. If the relations between the two countries are characterized by friendliness and mutuality, the motivation will be quite different. The visitor will try to validate positive stereotypes, and will discount evidence of negative characteristics. In either case, the validation of stereotypes and value judgments serves two purposes. It meets the personal needs of the visitor by justifying his previous thinking and his previous feeling. It also reaffirms his ties to the home country, by placing him in agreement with its norms.

It is always possible that a particular individual will choose some referent other than people at home. An American Communist visiting the Soviet Union, for example, would try to validate good rather than bad preconceptions about the Soviet Union. Similarly, a particular German visiting America might prefer to align himself with American rather than German norms. Another possibility is that an individual will be motivated either by indifference, or by a strong interest in objective fact-gathering, so that he collects new ideas rather than validating old ones. In any case, the ideas which a visitor brings with him serve to direct his observations, and the values which he brings with him condition his interpretation of these observations.
The interest of the host, just as of the visitor, lies in values and interpretations. He wants his visitor to see not only the specific behaviors and activities of people in his country, but to interpret these "correctly." He wants the visitor to adopt his values and his interpretations. For example, the American host wants the German visitor to evaluate what he sees in terms of American standards. The visitor should see what a particular event means to Americans, and not what it would mean to Germans if it occurred in Germany. At any point where German and American stereotypes about America differ, he wants the visitor to disprove the German stereotype, and to accept the American one. Also, because he is democratic, he wants this to happen voluntarily. The visitor should be convinced by the weight of objective evidence, and not by any personal persuasion. However, if the American assumes that this will happen automatically, he is likely to be disappointed. He has not taken adequate account of the contrary motivation on the part of the visitors.

The German visitors brought to America several different stereotypes or preconceptions. We shall deal with each in turn, reporting both on the initial attitudes and on the extent to which the visit resulted in change or lack of change.

**Negative Stereotypes about American Character**

There seem to be three major negative stereotypes about America which the Germans brought with them. America is materialistic and uncultured; Americans are superficial, both in intellectual understanding and interpersonal relations; and in American government there is corruption, inefficiency, and naivete. (Table 2) The last criticism is the only one the Americans shared. Thus, people from both countries could agree in criticizing the system of government, but only the Germans criticised American character.

There was little change over time in these beliefs. Whenever the Germans were asked to criticize America they gave the same answers, whether it was at the time of arrival, departure, or six months after return. About one-third of the people in the first two groups reported some testing of the stereotype about materialism, saying that they found less materialism in America than they expected. However, they still believed it to be a serious American problem. Their major criticisms remained relatively unchanged.

None of these stereotypes, of course, can be readily tested. They are interpretations of behavior and not simple statements
of fact. Thus, for example, the high material standard of living does not necessarily imply the dominance of materialistic values. However, if one first assumes that materialistic values are present, then every instance of material comfort will confirm the assumption. It is much easier to find confirmation for existing assumptions than to discover points at which new assumptions or interpretations are required. Simple observation of behavior is more likely to justify existing assumptions than it is to change them.

Reports from the Germans indicated that there was some testing of less salient stereotypes while in America. Thus, in addition to the reports of finding less materialism than was expected, there were reports of finding America less urban and less commercialized than was expected; or of finding that Americans work harder and have less money than was expected. Also, there was some indication that American size, power, and prestige became more salient after the visit to America. Evidently, the persistence of the major negative stereotypes did not prevent the accumulation of new information about other aspects of American life.

I ideas about Democracy

The German visitors in the first program were classified as potential "German leaders," and in the later programs, as "government officials." Each program was under the direction of the University of Michigan's Political Science Department. Therefore, there was special interest in the understanding which the visitors would show for American political institutions. The interviews included several questions on this subject.

In general, the answers to questions did not change over time. When asked to compare political parties in Germany and America, there was recognition from the beginning that Germany had a multiple party system, while America had two parties. Also, there was widespread comment on the greater ideological emphasis and rigidity in the German parties, as compared to more pragmatism, flexibility, and cosmopolitanism in American parties. The American system was generally preferred. When asked to explain the differences between the two governments, the Germans would mention either the different historical traditions of the two nations, or the difference between German and American character. None of these answers showed any change.

A second set of questions asked about the political influence structure of the two countries. Again, information on differences
was familiar from the beginning. In all interviews, the Germans commented on the fact that the United States had more civic organizations and non-political interest groups than Germany.

Several general questions about democracy were analyzed to see if there was any change in salience or quality of comments about American political institutions. The interviews do not provide any evidence for such change. Comments about political institutions were rare in all interviews. In fact, comparison of the first group with the Americans shows that the Germans had significantly less tendency than Americans to talk about democracy in terms of political institutions. Rather, they stressed the democratic qualities of daily living.

Our conclusion, then, must be that the Germans brought with them some general understanding of American government, and that this did not change over time. Presumably they acquired specific information to supplement the first general ideas. Exposure to the details of American government through courses and direct observation could not help but provide new information on many specific points. In fact, there is evidence that comments about American democratic institutions became more differentiated over time. (Table 7) However, new information seems to have been assimilated to a general framework already existing, so that general questions about American political life brought the same answers at all times.

It is obvious, of course, that democracy means more than political institutions. It is a way of life. The Germans were very much aware of this, and again, this awareness appeared right from the beginning. Comments about American democracy and the American way of life included many references to the pervasiveness of democratic attitudes and democratic behavior. The visitors were impressed by the fact that democratic attitudes and behavior appeared everywhere, in the routine activities of the ordinary citizen, and in the operation of all levels of government. In comparison with Americans, they were much more likely to talk about democracy in terms of specific aspects of daily living. They reacted to democratic living as a foreigner might react to the speech of a child. It is always a shock to see the things which one has learned slowly and laboriously appear as the casual and automatic behavior of relatively untrained people. Presumably the immediate and continuing interest of the Germans in everyday democratic behavior arose as much from the contrast between Germany and America, as from preconceived ideas brought from Germany. Whatever the source, this theme was of unchanging importance in all interviews. Again, the process seemed to be one of confirmation and elaboration rather than change.
Disillusionment

Certain expectations could be verified in America, but other more unrealistic expectations were doomed to disappointment. In our discussion of German character, we mentioned the search for a supreme "good father." America, by playing a large part in the defeat of Germany and then stepping into the position of major western world power, became a candidate for that role. She became a major dispenser of reward and punishment in Germany. In this, she compared only with Russia. Many Germans--and these German visitors in particular--found more reason to expect good treatment from America than from Russia. Thus, we see one pressure toward exaggerated estimates of America's power to do good in Germany.

Once an individual was committed to the side of the western powers, and to democracy as a goal for Germany, there were further reasons for looking toward America. America was the homeland of democracy, and a potential source of guidance and inspiration for Germany. America was supposed to have all the answers.

The exaggerated hopes for American leadership, however, were not unmixed with resentment. The desire to prove America wrong probably balanced or outweighed the hope that she was right. These were two parallel aspects of a single ambivalence. The greater America's power over Germany, the greater the intensity of both hostility and admiration on the part of the Germans. The result of this intense ambivalence often was to set up impossibly high expectations concerning America. Then, with the disappointment of these expectations, hostility and independence could be reaffirmed.

We do not have good information on expectations. We can only infer disillusionment from the increase in critical comments which followed the visit to America. Specifically, we are interested in the increase in accusations of egoism, and of nationalism or imperialism. (Table 7) These characteristics were consistently associated with Germany in all interviews. (Table 25) However, nationalism was not cited as an American weakness until the departure interviews and egoism did not become salient until the follow-up interviews. It is interesting to note that the two criticisms were essentially the same, except that one applied to individuals and the other to nations. Each represented an accusation of striving for self, at the expense of others. It will be remembered that this was precisely the German perception of people in general. Now it appeared that this was a salient category of response, not only to ambiguous items on a
sentence completion test, but also to the ambiguous stimuli of Germans in general, or Americans in general. At first the criticism was made only of Germany, apparently with some hope that America would be different. A visit to America destroyed this hope. Americans were found to be as egoistic as Germans. The general negative evaluation of human nature, to which America was tentatively considered an exception, was unfortunately confirmed. It is of course impossible to tell how much this disappointment represented a projection of internal needs, and how much it was a realistic assessment of the facts. But, the disappointment itself was clear.

There was another criticism of America which appeared more often in the second and third interviews than in the first. This was the accusation of prejudice and stratification. Here the reasons for increase were not so clear. The frequency of this criticism in anti-American propaganda was such that the Germans must have been aware of it before they came. Their failure to mention it in initial interviews may have meant either a courteous refusal to criticise, or an actual withholding of judgment. Thus, the emergence of the criticism in later interviews may represent either a greater freedom and security in making criticism, or an increased certainty that the criticism was true. In either case, the shift would be accelerated by the fact that Americans, too, are critical of prejudice and stratification. It was no surprise that the Germans took note of this criticism. The only surprise was that they did not do so on the first interview.
Motivated Learning: 
Exploration of Areas of Difference

The visitor who approaches a new culture looking for evidence to support preconceptions is most likely to focus attention on subjects of high emotional significance. Such significance may derive either from strong norms in the home country or from strong personality needs. In either case, it is more important to him to arrive at a specified conclusion than to be sure that the conclusion is correct.

His approach may differ in cases where it is not so important to arrive at a particular pre-determined conclusion. He may be interested then in exploring areas of difference. He is not particularly threatened by these differences; he does not need to prove his country is right. He is curious about what they mean to the people in the other country. He retains an open mind.

Three topics in our study might fall into this classification. Each was a specific aspect of democracy, highly visible as a point where America was different from Germany. Each drew a good deal of comment from the Germans. They include the balance of individualism and groupism; the definition of appropriate citizen behavior; and the organization of family life. We shall discuss each in turn.

Individualism and Groupism

One of the most difficult things for the Germans to understand about democracy was the relation between the individual and the group. They recognized only two alternatives. There was "groupism," or mass submission; and there was "individualism" or complete individual independence. The reaction in Germany against Hitler and Fascism brought with it a complete rejection of groupism. Democracy, as the opposite of Fascism, was identified with the opposite of groupism, namely, individual freedom. People in all interviews mentioned respect for the individual as an important aspect of American democracy, and as one of the important things which democracy has to offer Germany. (Tables 15, 16)
At the same time, the German visitors recognized that their concept of individualism did not describe the state of affairs in America. They saw freedom restricted by obligations to others, and independence limited by the desire to conform. They were thrown back to the conclusion that Americans place too much emphasis upon conformity to group opinion.

Actually, there is not much evidence to indicate that the visitors became more aware of the checks upon individual freedom required by responsibility to others. An overall coder rating was made of each interview to determine whether the interviewee defined freedom in terms of rights alone, or whether he thought of a combination of rights and responsibility. It was found that members of the first group stressed the combination of rights with responsibility in all three interviews; members of the second group were inclined to stress only rights, in all interviews; and the third group showed a slight change after the first interview toward a greater awareness of responsibility. In general, initial conceptions were maintained. Apparently this is not an area where it is easy to bring about new understanding. When all three groups are combined, it appears that approximately 40 per cent of the visitors thought of freedom exclusively in terms of individual rights. This proportion held true on all interviews.

Similar evidence came from a question about their understanding or perception of the meaning of democracy which was asked in the initial interviews with the first group of Germans. Again most of the visitors spoke of democracy in terms of individual rights, personal freedom, or equality of individuals; there were relatively few comments about individual responsibility.

On the other hand, the Germans did recognize the dangers of excessive individualism. They spoke of the desirability of having people in Germany show more liking and respect for each other, and more respect for other people's ideas. They said that people should not be too critical, or too quick to reject the leader or the leader's ideas. (Table 10) They recognized the desirability of having people react differently; but they did not think of this different reaction as an obligation which the individual owed to his fellows. They spoke of individuals and personal qualities, rather than relationships of social responsibilities.

More information on this topic came from a series of questions about how to help a small face-to-face group work together more satisfactorily. (Table 11) Concern about making individuals more receptive to each other was sometimes mentioned in
comments about community and national affairs, but was ex­
pressed most strongly in comments about the small groups.
At the same time, discussion of the small group often implied
that the only way to get things done was to maintain strong con­
trols, with full authority vested in the leader. Thus, the visi­
tors seemed to say that it would be nice if people were different;
but since they aren't, the only possible approach is to make
sure that their negative tendencies never have a chance to mani­
fest themselves.

The visitors took a directive approach to the small group in
both the initial and follow-up interviews. In the initial inter­
views, they were more likely than at other times to judge the
success of group action by whether or not the group had ac­
cepted their own ideas. In other words, the criterion of suc­
cess was acceptance of self. In the follow-up interviews, the
same tendency appeared in answers to questions about how to
influence a group, or what to do with opposition in a group.
The answer came to be, "Tell the group," or "Make the oppos­
ing individual understand your point of view."

Departure interviews showed clear evidence of American
influence. The criterion of success in a group was the process
by which it operated, and not its willingness to accept the "right"
ideas. In the case of opposition, it was judged important to
understand the other person's point of view, as well as to make
him understand yours. The appropriate way to influence a group
was not to give orders, but to stimulate participation and learn­
ing through experience. Business should be conducted in an
atmosphere of tolerance and mutual understanding.

Return to Germany convinced the visitors that this approach
would not work. They had to find other ways to produce results.
In the follow-up interviews, there was more concern about the
motivation of people in Germany, and the difficulties arising
from problems of apathy, disinterest, or strong competing inter­
est and activities. There was concern about lack of tolerance.
The implication was that one could not depend upon the motiva­
tion or tolerance of ordinary Germans; the only solution was to
tell the people what to do.

An overall estimate was made of each interview to deter­
mine the general approach to small group activity. Information
about change in America is inconclusive, since there are no
measures for the second group. The first group, which was
here longest, changed mostly in a positive direction; the third
group, which was fighting Group Dynamics, changed in both di­
rections. However, after return to Germany there was a clear
predominance of negative change. Returnees became more directive; i.e., more concerned about end results and less concerned about maintaining democratic procedures in achieving these results. It should be noted, incidentally, that only about half of the returnees engaged in group activity after return. (Table 30) For the others, change was based on observation of Germans in general, and not on actual group experience.

The temporary increase in willingness to try American procedures was paralleled by other changes. Comments about the operation of democracy were examined to see how the respondent felt about democratic decision-making procedures. The Germans were never completely persuaded of the desirability of taking time to consider the ideas of all relevant people before making decisions. However, their willingness to accept such procedures was highest at time of departure, and dropped again after return to Germany. (Table 8)

At the time of departure, people were more likely than later to express an interest in building up civic groups in Germany. (Table 13) It looked like a good idea, when one viewed American success; it seemed less feasible in the light of German conditions.

The salience of civic activity in America was indicated by a sharp rise in descriptions of Americans as community-minded, cooperative, groupists. (Table 8) However, like the other references to group activity, this type of comment declined again after return to Germany.

It is interesting that "groupism" was used by the visitors to describe both the cooperative interaction which they admired, and the conforming behavior which they deplored. Their criticism of group conformity was marked. They tended to equate conformity with superficiality. Thus, they announced that Americans don't think for themselves, but only copy their neighbors. Americans are friendly, informal, and superficially easy to get along with; but they don't mean anything they say. There is no depth to either the thought or feelings of Americans. They care only about conforming to the group.

It is not surprising, then, that the recognition of positive aspects of "groupism" disappeared after return to Germany. The negative aspects were too strong, and were reinforced after return by both the language and behavior of the Germans at home.

What remained was an admiration for the individual qualities which make cooperation possible. We have mentioned the
desire to have individuals show more respect for each other. In addition, the visit brought a lasting increase in descriptions of Americans as active and responsible citizens, or as friendly, trusting, and full of goodwill increased after the visit here, and remained high after return. (Table 12) Comments on American tolerance and attitudes of give-and-take increased somewhat during the visit here, and increased more after return home. However, the visitors did not seem to feel that American patterns of initiative and criticism could be transferred to Germany. (Table 10)

Thus we find the Germans returning with a clear picture of two dangers to be avoided, but without any clear positive alternative. They wanted to avoid the dangers of excessive individualism, by having people become more sensitive to each other. At the same time, they hoped to preserve individual independence, and avoid excessive conformity, or groupism. Yet they did not seem to have any clear image of a sensitive and independent individual who could serve as a model for their own behavior. In fact, if we may judge from their comments about small group activity, they seemed to feel that the democratic individual in present-day Germany can only proceed by telling others what to do.

It is only fair to point out that many Americans are also confused about the relationship between the individual and the group. They are not sure how to resolve the value conflict between individual initiative and independence, on the one hand, and social obligations, on the other. Cooperation is valued, but blind conformity is not. The line between them is often not clearly drawn.

Our conclusion, then, must be that exposure to the democratic pattern of cooperative interaction was not very helpful. It was puzzling, because it did not fit the German stereotypes. It was impressive, because the achievements of cooperative community action were greater than anything judged possible in Germany. But it could not be assimilated for transfer, because it was based upon a psychological orientation quite different from that prevailing in Germany.

Citizenship Behavior

The behavior of the average citizen in a democracy is obviously different from that under a dictatorship. It was widely recognized by both Germans and Americans that one of the major tasks of reconstruction in Germany was to change the behavior.
of the average citizen. However, it was not clear what to do nor exactly how to do it.

The major task, as stated by both Germans and Americans, was to get German citizens to become more aware of their rights as citizens, and to become more critical of what government officials were doing. (Table 10) However, the simple statement of the problem in this form became less frequent with each successive German interview. There are two kinds of comparison permitted by the interviews. One is the comparison of Germans and Americans; the other is the comparison of comments about different types of citizen behavior. Also, there is some information about change over time.

The Germans tried to be diagnostic about what the difficulties were. (Table 13) For example, they stressed the competing demands of making a living in a period of hardship and poverty: There is no energy left for thinking about national improvement. Attitudinal difficulties are not merely wrong information or wrong psychology, but a rational assessment of the situation: With the Russians coming it is not strategic to work for democracy nor for any kind of social change. Faced with such problems, the Germans recognized that fuller citizen participation cannot be created by wishing, nor even by education. They stressed the importance of building up morale and confidence, and of trying to produce behavior changes by stimulating individual initiative. As mentioned earlier, they were intrigued by the possibility of working through small citizens' groups at the time when they left, but this interest dropped after return.

Americans tended to place more stress on education and demonstration. Their diagnosis of attitudinal difficulties in America centered on misinformation, lack of information, or psychological beliefs. Apparently they carried this same diagnosis over to Germany, and made the assumption that if education could change the cognitive understanding of the German citizens, then that would be sufficient. They did not recognize the problems of morale and motivation stressed by the Germans. When they did recognize the inadequacy of their proposals, they were stumped: Change should occur, but aside from education, they didn't know what to suggest.

Americans and Germans differed also in their confidence in the judgment of the German people. The Americans were willing to say that education should help the Germans to stand on their own feet, and then the Germans should make their own decisions. They did not really believe that independent choice would result in rejection of the democratic alternative. Germans, on the
other hand, were not sure. They wanted to see the German people receive education and stand on their own feet, but they also wanted some way of guaranteeing that the Germans would then conform to the right (my) ideas.

With respect to Germany democratization, the German answers became more like the American ones. (Table 13) Here they cited problems of authoritarianism and wrong attitudes: Their solutions relied more heavily on education. Education thus appeared as the technique for making people into something different. It was the suggested means for changing from authoritarianism to democracy. But it was not suggested for problems in which the Germans were more directly involved. When faced with questions about democratization, the Germans became somewhat unrealistic, expressing themselves in cliches. Only questions about social change in Germany led to consideration of the problems as they actually exist.

There is another aspect of citizen role which should be reported. This is the perception of individual power. The Americans reported much more faith than the Germans in the power of an individual to affect what happens to him and to his country. Germans were more likely to feel that the individual is powerless. (Table 14)

At the same time, the Germans were more ambitious for personal power. The Americans did not seem to feel the same need for personal influence. Apparently they thought of social change rather than individual power. An individual is powerful because of the people he works with, and not because of personal influence. The German conception of limited possibilities for individual effectiveness, plus aspirations for large amounts of personal influence, was quite the opposite. It stressed the personal power of the individual.

There is evidence to show that the Germans became more sensitive during their visit to the possibilities for joining others in organized effort. This change persisted after return to Germany. Also, they became more optimistic during their visit about the way things were going in Germany, but there is no information about optimism after return.

If one believes that the individual is helpless or unimportant, one does not give him much weight in a plan for social change. Thus, Germans differed from Americans at the beginning of their visit in wanting to focus their change efforts on national leadership. (Table 13) Americans were more interested in changing understanding and motivation at the grass roots. Similarly, in
talking about means of change, the Germans were more likely to speak of high echelon planning, or to speak in terms of paternalism, structure, and restraint. However, the number of such comments was small and the overall difference between Germans and Americans in approach to social change was much less than anticipated. Both the tendency to focus on top leadership and the tendency to speak of top-down methods of change disappeared by the time of the follow-up interviews.

In summary, then, the Germans were somewhat diagnostic in their analysis of problems to be met before German citizens would participate actively in national affairs. The visit to America helped the Germans to see the possibilities of cooperation among individuals for common ends, and to lose their feeling that the individual is helpless. It helped to shift their attention from bringing about change in top leadership to a concern for change at the grass roots. However, it did not give them much help in meeting the special problems of Germany: Apathy, the motivation to stay out of trouble, and a psychological atmosphere of mutual hostility and authoritarian behavior patterns.

The Family Age Roles and Sex Roles

The family unit and relationships defined by it are central to almost any culture. In the case of Germany and America, presumed differences in family relationships have aroused criticism of each by the other. Americans criticize the German family for being too authoritarian; Germans criticize the American family for an absence of real emotional ties between members. It was to be expected, therefore, that visitors from one culture to the other would want to find out about family living. Certainly this was true of the German visitors to America. They stated often and emphatically that they wanted to "get into American families." Their motivation seemed to be a combination of intellectual curiosity, and a search for some emotional home base. We shall be reporting here only on their intellectual views, namely, their ideas and attitudes about desirable patterns of family living.

The sentence completion test and some of the interviews contained questions about desirable child-rearing practices. (Table 15) We had expected to find the Germans taking a more repressive point of view than the Americans. This was not the case. Questions about how to handle a disobedient child revealed no difference between Germans and Americans. Both groups were sensitive to the importance of trying to understand why the child behaved as he did, and both also felt that the
parents should remain in clear command of the situation. They were equally split in their ideas about the appropriate relationships between parents and children, with some Germans and some Americans visualizing a rigid hierarchical structure, in which parents maintain some appearance of superiority and infallibility in front of their children. Similarly, some Germans and some Americans took the opposite point of view. It is interesting to note in passing that Americans more than Germans described their own childhood as one in which parents were clearly "on top."

These findings, it should be remembered, are based upon a comparison of the first group of Germans with the special sample of Americans. The first group was the only one which included any appreciable number of women. Their attitudes, therefore, may not be comparable to those of the two subsequent groups. Men and women may certainly be expected to differ in their ideas about appropriate sex role definitions, and they may also differ in their views on appropriate techniques of child-rearing.

We had hoped to define pressures toward change in terms of initial difference between Germans and Americans. We found no initial difference in our sample with respect to child-rearing, but we did find change. Evidently there was an awareness of difference and a pressure toward change which our measurements did not reflect. Thus, overall evaluations of the arrival and departure interviews for the first group showed a shift toward virtual unanimity in expressions of consideration for the child. We had no initial measure on the second group, but departure interviews showed definite interest in American patterns of behavior. Departing visitors criticized the Americans for allowing their children too much freedom. On the other hand, they recognized the importance of this freedom in training for responsibility and in personality development, and they reported a personal preference for introducing some aspects of the American pattern into their own homes. The third group showed little change in this country, but when people in the second and third groups were asked on the follow-up interviews about desirable change in Germany, both stressed the importance of more democratic education and child training practices. In fact, of all things mentioned in answer to this question, change in child-rearing practices took first place. Clearly, then, the visit to America had some impact on attitudes. The returned visitors were definitely impressed with the child-centered point of view which they found in America.

Further questions in this general area focused on school practices, and on general objectives for child training. Again
we find no initial difference between Germans and Americans, but we do find evidence of attitude change among the Germans. After their visit to America, Germans placed less emphasis upon the responsibility of school and home to promote the unique development of each individual, and more emphasis upon the importance of teaching him to get along well with others. Also, they came to place less emphasis upon the obligation of the home to give specific training in such things as citizenship or vocational skills.

Germans and Americans showed similar types of dissatisfaction with their present school system. Germans were concerned about such things as war damage and resulting inadequacy of school facilities and materials; or about the difficulty of getting democratically-trained teachers. Americans, however, could raise just as many questions about the adequacy of the American system in meeting pupil needs, providing adequate materials, and selecting an appropriate curriculum. If German and American answers differed, it was a reflection of differences in the real situation, and not differences in attitude.

Briefly, then, we find that one effect of the American visit was to direct the attention of the German visitors toward two aspects of child raising: the obligation of parents to consider the child's point of view, and the importance of training children to get along well with each other. Commitment to these values was strengthened rather than negated by the return to Germany.

With respect to sex roles, there is less evidence of attitude change, and more evidence of difference between the Germans and Americans. Germans made a much sharper distinction between sex roles, keeping them complementary but non-overlapping. The Americans were more likely to feel that appropriate behavior would depend upon the situation, and not upon a priori role prescriptions.

Specifically, the Germans were more likely to define roles in terms of hierarchial or parallel relationships; the American definitions were dependent upon the particular situation. German definitions showed more rigidity, and more emphasis upon the importance of maintaining male infallibility. In answering sentence completion items concerning the role of the man in the home, the Germans were likely to reject the possibility of his doing housework, and to insist upon differentiating the roles of the two parents with respect to the children. Also, they were more likely to feel that professional activities for women were incompatible with marriage.
On the other hand, the sharp differentiation of roles meant that each has a special contribution to make to the other. This was evident in the description of complementary activity in child-raising. There is similar evidence from questions about other kinds of special roles, as for example, a question about the value to be placed upon suggestions from younger and newer people in an organization. The Germans placed a higher value on such suggestions than did the Americans. (Table 16)

Some change in German attitudes was brought about by residence in America. More people were willing to vary role definitions in accordance with particular situations. There was more acceptance of the American pattern of mutual give-and-take in marriage. This was in contrast to the original emphasis upon the similarity of background as a major condition for success in marriage. There was less criticism of the American family for the lack of stable and deep relationships. However, these changes were small. The general tendency was to admit that American ways might work in America, but to retain for themselves their allegiance to the German pattern. (It should be noted that the specific question on preference was asked only of the second and third group, which, with one exception, were composed of men. However, the data on lack of change come from all groups.)

It appears, then, that reactions to family patterns in America were of two kinds. The approach to child-raising was admired. The relative equality of sexes and flexibility of sex roles was criticized, especially by the men. In view of these differences, it is probably misleading to talk about any one syndrome of attitudes toward the family. Nevertheless, we computed one overall index of attitudes toward the family for each person in each interview. This made it possible to judge the extent of change for particular individuals. We found that almost everyone showed some change in these attitudes, and that of this change about two-thirds was positive and one-third was negative. In the first group, contributions to the judgment of positive change could come from attitudes relating to either child-raising or sex roles; in the third group, positive change concerned only child-raising. Negative change occurred in both areas, for both groups. There is no information about change in the second group, since initial interviews were lacking, and none of the follow-up interviews contained questions on these subjects.

Our conclusion must be that the reaction of the German visitors to the American family was predominantly positive. There was some dismay at the way in which the American male
was stripped of power and authority; and at the excessive and unconstrained freedom of American children. In general, however, these negative reactions were outweighed by admiration of the way in which democratic values were incorporated into child-rearing practices, and, occasionally, by admiration of flexible give-and-take relations between the sexes.

Some Speculations about Learning

The data from this and the preceding chapter indicate a variety of ways of reading to differences between Germany and America. In the case of negative stereotypes about America the differences were seen as a credit to Germany, and the attitudes of the visitors did not change. The American pattern of individual-group relationships was bewildering. It could not be adequately understood in terms of individualism and groupism, but these were the conceptual tools which the Germans relied upon. If the visitors tried to give up these tools and think about American behavior in American terms, they found themselves in an untenable position when they returned home. In the area of family relations, however, there was some opportunity for change. Initial concurrence with American objectives in child-rearing made it possible for the German visitors to accept and learn from American behavior. What can we learn from these findings about what conditions facilitate learning, and what conditions impede it?

Conditions which we have seen to be associated with failure to learn are the following:

- Learning does not occur when the attitudes to be learned would contradict deep-lying personality orientations. Thus, we find no real change in the authoritarian attitudes described in Chapter III.

- Learning does not occur in the face of defensive stereotypes which one nation maintains about another. Thus we note the persistence of the major German criticisms of America, and of the broader hostile overtones in comments about America.

- Learning does not occur at points where two cultures differ widely in values or conceptual frame of reference. New ideas must be meaningful to the visitor and their colleagues back home, in their own terms, before they can be successfully assimilated.

On the other hand, what situations are conducive to learning? We found:
Learning will take place when new information can be assimilated to a pre-existing frame of reference. This frame of reference may consist of certain emotional attitudes toward the host culture; of certain concepts and values for interpretation of specific behaviors in the host culture; or of a general system of information about the host culture.

Learning will take place at points where people of two cultures seem to be approaching the same problem from different points of view. Under these conditions, there is no need to change values or objectives, and there is no possibility of discarding the different behavior as irrelevant. There are still various ways in which the difference may be evaluated. If the new procedure is considered undesirable, no learning will take place. However, if it is considered as good as or better than what occurs at home, then learning and transfer will occur.
Changes in Attitudes and General Point of View

Attitudes toward America and specific democratic practices were not changed very much by the visit to America. However, attitudes toward things nearer home did change. The German visitors seemed to find more reason for modifying or expanding their views on Germany than for changing their ideas about America. This suggests that learning may be more efficient when it involves an elaboration or reorganization of the clear and familiar than when it requires creating order out of a mass of information ambiguously unfamiliar.

When questioned directly, the Germans reported the same kind of learning about both Germany and America. (Table 17 and 18) They said that they had gained increased perspective on each country, could understand each better, and were better able to make constructive criticism of Germany. However, they denied that any attitude change had taken place. A count of the number of favorable and unfavorable statements about America indicated some increase in positive statements after the visit, and a negative shift after return.

Further information about attitude change came from a question about personal effects of the trip. This question brought the most response from the people in the first group, and decreasing response from each subsequent group. This is probably a function of age. The people in the first group were younger, and more willing to respond to new experience in terms of personal change. People in the later groups were older. They showed the same pattern of change as other groups in response to questions about internationalism, democracy, and German psychology. However, they were not so likely to recognize change in themselves, or if they saw it, to report it.

The personal change most frequently reported was an increase in cosmopolitan attitudes. (Table 19) Indirect measures of attitudes toward Germany and toward world affairs supported this evidence of a shift toward stronger internationalism.

The second kind of personal change reported was an increase in autonomous and democratic behavior patterns. For example, people in the first two groups reported that they were now more
active in forming their own opinions. Other people from all three groups thought that in the future they would be more inclined toward tolerance, adaptability, or flexibility. Thus, they began to take what might be called a democratic approach toward the formation and exchange of ideas.

This change at the personal level was reflected in new attitudes toward Germany. The two new criteria of internationalism and democratization were applied to the German scene and resulted in a third kind of change. New aspects of the German situation emerged for the visitors. The psychological attitudes and resistances of the German people, which were opposed to the new values, became more salient. The external physical difficulties resulting from the loss of a major war were felt less sharply. The general point of view on Germany came to be much closer to that of the Americans, and more distant from that of the average German.

What was the nature of these attitude changes?

**Internationalism**

Internationalism became increasingly salient for the German visitors both as a characteristic of self, and as a criterion for evaluating others. We have said that change toward more cosmopolitanism was more frequently reported than any other personal change. It appeared in all three groups. The first two groups reported such change by the time of departure; the third group did not report it until the follow-up interviews.

We have also reported that the evaluation of America changed after the visit to include more criticism of imperialism. This appeared in various ways. Generally, America was credited with world-mindedness, goodwill, and active concern for other nations at the beginning of the visit. (Tables 7, 20) She was seen as interested in promoting democratic ideas throughout the world. Later, the evaluation changed. America came to be seen as less idealistic and more imperialistic—as a center of power, but not of inspiration. The visitors expressed the feeling that what would contribute most to American national life would be world mindedness, thus indicating both that they felt it was absent, and that they felt it was important.

With respect to Germany the shift toward internationalism was associated with a reduction in nationalism. (Table 1, 21) At the beginning of the visit there was heavy emphasis upon the abuses which Germany was suffering at the hands of others.
Even the world-wide struggle between east and west was noted only as it impinged upon Germany: Germany was suffering from division into two parts, and Germans must be excused from taking responsibility because their country was to be the battlefield for the next war. By the end of the visit the struggle was seen in more global terms. The visitors showed increasing evidence of an international point of view on German problems.

Specific questions about other things also drew increasing comments about international relations. There was more mention of improved international relations as a criterion of progress in Germany, and more attention to the difficulties still existing in relations between Germany and the United States. At the same time, there was more criticism of the German people for not being sufficiently international, and a report of wider disagreement between self and others on the subject of international relations. In talking about German leadership there was more mention of the importance of Germany’s leaders becoming more cosmopolitan. In short, there seemed to be an increasing feeling that Germany needed to improve her relations with other nations, and that this should include both better diplomatic relations and better attitudes on the part of the German people.

There was a shift over time in the extent to which internationalism was used as a criterion for a third set of judgments, namely, evaluation of the Visitors Program. (Table 22) Early visitors thought of the program in terms of re-educating the German people to accept democracy. People in the third group spoke almost entirely in terms of promoting international understanding. There was a corresponding change in comments about whether formal returnee groups should be organized in Germany for visitors who had been to America. People in the early groups thought such organization might provide help and mutual support for returnees when they set out to look for jobs or work for democracy. They valued American help. People in the later groups suggested more neutral purposes for returnee groups -- briefing new trainees, keeping alive memories, supplying new information, and giving an opportunity for sociability. The role of American officials became increasingly unimportant, so that by the time of the third group, people associated American help with failure. American influence was helpful in the early task of spreading American ideas, but it was a handicap for the later groups whose purpose was to increase mutual understanding between two sovereign nations.

The impact of the visit upon attitudes toward America did not seem to last. (Table 23) There was a temporary increase
in feelings of closeness to America, but this disappeared after return to Germany. At the time of departure from America, when American influence was at its height, America was generally described as friendly toward Germany, while European nations were credited with hostility, fear, envy, mistrust, or abuse. The follow-up interviews, however, gave the opposite picture. The European nations were seen as friendly, and America as unfriendly, or at least as being interested in Germany only because of need for German support. Apparently, then, feelings of closeness varied in accordance with the amount of contact. Judgments of friendliness and hostility varied with geographical proximity.

Beside this variation dependent upon contact with America, a general shift could be observed over time in attitudes toward America. There was an increasing amount of hostility. We have already reported the increasing rejection of American help to returnee groups, and the disappearance of any feelings of obligation to spread American ideas. We have also reported that return to Germany was always associated with increased alienation from America. This alienation was not all of the same kind. The first two groups contented themselves with stressing America's need for German support as an explanation for American behavior. The last group, however, expressed direct hostility toward America, and resentment that America was not giving to Germany in proportion to what she wanted to take. If the interviews from all phases are combined, and arranged in chronological order, the same tendency appears. There was more attribution of unfairness, envy, fear, and mistrust in the later interviews than in the earlier ones, with the biggest shift coming between 1951 and 1952.

Presumably this increase in anti-Americanism was associated with an increase in German nationalism throughout Germany as a whole. This is hard to detect in our sample because of the counteracting influence of the trip itself. There are occasional cues, such as the presence of more conflict over national submissiveness in the early interviews. It was only in the first interviews in the fall of 1949 that people would express either submissive satisfaction with the behavior of other nations toward Germany, or a belligerent demand that other nations stop their interference with Germany—the dismantling and the partition of Germany. By the time of the later interviews there was more recognition of German independence, and less need for conflict over submission. For the people in our sample this greater independence was associated with attitudes of responsibility, both for internal affairs and for international relations. However, it is difficult to see how such attitudes could
stand up if the shift within Germany itself were toward an aggresive nationalism.

**Democratization**

There are at least two ways for measuring commitment to democratic values and objectives. One is to ask specific questions about democracy, and take the answers at face value. The other is to ask more general questions, and then examine the answers to see whether they show an implicit and internalized acceptance of democratic values. We tried both ways. (Table 24) We found that, although the explicit acceptance of democratic objectives was highest at time of departure and dropped off again after return, the internalization of democratic values showed a steady increase from the first to the follow-up interviews. On the average, then, internalization of democratic values can be seen as a continuous process, beginning in America and continuing after return to Germany.

If we look behind the average, we see that there are important differences between groups. The first group, which was in America for a full year, showed the most positive change in this country, and the most negative change after return to Germany. Apparently some people found the change in America too great to be sustained. Others, however, held their positions even after return to Germany.

In the third group there was a different pattern, consisting of no change or negative change in America, and positive change after return. This is a phenomenon which we observed repeatedly in the third group. The visitors reacted negatively to the particular experiences they had in America, and departure interviews reflected this negativism. After return to Germany the negative effects disappeared, and there was a concentration of positive change which brought the third group into line with the other two. Thus, for the third group, commitment to internationalism and to democracy both appeared for the first time in the follow-up interviews, while for the other two groups they were already present in departure interviews.

The second group was somewhere between the other two, making some positive changes in America and more after return.* It is possible, therefore, that some of the delayed effect should

---

*This estimate is based upon data from the sentence completion test, since there were no initial interviews.
be considered as a function of time. New ideas got their start in America, but it took a year or so before they became crystallized. Thus all groups, interviewed one year after arrival in the United States, gave strongly positive answers. Some of the people who spent the full year in America became discouraged later after return, but we can hope that the people who stayed a shorter time, and still were showing positive change after six months back in Germany, were able to avoid the discouragement.

If we turn our attention now from the internalization of democratic values to the explicit endorsement of them, we find a somewhat different picture. Return to Germany unquestionably reduced the amount of explicit interest in democracy. There was less mention of democracy as a goal for Germany, or democratization as an important objective of young people. Democratic living, which seemed to be an important personal motivation at the time of departure interviews, was relinquished in the follow-up interviews as unrealistic in Germany at the present time. Personal interest in participating in democratization was at a high point at time of departure, but dropped after return.

There are two ways of interpreting these findings: One is to assume that the number of people giving democratic answers was artificially inflated at time of departure, because people then were anxious or willing to give the answers which the Americans wanted. The discrepancy between the number of people giving technically democratic answers and the number showing evidence of internalized democratic values was then a measure of polite deception: Some of the visitors professed a position which they could not really accept. The motivation for such deception was minimized by the time of the follow-up interviews.

A second interpretation is that the departing Germans were genuinely impressed by what they had seen of democracy, and were willing to give it a trial in Germany. However, when they got back and saw the difficulties involved, they gave it up. Without understanding or being fully committed to the values of democracy, they were not interested in tying themselves to an unpopular goal. This interpretation made the profession of democratic values an intermediate step in change. If the environment had continued to support the values to which he was giving lip service, the individual would have continued to change and eventually would have developed the internalized conviction that these values were right. There is some evidence in the literature of attitude change that verbal statements of a new point of view are indeed a preliminary step toward change. In the case
of some Germans, return to Germany stopped the process, and
the person went back to "normal." Others, however, kept right
on changing. It would be interesting to know what made the
difference. Some persons made a change in this country and
maintained it; some began to change here, and continued after
return; some started to change, but gave it up; and some made
no change at all. The only thing which we can say clearly is
that the visit did influence a significant number of people toward
more acceptance of democratic values and objectives, but it did
not convince them all.

Internalized commitment to democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Dynamic View of Germany

The interest in internationalism and democracy as possible
objectives for Germany led to new ideas of how to bring about
change. There was less concern about the restrictions imposed
from the outside, and more concern about intrinsic German atti­
tudes and German psychology. (Table 25)

The early picture showed Germany as helpless and victim­
ized. There was a tendency to feel that Germany's fate rested
entirely in the hands of other nations; Germans themselves had
no power and no responsibility to influence what happened to
them. Also, living was difficult in Germany; people had no
energy to do anything beyond keeping alive. Besides, with the
threat of Russian invasion always present, Germans knew it was
not wise to become involved in social action of any kind. They
might be punished later. Under these conditions, it was natural
for the German people to be apathetic and for each German to be
concerned only about looking out for himself. External condi­
tions required such an attitude.

The visit to the United States changed this view considerably.
(Table 26) First, there was a change in thinking about Germany's
power to influence her own fate. The end result of the trip
was to increase the belief that Germans had power and freedom
to act on their own behalf. However, there was some delay in
the appearance of this belief. At time of departure, the visitors
showed less confidence in Germany's power to work out her own problems than at any other time. There was more feeling that the responsibility belonged entirely to other nations, and more fear of what Russia might do. We interpreted this as a projection of individual insecurity. When the visitors were about to return to Germany, they were unsure of their own ability to influence events at home, and this anxiety was generalized as uncertainty about Germany's national role.

By the time of the follow-up interviews, confidence had been restored. The visitors felt then that much could be done by Germans about Germany. They were less concerned about the insoluble international problems, and more concerned about internal German problems. They were less concerned about what Russia and the United States would do to Germany, and more concerned about restoring a German government to power within Germany so that Germans could do for themselves.

Each interview was evaluated to determine the extent to which change goals for Germany reflected concern about internal problems. It was felt that internal problems were more within the power of Germany to solve, and also that concern about internal problems showed more acceptance by Germans of responsibility for their own fate and less projection of blame upon others. Thus, positive ratings were given to concern about democratization of attitudes or institutions in Germany; to interest in reducing nationalism; and to an interest in bringing about greater economic equality within Germany. Neutral ratings were given to concern about economic difficulties, the Russian threat, or reorganization of German institutions. Negative ratings were associated with concern about German unification, or improving relations with the United States. There were usually several answers for each person for each interview, and these were combined in a single overall rating.

Change was reported for slightly less than half of the visitors in America, and for the same proportion after return to Germany. Once again, it appeared that change was well under way for members of the first group by the time they left America, but did not develop in the third group until after their return to Germany. For the second group, of course, we have no information about change in America. Almost all of the change which occurred anywhere was positive.

This focus on internal problems was accompanied by more concern about the attitudes and motivation of the German people. No longer did the visitors describe the German people as apathetic, or unable to participate in social action because of the
difficulty of making a living. Instead, they expressed criticism of the German people for authoritarianism. (Table 11) The refusal of people to act was no longer associated with external difficulties, but with internal motivation.

Concern about German attitudes was expressed in several ways. German character came to be described as authoritarian rather than apathetic. Criticisms of egoism and nationalism, which had been present from the beginning, remained unchanged. (Table 25)

A shift in thinking about the desired target of change has already been reported. (Table 13) Early answers stopped with the proposal that change should be introduced at the top of the power structure. The Americans, on the other hand, stressed the importance of change at the grass roots. By the second and third interviews, however, the visitors were attaching more importance to changing the attitudes and behavior of ordinary Germans. Similarly, their comments about progress in Germany showed a shift from interest in change in political or economic institutions, to an interest in attitudinal change. (Table 26) Even when they referred to institutional change, their interest was in attitudes rather than institutional forms. For example, in talking about German political parties, they said less about the desirability of a two-party system, and more about the desirability of developing attitudes of tolerance and compromise.

The diagnosis of barriers to democracy in Germany showed the same trend. There was a steady shift from initial to follow-up interviews, with increasing attention being given to psychological factors and less to situational difficulties.

The increase in concern about German attitudes and motivation was particularly evident after return to Germany. In America shifts were recorded in both directions, but in Germany almost all change which occurred was in the same direction. Confronted with the actual state of German affairs, the returnees responded to the difference between Germany and America, and came up with a criticism of German authoritarianism and a desire to change German attitudes. It is interesting to recall, in this connection, that tolerance as an American characteristic increased sharply in salience after return to Germany. (Table 12) At the same time, the visitors felt that the most difficult thing to transfer from America to Germany would be American attitudes with respect to individual initiative and criticism. (Table 10) Thus, return to Germany made American attitudes seem both desirable and unattainable, and opened the way to rejection of German attitudes.
Self as Agent of Change

Did their new aspirations for Germany and their new concern about changing the psychological situation there cause the visitors to take action in introducing the desired changes? It appears that about half of them were personally motivated to take an active role in social change or democratization. (Tables 24 and 27) There was some fluctuation in this interest. About half of the people showed some change in America, and half showed some change in Germany. This change was almost entirely positive for the first and second groups, but for the third group there was as much negative as positive change. In general, it seems that the trip stimulated some interest in social change activities, but not enough to result in any real change in motivation. The number of people motivated to take action was essentially the same at the end as at the beginning, namely, about 50 per cent of the visitors.

When a direct question was asked about personal goals, a slightly larger number of people indicated some kind of interest in social change. (Table 27) Three-fourths of the respondents said in follow-up interviews that they were interested in working for one or more of the following goals: helping Germany, promoting good will and understanding between Germany and other nations, or democratization. These three goals were mentioned with about equal frequency. The other quarter of the people mentioned only personal or opportunistic goals. Again, we found the third group behind the others. It split about half and half on interest in social vs. personal goals, while the other two groups split about four to one. It is not clear why the interest in social change was lower in the third group. The people may have been better established in professional careers and less able to assimilate new personal goals; or the situation in Germany may have changed so that there was generally less interest in social change.

Discussion

In this chapter we have discussed three major shifts in the point of view of the Germans: toward more internationalism, more democratic values, and a dynamic view of Germany. In the course of our report we have noted several different factors influencing the extent of this change.

Initial Selection of Participants

The first group changed the most in this country, and suffered the most disappointment after return home. They were
probably among the most favorably disposed toward America, since they chose to come when arrangements were almost entirely in the hands of Americans, and when there was no procedure for nomination by fellow Germans. They were also slightly younger than the other two groups.

Because of their youth and interest they were probably more eager to accept what America had to offer, and perhaps also in a more unstable situation after return home. Very few of the visitors in this group returned to jobs in Germany; several were at loose ends. Probably they had more difficulty and more freedom in finding a place for themselves. Thus, there were possibilities for both discouragement and creativity, and both appeared. Some people gave up their newly acquired values and regressed to their original views. Others lived up to new values, working actively in community affairs to an extent not duplicated in either of the other groups.

**Length of Stay: the "Sleeper" Effect***

The first group was the only one that stayed in America for a full year. The fact that they made more positive change than other groups by the time of departure resulted at least in part from this longer stay. It seems clear that a longer exposure to the American scene resulted in more influence.

However, the information on change after return to Germany casts doubt on the desirability of extensive change. The greater the change in America, the more difficult was the readjustment to Germany, and the greater the possibility of disillusionment and regression to the original views.

On the other hand, our results showed continued change after return to Germany for the people who had been in America only six months. It was as if the visit to America was just long enough to stir things up, challenging old assumptions and suggesting new ones. Then, before any new ideas had time to jell, the visitors returned home. There they continued to question and re-evaluate the old assumptions, testing them against current German realities. When they did alter their systems of values or beliefs, the change was compatible with the existing German situation. Thus, it did not generate as much emotional conflict as change accomplished in the distant and different atmosphere of the United States.

---

There is an alternative explanation. Departure interviews with the first group and follow-up interviews with subsequent groups were all conducted approximately one year after arrival in America. Perhaps this period of time was just long enough for the visitors to explore and become enthusiastic about new ideas. Later, with more time for living with the new ideas, their deficiencies became apparent. By this reasoning, if we had re-interviewed the second and third groups after twelve months in Germany, we would expect regression and disillusionment. There is, of course, no way in which we can disprove this hypothesis. However, in view of the continued positive change evidenced by the second and third groups after return to Germany, it strikes us as improbable.

The Emotional Tone of the Visit

The change pattern of the third group was distinctly different from that of the other two. There was relatively little change in America, and when change did occur, it was often in a negative direction. We attributed this rejection of influence to the unhappy experience in Ann Arbor, associated with lack of personal contacts and with tensions about the group-centered program. We felt that this dissatisfaction would spread to other aspects of the visit, serving to emphasize the negative qualities and detracting from the positive ones. Also, the research staff and the interview situation might arouse all the negative emotions associated with "group dynamics," so that departure interviews could reflect even more hostility than actually existed.

It was encouraging to find that this interruption of learning was only temporary. By the time of the follow-up interviews, the third group paralleled the second. We may guess that the same thing would be true in reverse. If an individual had a particularly gratifying experience while visiting a foreign country he might come away with exceptionally favorable attitudes. However, the present findings suggest that this halo effect might disappear, leaving him with essentially the same attitudes as his fellow-visitors. Our evidence on this point is weak, but it is supported by our findings on "sleeper" effects. It seems as if the trip can stir up certain processes of thinking and re-evaluation which are then carried through by the visitor, regardless of external pressures, and regardless of temporary emotional bias.

Closeness to the Source of Influence

We noted a temporary rise in explicit endorsement of democracy and democratic change objectives. Such endorsement
was highest in the departure interviews, and dropped after re-
turn to Germany. Thus, it seemed to be a function of physical 
and/or psychological closeness to America. There are several 
different ways in which this closeness might operate to influ-
ence the answers of the visitors. First, there might be a 
courteous willingness to give the answers preferred or desired 
by the hosts, which was no longer active in the follow-up situ-
aton. Second, there is the possibility that the visitors were "trying out" the acceptance of democracy, expressing acceptance 
at the verbal level, but still making some private reservations. 
This hypothesis assumes that if the trial period had been long 
long enough for acceptance to become crystallized, the change would 
have been retained. Finally, there is the hypothesis suggested 
in connection with our discussion of groupism. Perhaps many 
ideas and procedures which seemed feasible when judged in 
America turned out to be unrealistic for Germany. Thus, re-
turn to Germany would draw attention to new aspects of the 
reality situation, and force re-evaluation of inappropriate as-
sumptions.

The Climate of Opinion at Home

A chronological analysis of all interviews showed a trend 
over time toward more nationalism and more anti-Americanism. 
We must assume that this trend represented a shift of public 
opinion in Germany which was in opposition to the effects of 
the trip.

One effect of these counter-pressures was to reduce the 
amount of attitude change shown by the visitors. Thus, the 
impact of the German Visitors' Program was probably less than 
might be expected for visitors from a more friendly country.

A second result might be that visitors who did acquire new 
values would not try to do anything about them. They would 
maintain their private disagreements with their neighbors, but 
would not become involved in overt social action. This may 
be one explanation for the fact that the trip produced no notice-
able increase in personal motivation to participate in social 
change activities; and also for the fact that such motivation was 
lower in the last group than in the preceding ones.

Social climate interacts with selection criteria to a high 
degree. Thus, in the period when Germany was looking to 
America for help, the people who applied for the program were 
often those who wanted to help Germany. The high proportion of 
altruistic motivation in the first and second groups probably 
reflects this type of self-selection. Later, when Germany was
able to take care of her own interests, the people who applied for the program were motivated accordingly. They came to learn what they could in their professional fields, or to have the pleasure of traveling abroad; they did not come with broad social objectives in mind. Thus, the interaction between social climate and the self-selection of visitors provides a second explanation of the differences in social motivation which existed between the third group and the preceding ones.

There is another way in which social climate affects the results of a visitors' program. The ultimate objective of the program is to have some impact on the home country, and this requires activity and initiative from the returnees. However, they can act only in the ways—informal or institutionalized—which are open to them. If relations between the two countries are unfriendly, there will not be many ways. Hence, the returnee may have the best will in the world, but may not be able to do anything about it. When he chooses a course of action, he chooses not among a set of ideal alternatives, but among the alternatives actually open to him. What he can do will depend upon what the powers-that-be permit him to do. What was the situation confronting the returnees when they came home?
Return to Germany

Initial Reactions

The first reaction on return to Germany seemed to be a sense of let-down and depression. Only one person out of twenty-six reported that his first reaction was one of rejoicing. Other reactions, reported in order of frequency of mention, were the following. The German people look different; they are stiff, isolated from each other, grey, and unfriendly. Their living conditions are bad, and in particular, housing is crowded. And then, too, there are the authoritarian attitudes and way of life which one finds in Germany. There are also nationalistic attitudes. Germany is faced with great social problems.

The initial feeling of shock and depression became less salient as time went by. About half of the people reported in the follow-up interviews that they were getting used to it, and trying to adjust to Germany again. The others said that they were trying to change the situation around them and the point of view of the Germans with whom they came into contact. Thus, all agreed that they were finding ways to reduce the first negative reactions, but also implied that they had not yet been wholly successful.

Alienation of Self from German Situation

The visitors expressed some anxiety in the departure interviews about whether or not they would be well received by their friends and colleagues in Germany. (Table 28) The Americans working with the Program were also concerned about this. However, no real difficulty materialized. Only about half of the people who had anticipated possible difficulty encountered any. Almost everyone reported receiving more positive than negative reactions. The returnees appeared not to have lost many friends because of the trip, though a few people reported losing some old friends and gaining new ones. In short, their German compatriots were not automatically hostile to them when they came home.
On the other hand, the returnees found themselves more dissatisfied with their fellow Germans than they had anticipated. (Table 29) In talking about their jobs, for example, their most frequent complaint concerned the way Germans behaved with one another, or "the way Germans are."

Also, in talking about the achievement of personal goals, the attitudes of other Germans became the most salient difficulty. In America the problems had been the routine ones of completing an education, finding a job, or overcoming undesirable personal traits. After return to Germany, however, these were no longer the most important barriers. The disadvantage mentioned most often was possible hostility and suspicion from other Germans. This did not mean that they were currently experiencing hostility from other Germans; on the contrary, most of the returnees assured us that they were having no difficulty. However, the returnees seemed to feel such a gap between themselves and other Germans that they feared that any effort to work for what they believed in would arouse this hostility and suspicion. In this connection we note again the finding that return to Germany resulted in a sharp increase in the salience of tolerance as an attribute of democracy. (Table 12) One might infer that the visitors themselves were receiving less tolerance than they would like.

There are several evidences of perceived distance between themselves and other Germans. When asked whether other Germans felt "the same way that you do," reports of disagreement rose sharply after return. This was true whether the question concerned America's role in the world, the international situation or personal goals in life. It seemed to be generally assumed that other Germans thought about things differently.

Also there was more disparagement of ordinary Germans in the follow-up interviews than at other times. This kind of separation of themselves from others was lowest at time of departure, when Germany was farthest away, and highest at the time of follow-up interviews.

The sense of distance from others was not accompanied by any evidence of withdrawal from others, or increased hostility toward them. We asked in both departure and follow-up interviews what the visitors would do if they met suspicion and hostility from other people. They always gave the same general reply: They would try in private talks to explain the situation and restore confidence. There were two people who suggested in follow-up interviews that they might win confidence by joining in the criticism of the United States, and three people who said they would ignore or reject the hostile person. However, such
answers were clearly in the minority. Most people seemed interested in trying to bridge the gap between themselves and other Germans.

Civic Activity

About one third of the returned visitors reported some current participation in community activities, and another third anticipated some such activity in the future. (Table 30) However, these findings depend very heavily on the first group. Almost all of the people in the first group expressed some interest in community participation, either present or future, but the extent of such interest in later groups was much lower. It is not clear whether this is because the first group included younger people, who could be more flexible in designing their lives after return, or whether there was really a difference in attitude. As we have noted elsewhere, differences in attitude could arise either from differences in original selection, or from the longer exposure to American influence provided by a full year's visit.

A question was also included in the follow-up interviews about whether the returnees ever participated in small-group activity. We were curious about this, because we had been told so often that people in Germany do not do things through groups, but only as individuals. Just half of the returnees reported some group activity. Much of this took the form of staff conferences on the job, particularly for people working with the Americans, but also for others. Thus, we got an equivocal answer. There was apparently more group activity than the visitors would have had us believe, but not as much as there would be in America.

In general, the returned visitors were unhappy about the lack of opportunities for influence. We asked a general question about the status of young people ("like yourself") in Germany. In America this brought relatively noncommittal replies, but in Germany there were a number of people who said that young people had no influence and didn't like not having any. It is an extension, but not an unwarranted one, to infer that the people making such answers were also unhappy about their own lack of influence. Such a complaint ties in with the general picture of distance between returnees and other Germans, with returnees anxious to bridge the gap but not knowing how to do so.

The Job Situation

The Germans felt that the best opportunity for exerting influence would be through their jobs. We asked the visitors
whether they saw anything that they, personally, could do to contribute to German improvement. In America, they were able to cite a number of possibilities, both on and off the job. In Germany, they mentioned only job possibilities. Apparently the non-job activities which seemed possible from a distance turned out to be impractical. (Table 14)

What kind of job openings were available to the home-coming Germans? First, there was no evidence that they experienced either unexpected difficulty or unexpected opportunity on their return. Considering the group as a whole, people were doing pretty much what they had expected to do. Of the twenty-five people about whom we have information, six were back at former jobs; ten had new jobs, half with American authorities and half with German organizations; and nine were still in school. Three other people had left Germany.

Special analysis was made of the situations of the thirteen people who failed to return to jobs held before the trip. (Table 31) There were almost no instances of people losing jobs because of their American experience. About half of the people had been forced to give up their jobs because of their prolonged absence, or had left to continue academic study. The others had left because they were no longer happy on their jobs. The most frequent objection concerned other people on the job, and the second objection concerned the nature of the work itself. It is possible that some of this unhappiness had been generated indirectly by the trip. However, there seemed to be almost no direct connection between the visit to America, and the decision to quit.

Sixteen people who left an old job or who left school were faced with the problem of finding a new job after return to Germany. Of these, ten found it easy to get another job; six found it difficult. The people who found it easy either had been able to capitalize upon some casual contact with the Americans, or had applied formally for a job with a German organization. People who applied formally to the Americans found it difficult to get accepted. Thus it is clear that there was no automatic connection between an American visit and a job with the Americans. Formal pressures operated to keep the returnees in the German job market, and it was only informal contact that led to jobs with the Americans.

There is indirect evidence indicating that the Germans had expected the trip to America to be more of an advantage than it turned out to be. (Table 32) In early interviews they said that they expected the trip to give them professional knowledge which they could use on the job, and to increase their opportunities
or influencing others. After they returned to Germany, there was no more mention of these things.

Similarly, in a discussion of the personal situations of the visitors after their return to Germany, early interviews brought out comments on the advantage they would derive from American experience and American support. After their return to Germany these advantages became less important, and emphasis was placed on personal characteristics or training. In short, they found that they had to depend on the assets which they had accumulated for themselves before the trip rather than upon any special advantage from the trip itself.

In general, then, it seems that the job situation of the returned Germans was much the same after the trip as before. They acquired no special advantages, and they encountered no special difficulties. If there was any influence of the trip on job activities, it occurred only as influence upon the personal interests and motivation of the returnees.

With new goals and aspirations created by the trip it seemed as if the only way for an individual to work for these goals was to do so on his job. Did job plans change often after the visit to America? The Germans gave one answer to this question while they were still here, and a different answer after the return home. (Table 33) In America, the visitors said only that the trip made them better able to do what they had already planned. After return to Germany, however, about one-third of them said that the American experience had opened up new interests, or had led to some change in job plans. Thus, the impact of the trip did not become effective until the Germans had returned home, and actually tried to go on with their previous plans. Only then did they begin to realize that new interests had developed, which might require a change of plans.

The major new interest which appeared in the interviews concerned the diplomatic service. The number of people who thought they might possibly enter the diplomatic service jumped from thirty per cent to fifty per cent. There was also an increase in the number of people working for the American occupation forces.

If we consider the entire group of twenty-nine visitors, we find that three people had emigrated from Germany before the follow-up interviews; fifteen had some interest in entering the diplomatic service; and six of the others were working for the American authorities. This leaves five people who were satisfied to work in Germany for Germans, and two of these made some change of job after their return from America.
The visit to America obviously led to an increased interest in working with non-Germans. It is hard to tell how much this represented a positive effort to improve Germany's relations with other countries, and how much it represented an impatient desire to get out of Germany.

Some clarification comes from questions about emigration. (Table 34) Most people said they would not consider emigration, even at the time of the follow-up interviews. There were many who said they might go abroad again for a visit, but that they did not want to emigrate. They said that in Germany they would have more professional advantages, or simply that they liked Germany and wanted to stay there. Some people, particularly in the first group, stressed their feeling of responsibility to help democratize Germany. They felt that if everyone who could criticize Germany should leave, then Germany would be deserted to the enemy.

We asked everyone about possible advantages in emigration. Here the answers stressed security from war and from poverty, and a happier way of life. Political or idealistic advantages were unimportant. Rather, it was the general way of life which was stressed. In Germany, life was difficult, but also serious and meaningful. Elsewhere, as in America, life would be easier, less concerned with problems. They could see the advantages of emigration, but they still preferred to stay in Germany.

There was no serious problem of alienation from Germany. Visitors returned to Germany more unhappy than when they left. They had become aware of changes which they would like to see introduced in Germany, but which they could not accomplish themselves. They found themselves more out of sympathy with traditional characteristics of German institutions and German ways of doing things. They wanted to explore alternative channels for getting things done. Specifically, they turned toward the American occupation forces and the German diplomatic service. Throughout all of this, however, their loyalty to Germany apparently remained intact.

We may conclude that the Visitors' Program succeeded in building support for progress and change in Germany. To put these views into effect, however, two conditions would be necessary--wider public interest in social change, and some institutionalized means within the German culture to work for such change. Lacking these avenues the new aspirations stimulated by the visit abroad often led to disillusionment and apathy; or they gave way to new aspirations more suited to the climate of opinion prevailing within Germany.
Attitude Change: Summary and Conclusions

What happens when people visit a country of which they are suspicious and which is suspicious of them? What things influence them?

There Were Strong Emotional Tensions Early in the Visit

We have two kinds of evidence concerning emotional tension. Defensiveness about Germany was highest in initial interviews, dropped by the time of departure, and was even lower on follow-up interviews. The first group of visitors initially linked this explicit defensiveness with a black-and-white view of Germany and America, in which America was described with uncritical approval. They seemed to feel threatened by the contrast between Germany and America. They were afraid of being criticized, or even of being shown differences which would reflect unfavorably upon Germany. Hence, they kept their defenses high and impermeable. Later, as their security became greater, they were able to relax and let their defenses down.

The data on authoritarianism provide only indirect evidence of emotional tension. In their attitudes toward peers the Germans differed significantly from the Americans. They showed more hostility, suspicion, and fear; they wanted to be protected from other people either by carefully structured and impersonal relationships, or by unmistakably close and warm acceptance. Americans in general could neither understand nor meet these needs. This lack inevitably generated tension. The visitors could not accept nor understand American behavior; but until they found some way of coming to terms with it, they were disturbed by it.

There Was No Reduction in Authoritarianism

Several attitudes which proved more characteristic of Germans than Americans may be described as authoritarian. In addition to their hostility toward peers, the Germans were ambivalent about authority, desiring to submit to a great inspirational
leader yet resenting any particular authority. They relied upon externalized systems of reward and punishment, both for personal security and as measures of personal success. They generally defined relations between the sexes in terms of rigid male superiority, with no overlapping of the functions of husband and wife. The type of metaphysical generalization which appears in the F-scale measure of authoritarianism was more typical of Germans, although with respect to specific, concrete statements of procedure the Germans were as democratic as the Americans.

To the extent that authoritarian attitudes did exist, they remained unaffected by the visit to America. The proportion of people giving a particular authoritarian response was just about as high at time of departure as at time of arrival.

There Was No Reduction in the Original Criticism of America

The Germans made certain criticisms of America continuously from the beginning to the end of the study. They felt these things strongly and did not see anything in America to make them change their opinions. They felt that Americans, as compared to Germans, were materialistic and uncultured, superficial emotionally and intellectually, and politically naive. Some people reported that America was less materialistic than they had expected, but they still felt that this was one of her major weaknesses.

Other criticisms developed during their stay in America. They came to see America as egoistic, nationalistic, and imperialistic. Also, they became more free in their criticisms of American prejudice. Thus, any change was toward a stronger conviction that Americans were self-centered and uncaring about others. It is of interest that the Germans criticized German egoism from the beginning of their visit, but they had to learn about American egoism. Perhaps it is their habitual way of viewing others from which America was originally exempt, or perhaps criticisms of America arose independently out of unhappy experiences with American coldness.

The Visitors Were Impressed by the Day-to-Day Operation of Democracy

Initial interviews with the Germans showed that they brought with them a good general understanding of the operation of
American government. Further instruction only helped to fill in the details.

The thing which most impressed the visitors was the responsibility and cooperation shown by Americans in the conduct of everyday affairs. They could see that this kind of constructive citizenship was a special asset of democracy. They admired it, although they were convinced that the attitudes which brought it about could never be transferred to Germany.

They themselves absorbed some of the American point of view during their visit. They came to emphasize things which could be done by ordinary individuals, as compared to official power figures. They began to accept democratic standards for behavior in a small group: Things should be organized so that decisions were made by the members of the group, rather than imposed by the leader. They were impressed by the respect and responsibility granted to American children, at home and in the schools.

Return to Germany reinforced their opinion that Germans were not ready for this kind of democracy. They gave up any idea of trying to get small groups of Germans to work together democratically at the present time. However, they continued to feel that the average citizen was important. They wanted to influence him, rather than his leaders or his government. In particular, they wanted to influence the children. The desire for more democratic procedures of child-rearing was widespread.

The Visitors Were Bothered by Evidence of Groupism and Conformity

Much as they admired the positive achievements of democracy, the German visitors could not accept the concomitant emphasis upon conformity to the group. They recognized the importance of tolerance and cooperation; but they felt that Americans had carried such virtues too far. They felt that Americans had lost all interest in individual freedom, and for them, this meant the surrender of democracy. Still, they were puzzled. They criticized excessive emphasis upon individual freedom just as much as they criticized excessive submission to the group. They did not feel that either American or German attitudes were truly democratic; but they themselves could not have given a satisfactory resolution of the conflict between the individual and the group.
The Trip Resulted in More Internationalism

The visitors reported that one of the main effects of the trip was an increase in cosmopolitanism, and their comments about world affairs verified this claim. They adopted an internationalist point of view for talking about both America and Germany. They felt that their attitudes had become quite different from those of other Germans. Their internationalism included special friendliness for America at the end of their visit, but by the time of the follow-up interviews this had disappeared. By that time, the emphasis was on building up better relations with the rest of Europe. Thus, the important thing seems to have been to get out of Germany and have a chance to see world affairs from a new perspective. The search for friends outside of Germany remained, but it was not directed specifically toward the United States. Part of the reason for this, of course, was the rise of hostility toward America that occurred in Germany during the period of this study.

The Trip Resulted in a Stronger Commitment to Democracy

Explicit references to democracy as a desirable goal for Germany were highest in the departure interviews, when American influence was still strong; they were reduced in the follow-up interviews. However, internalized commitment to democratic goals and democratic values showed a steady increase from initial to follow-up interviews. The pattern was the same as for internationalism. The visit to America opened up certain new perspectives which, at first, were seen in American terms. America was seen as a friend of Germany's; democracy was seen as an appropriate goal for Germany. Later, after return to Germany, the new perspective and its associated values were maintained, but details were altered to fit the German situation. Hopes for international alliance became focused on Europe; aspirations for social change were defined in terms of current German problems.

Internalized commitment to democratic values for the two groups who were in America for six months increased after return to Germany. The group that was here for twelve months, however, showed negative change after return to Germany. Possibly the ideal pattern is for the visit to open up new perspectives, but to let the testing and solidification of new ideas and values occur at home.

When they returned home, visitors were dismayed by German authoritarian attitudes and wanted to find how to change
them. Originally their interest in social change had focused on economic, political, and institutional matters. By the time of the follow-up interviews, however, they were more concerned about psychological and attitudinal change. About half of the visitors expressed a personal interest in participating in social change activities, and three-fourths of them indicated some commitment to altruistic goals.

Return to Germany Was Depressing

First reactions on return to Germany were almost all negative. Returnees were depressed by the authoritarian attitudes and unfriendly appearance of the people, by the crowding, and by the immensity of the task still to be done. Later they became somewhat used to these things. However, there was still considerable criticism of German behavior, and frequent reports from the visitors of differences of opinion between themselves and other Germans.

The follow-up interviews indicated some revision of vocational plans. People were considering some change in their particular job, or in long-range plans. Many persons speculated on the possibility of going into the diplomatic service. Emigration, however, was still rejected. People said that they might like to go abroad again to visit, but they did not want to cut their ties with Germany completely. On the other hand, three out of twenty-nine persons in our sample had left Germany before the time of the follow-up interviews, and were not around to deny an interest in emigration.

There Was No Problem of Hostility from Other Germans

Antagonism from other Germans did not materialize. Returnees reported no loss of friends, prestige, or employment. Several people lost jobs because of the trip, but the reason was that the job could not be held for a long period of absence, rather than any objection to the American trip as such. If the trip was no liability, neither was it an advantage. Many of the travelers had expected that their American experience would be an asset on the job market, but this seemed not to be the case. Each person had to shift for himself. Several found jobs with the American authorities, but in each case this seemed to be an accident of personal contact. The returned visitors were neither sought out nor rejected. The only effect of the trip on job placement was to increase the returnees' dissatisfaction with the people and situation in Germany.
PART THREE

TRAINING IN GROUP DYNAMICS
An Experimental Training Program

Now we would like to turn to a more limited aspect of the training program: the special training in human relations offered by the Research Center for Group Dynamics. What was its effect? How well did it achieve its objectives?

One objective was to transfer to another culture a type of leadership training which had proved valuable to Americans at the National Training Laboratory in Group Development. We hoped that it would turn out to be equally valuable to Germans; but if this were not true, then we wanted to find out why.

A second objective was to focus specifically on the patterns of cooperative activity and interdependence which seemed to distinguish America from Germany. We felt that the Germans were familiar with patterns of intense individualism and patterns of mass submission, but they lacked experience with positive group cooperation. It seemed that an opportunity to participate in this kind of cooperation would increase their understanding of many aspects of American life. A third and last objective was to give support to the visitors in their efforts to adjust to and learn about the American culture. Working cooperatively with others should be easier than working alone.

The German-American Discussion Groups

The first training program consisted of evening discussion groups, held once a week for six weeks. There were two groups, each including five Germans and three Americans.

An invitation to the Germans to participate in the program was extended at one of their regular seminar meetings. We described the program as a study of human relations, and, to make this subject more specific, we asked them to tell us about problems which might come up in work with organizations in Germany. A list of problems was drawn up and recorded. Our offer to provide training related to such problems was then accepted.

As we studied the list, however, the problems seemed too
specific to provoke discussion and too far away from the experience of the Americans for them to be able to participate. A new topic was chosen. On the surface it was trivial: "How to Persuade German Families to Eat More Green Vegetables." We thought, however, that it would lead into the more general and difficult questions of how to motivate people to behave differently. Americans might be reminded of the research on changing eating habits in America, while Germans would know about the particular characteristics of the psychological situation in Germany. The subject of green vegetables was to be illustrative only; the real topic was to be social influence and social change.

The formal topic was presented to a joint meeting of the two discussion groups. By the time "Group A" had reached its own room, a German member (Mr. X) had already written out a list of answers to the question. The rest of the meeting was devoted to a discussion of his proposals by the Germans, who expressed considerable disagreement and rejection, while the Americans sat silent.

Thus, the group had its attention directed forcefully and immediately to the subject of group process. Their problem was the dogmatic Mr. X. Their next meeting was spent discussing the question of how to solve problems, and from then on the group was interested in the methods as well as the content of discussion. Subsequent meetings took up such topics as leadership and supervision, apathy and participation in voting behavior, authoritarianism, and democracy. For a while the Americans sat relatively silent, but at the end of the fourth meeting the Germans complained about this, and asked the Americans to give more freely of themselves. From then on there was increasing freedom on the part of all members of the group to talk about themselves and each other. Examples were drawn from both Germany and America, and from the history of the group. The group explored each topic cooperatively and with increasing insight, ending the last meeting in an atmosphere of harmony and goodwill.

"Group B" got off to a slower start. They dutifully discussed the assigned topic during the first meeting, and continued in the second meeting with the assigned topic of "Apathy and Participation in Voting Behavior." By this time their own apathy was sufficiently obvious to warrant discussion, and they decided that from then on they would try to set their own topics. The third meeting ran overtime as they hammered out a topic for discussion: "The Refugee Problem in Germany." When they finally had chosen this topic and were ready to break up, however,
they decided to abandon it and start fresh the next time. This ineffectual behavior led the group to further examination of itself, and of the difficulties which each nationality group felt in being spontaneous with the other. People were too polite. It was decided to break this pattern by choosing a topic which would stimulate disagreement—preferably within rather than between nationality groups. The topic chosen and discussed during the fifth meeting was "Collective Responsibility for Anti-Semitism in Germany." The argument was heated and, of course, the lines were drawn between Germans and Americans. Some of the Americans felt guilty afterwards at the violence of their attack, but the Germans protested that they did not feel attacked. The last meeting consisted of a review and analysis of what had happened during the course of the anti-Semitism discussion.

Most of the time and energy in both groups was invested in an exploration of German-American differences, either in general or specifically as they affected the activities of the discussion group. There was little opportunity for generalization to more abstract principles of human relations or group development.

The learning reported from these discussions had to do with characteristics of Americans, or of these particular groups. The Germans felt that these groups were unusual in their make-up—in language barriers, and in the unusual politeness which prevailed. They judged Americans to be more frank and less dogmatic than Germans. They could see that group discussion had some advantages as a means for people to get along well together and learn from each other, but they did not think that the procedures which they had observed would work in Germany. They felt that the techniques of permissive leadership and group problem-solving could work only under very special conditions, with very special kinds of people.

There were occasional comments from people who could see that it would be desirable for them personally to talk more, or less. This was the total reported gain in self-insight, and it was always accompanied by the comment that the person had been aware of this need for a long time. With respect to group development there was no reported learning: Any changes that occurred were attributed to longer acquaintance.

The staff agreed that the meetings had not been particularly successful as a training program. The problems of international relations had required so much attention that there was not much opportunity for other generalizable insights. Also, the time had been too short for the participants to be able to stand back and
learn from their own experience. There was some evidence that the style of participation of the Germans changed to become more like that of the Americans, with more listening and reacting to the ideas of others, and fewer autistic pronouncements. This change did not go far enough, however, to be noticed or remembered by the Germans themselves.

The Group-Centered Program

The program for the third group was designed to correct some of the difficulties associated with the discussion groups. It lasted for a longer period of time, focused on problems more central to the visitors, and avoided the distraction of including American members.

At first the program got off to a good start. There was an initial meeting, in which the social psychologist (group feedback observer) and political scientist (program coordinator) introduced themselves to the Germans, and explained their respective roles. The need for research data was explained, and permission obtained for the subsequent use of a tape recorder at all meetings.

Then a member of the research staff presented results from the first short interviews, in which each visitor had been asked what he wanted to get from the trip and how he would like to see the program organized. Faced with these statements of individual preference, the group gradually and tentatively began to mold them into a single program for the group to follow. This discussion was in English. Later, the group members got together of their own accord and repeated the discussion in German, fashioning a program which now everyone understood and accepted, and which was almost identical with that which had been produced by the discussion in English.

The program listed topics which they would like to see covered—schools, family life, race relations, American standard of living, American government, and several others. The staff proceeded to tackle these topics, one by one. At first they tried to proceed by question and answer and general discussion, but later at the request of the group they shifted to a more formal method of lecture presentation.

The discussion began with a mixture of hesitancy and goodwill. The coordinator asked the visitors to help him plan the program; the visitors tried to do so. Then both sat back to see how things would work. Almost at once tension began to
rise. Points of disagreement between staff and visitors began to take shape and, once formulated, were not resolved. Interaction observations indicated relatively high numbers of hostile and over-riding statements, but also a relatively high level of interest. People were unhappy, but they were still trying to make the program work.

During the first three weeks there were three evaluation sessions of critical importance. The first one was initiated by the staff at the end of the second week. They knew that there was much dissatisfaction and wanted to find some way of meeting it. This session resulted in a request for formal lectures rather than informal group discussion, and this request was accepted and followed for the remainder of the program.

The second critical session came early in the third week, following a weekend trip to Toledo. The coordinator felt that the visitors should have taken some initiative in learning about the city before the visit, and then in going to see persons and places of special interest there. He scolded the group for having restricted themselves to general sight-seeing. The Germans, on the other hand, pointed out that it was very difficult for them to know what was important in a strange city in a strange land, and felt the staff should have taken more initiative in planning the trip and showing them around.

The third session was precipitated by the announcement on Thursday of the third week that one of the visitors planned to go to Cincinnati for a four-day weekend. The coordinator insisted that individuals could not go away during the time when group meetings were scheduled, but he pointed out that if individuals wanted to travel, the group could set aside free time for this purpose. The Germans could not see why any individual should be forced to attend meetings if he had other plans.

And then suddenly the fight was over. There was no more open hostility; there was also no more interest. Germans began to direct more of their comments to each other, and fewer to the staff. The three issues already clarified continued to appear, but they were never really re-opened. Each side maintained its position, and refused to give ground to the other. The lines were drawn, and everyone settled into a long, silent struggle. Germans and Americans communicated among themselves, and each tried to find ways to put up with the other. The Germans blamed "group dynamics." The Americans blamed the German character structure. Even a three-week automobile trip to the East coast two months later had no effect: Coordinator and visitors kept their guards up. The return to Ann
Arbor was followed by several days of violent explosion, catharsis, and interpretation, resulting in some temporary insight and mutual appreciation. Any gain disappeared, however, because the visitors departed immediately for distant points. When they returned for wind-up discussions and interviews they were right back in their original positions.

What had happened? Why did a program initiated with such high hopes mobilize so much tension and unhappiness? What were the salient issues, and what were the underlying tensions which made these issues insoluble?

The Issues: A. Lecture vs. Discussion

The Germans seemed willing enough to use discussion in formulating a program at the first meeting, although they did indicate the extent of language difficulty by the need to repeat the entire discussion in German. Once the plan was made, however, they wanted to be given information. They felt they didn't know what questions to ask or how to phrase them in English, and they felt too rushed for time to struggle with discussion. They wanted meaty and relevant lectures.

Beyond this, the group included one person (Mr. Z) who abused the privileges of discussion. He talked at great length and with no regard for anyone else. His comments were not so much dogmatic as irrelevant. Other members of the group made one or two half-hearted attempts to silence him, and then gave up. They felt that the only way to keep him silent and stop wasting the time of the group was to have a staff person lecture.

Staff members, on the other hand, felt that lecturing was very unsatisfactory. They did not know enough about the language ability and general level of knowledge of the visitors to know what kind of lecture would be appropriate, and they felt a need for some period of getting acquainted before resorting to pre-planned doses of information. They recognized the problem created by Mr. Z, but felt that the Germans should find a way to handle him themselves, rather than waiting for an official to do it. Finally, the whole plan for human relations training required that there be some possibilities for group discussion. People cannot gain insight about themselves and their own behavior by being told; they must work things out for themselves. This is just as true for a group as for an individual. The insistence upon lectures as the only acceptable procedure seemed to rule out the very processes of interpretation and discussion.
which might have served to resolve the existing emotional tensions.

The Germans were somewhat aware of this, of course, in that they recognized that insistence upon lecture procedures was an effective way of fighting their perceived enemy, group dynamics.

B. Trip Planning

The Germans felt that it was impossible for them to take an active part in planning trips. Their language was not adequate for reading the necessary materials in advance, and their knowledge of what to look for on any particular field trip was non-existent. Beyond this, they felt that it was the duty of an interested host to show his guests around. The effort of the coordinator to share planning responsibilities with them was perceived only as indifference.

The Americans, on the other hand, felt that every trip was too short to be complete, and that each trip should be selectively planned in accordance with the special interests of the visitors. They did not give much weight to the strangeness of the country; after all, the functions of city government are much the same from one nation to another, and men with experience in Germany should be able to specify what would interest them in America. Also, they felt that refusal to plan in advance or to discuss a trip afterward was a form of passive resistance to the program as a whole, and they were anxious to change this pattern to one of full participation. Not knowing how to stimulate the spirit of participation, they insisted upon its forms.

C. Individual Travel

Travel came to symbolize consideration of individual needs as contrasted with submission to the group. It was quite literally an escape from the group situation, and an opportunity for an individual to do by himself the things which he alone chose to do. The first person to raise the issue was Mr. Z. He wanted to leave the group, and group members wanted him to go. The coordinator's insistence that he stay seemed to be a complete denial of their own wishes, and proof of the hypocrisy of the democratic philosophy of the program. This incident convinced the visitors that they could not influence the program to accord with their own needs, and, in their own words, they "resigned."
Later the issue was revived in new form. Three of the visitors wanted to use the time scheduled for internships to go to California. They wanted to see the country and see their friends or relatives; they made no pretense of trying to use the trip for learning about governmental affairs. The coordinator felt that this trip would violate the spirit of the program, and would also eliminate the experience which previous visitors had found to be the most meaningful of all, namely, the chance for sustained close association with peers and colleagues. He was bitterly opposed to the California trip, but when the Germans refused to yield, he gave them their way. Three of the men arranged for a drive-away Cadillac and went; one of these had time for a short job internship after his return.

Before the dispute about the California trip, the issue was one of means rather than ends. The coordinator was glad to have the visitors travel, but he wanted such travel to be legitimized by group planning, rather than serving as an escape from the group. He wanted the group to set aside time to be used by individual members, and then he expected the individuals to plan with him about what they would do. In fact, he set aside regular afternoon office hours to consult with individuals about their plans and activities, and was disappointed when no one used this time. He felt that many opportunities for individual need satisfaction, existed, and was puzzled when they were not used. The Germans on the other hand seemed to feel that opportunity was not enough. They wanted the coordinator to take initiative in setting up the contacts. Later, they also wanted the coordinator to make it possible for them to leave the group, and thus become individuals.

D. Money

The three original issues persisted throughout the American visit, and eventually a fourth one was added. The visitors complained that they did not have enough money. The coordinator felt particularly bad about this complaint, since he agreed with the visitors but could do nothing to help them. Their continued complaints about money were seen by him as highly unfair. He felt that they had looked until they found an issue against which he had no defense, and then proceeded to use it as a club to beat him over the head. The issue sometimes took the form of general complaints about the program, including letters home and to the State Department about the impossibility of living on the allotted funds. At one point the issue was focused on rent. People wanted to move out of their current rooms and into cheaper ones, if the savings thus achieved would go to individuals.
rather than to the group. This change meant breaking agree­ments with the present landlords, and moving into places with no possibility for personal contact with other residents. It also meant that one (currently disliked) member of the group who had been assigned to a slightly more expensive room than the others would henceforth take the extra expense out of his own pocket. The group split 3-3 with one abstention in a vote on whether to make the change from group to individual rent payments. The abstainer was forced by the others to cast a deciding vote, and the change was made. This vote represented in part an attack on the coordinator and his original room assignments, in part an attack on the one group member who would now have to use part of his precious spending money for additional rent, and in part a rejection of the effort by "group dynamics" to make a decision by consensus rather than majority rule. Also, of course, it made available some additional money to those who chose to move, averaging approximately one dollar a week for six to eight weeks.

Behind the Issues: A. Time Pressure

There was, in fact, too little time to do all the things which were planned. This meant that some phases of the program were in competition with each other, and none could be given full justice. The presentation of academic content had to do double duty for this group, since the timing of their visit ruled out most university courses. Trips required some time for planning, even when the staff agreed to rough out the possible alternatives; and of course time was also required for taking the trips and for discussion afterward of points of interest. Some time was needed for evaluation of program operations, airing of complaints, and development of better plans for the future. If there was to be any growth in insight about the relationship between individual and group, or about how to use group situations constructively, there would have had to be time for a more leisurely review by the group of their own operations. This, however, was pretty much ruled out during the first twelve weeks because of hostility to group dynamics and group discus­sion, and because of the conflicting time demands.

The time spent in group meetings totaled thirty-two ses­sions, each lasting between two and three hours. This is equivalent to the time available for a single course meeting every day for six and a half weeks. Every summer session teacher knows the difficulties of trimming a full semester course to meet such a schedule. How much more difficult, then, was the attempt to "cover" American culture, American government, and conditions for effective interpersonal cooperation!
**ACTIVITIES DURING PHASE I OF THE PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of sessions*</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
<th>Percent of meeting time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field trips by the group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free for individual trips</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lecture or question and answer)</td>
<td>13 1/4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group discussions - substantive</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions about the program</td>
<td>8 3/4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning field trips</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The smallest unit of time recognized in original computations was a quarter-session. Number of sessions is therefore equal to or less than the number of days on which this activity was pursued.*

The staff did not see the time problem clearly during the course of the program. They were panicked by the opposition to "making us a group" into an offer to reduce the amount of meeting time, thus freeing more time for individual consultation, study and travel. This offer was first made during the second week, and was refused. It seems likely that the appropriate offer at that time would have been to increase the amount of meeting time, drawing a clearer distinction between the different kinds of activity. Thus, substantive presentations could be scheduled for morning meetings, and other business such as trip planning, program evaluation, or general discussion could be reserved for afternoons. The visitors were not yet using their free time to initiate individual consultation sessions with the coordinator, but they would have been glad for him to arrange more opportunities for contact.

The greatest need for individual free time came toward the end of the program, after the visitors had had some chance to get oriented. An effort was made to meet this need by reducing the amount of group meeting time, and increasing the number of days completely free for individual activity. Usually these days were Mondays and Fridays, thus clearing a long weekend for travel. Not many visitors made use of this opportunity for travel, however. It is possible that some arrangements for an alternative program in Ann Arbor should have continued even then. Perhaps the visitors were still not ready to venture forth as individuals.
In summary, time pressure affected the program in at least two ways. It heightened the competition between different activities, so that none could be followed through in a thorough or satisfactory manner. It also invalidated the basic premise of the program, that the visitors should plan for themselves. The rush of one thing upon another actually left very little opportunity to either staff or visitors for freedom of planning. First things had to come first, and there was no time for anything else. Thus, there was a chance to experience the frustrating delays of group problem-solving, but there was very little opportunity to share in its rewards. The things to be done were so highly determined by external factors that there was little room for personal preference to influence decisions.

B. Feelings of Not Being Liked

A second major difficulty in the program was the continuing feeling on the part of everyone that he was not liked by others. The coordinator felt that the visitors showed no respect for his judgment, no appreciation of the things he was trying to do for them, and no interest in establishing personal contact with him. The visitors felt that the coordinator did not like them personally, was not interested in showing them his country, and generally didn't care what happened to them. They also felt that the objective of group dynamics (and thus the entire program) was to make them into a group and avoid all contact with them as individuals. In addition to these tensions between groups, there were tensions within groups. Thus, many of the Germans disliked each other. Tension between the coordinator and social psychologist did not take the form of hostility, but there was considerable uneasiness. Both were somewhat insecure initially about their ability to carry off the experimental program successfully, and as difficulties increased each blamed the other and wanted him to start doing things differently. Altogether, then, each person was either so concerned about his acceptance by others that he could not initiate strong accepting behavior himself, or so hostile that he didn't care.

It is not clear just how this cycle got started. It was partly that everyone was in a new situation, and looked to the others for help. Also there were some problems of initial hostility and suspicion. Then when difficulties began, different people had different explanations for them, and each felt that refusal to adopt his solution simply aggravated the situation. Language and local geography served to sharpen the lines between nationality groups, so that Germans and Americans each communicated within their own group but failed to share their thinking with
the other group. The differences in past experience and hence in expectations about what should happen in the current situation also split the group along national lines. Each group was continually disappointed in and resentful of the other. Each had enough at stake in the program to be unable to take its difficulties lightly, or look rationally for solutions.

Another early source of tension was the loneliness of the visitors. The official program during the week seemed to proceed with moderate success, but the weekends were impossibly lonely. The visitors had nothing to do for recreation. They felt that the coordinator should do something to relieve this situation, and when he did not, they could only conclude that he was cold and unfriendly.

C. The Opposition between Group and Individual

The attention given to group dynamics brought into prominence the dual concepts of group and individual. These terms were used freely throughout the program, but their connotations were quite different for Germans and Americans. There was no basis for a common understanding of the ideas which were central to the entire program.

Some of the Germans were outraged and others bewildered when asked to plan as a group. They had never encountered such a request before. Four of the seven visitors were willing to give it a trial; the others were not. The opposition was expressed as follows, during the August meetings. "I think your effort to bring us together at any cost, and to make decisions by agreement and not by voting, increased the difficulty which exists anyway if you bring together people who are different. You overlook the special situation of the German people after the war. We are very suspicious about building up groups because we have had enough of that, so the trend is now towards strong individualism."

Faced with complete refusal to cooperate from two members and the inability of a third member to think of anyone but himself, the other four people "resigned." "After a few weeks I was completely down," one said. "I tried, but we could not find even a small way to come together. With everything we spoke about, there were such great differences. We came from such completely different backgrounds. And such difficulties grew up within our group for one part, and between us and you for another, that we could not react normally. I have never in my life been faced with such a difficult situation."
Thus, the Germans soon agreed that the American requests were impossible because they failed to take account of the irreconcilable differences between individuals. Every specific issue that came up took the form of trying to get more recognition for individuals. Lectures and staff pre-planning were necessary to prevent individuals from wasting time in idle disputes. Living arrangements should permit each individual to save his own pennies, regardless of the effect on others. The coordinator should give more individual attention and give up trying to force the visitors to become a team.

This concept of individualism is one which stresses the inevitable differences between individuals, and the impossibility of altering personal history to undo these differences and make the individuals compatible. Similarly, it requires that each individual be given personal recognition in terms of the achievements and personality which he brings with him from his past experience. It is an extreme form of historical determinism at the individual level, in which the present serves only as an opportunity for forces from the past to manifest themselves.

The American idea of individualism is quite different from the German one. It is focused in the present, rather than the past; and it emphasizes the ability of the individual to influence his situation rather than his dependence upon influence from it. An individualist is one who strikes out for himself. He knows what he wants, and expects this to be different from what other people want. He welcomes a situation in which he is free to follow his own interests, and he is happy to see other people do the same. If he doesn't like the way things are going, he tries to do something to change them.

It seemed to the Americans that the Germans spent a lot of time talking about individualism, but refused to act individualistically. Thus, they ignored the time set aside for individual conferences. They refused to consider the field trips as an opportunity for exploring individual interests, but insisted that a single group program be offered. They did not acknowledge the individualistic demands of others: Persons would not listen to one another nor make any effort to help one another get things they wanted from the trip. Individualism seemed to provide an excuse for being hostile, passive, and demanding. It was never associated with active initiation.

Similar difficulties existed with respect to the meaning of group. The Germans could think only of a homogeneous team, in which agreement appeared as the inevitable result of similarity. Attempts to resolve disagreement were perceived as
attempts to deny or destroy the essential uniqueness of each individual, and to make him a carbon copy of the others. His whole individual history seemed to be threatened by the attempt to find some common ground for agreement with his fellow-visitors.

The Americans had no notion of submerging the individual in the group. Their attitude was essentially pragmatic: Given these seven people, with different needs and interests, what plan could be devised to best serve the interests of all? They felt they could do a better job of meeting the needs of all if all would work on the plan, with each accepting the responsibility for thinking about his own needs in relation to those of others. However, there was no implication that such consideration for other people would involve any copying of them. Limitations of time and money meant that many activities had to be common, but it was assumed that people remained different and could each find a unique way of participating in the activity. The group was an artifact of the present, to be used as a means for accommodating rather than destroying the differences from the past.

Unfortunately the meanings of "group" and "individual" were not only different for Germans and Americans, but highly charged for both. The words became emotional slogans before there was any opportunity to develop common understandings, and after that, rational discussion became impossible. Both felt that the basic principles of democracy were involved but on opposite sides. For the Germans, democracy meant overthrowing the groupism of Hitler and asserting the triumph of individualism. For the Americans, democracy meant finding ways for people to respect their differences, and still get along together.

The Chicago Human Relations Training Program

Additional perspective on the problems of human relations training with German visitors comes from a study by Jean MacKenzie.* She reports on a program which was conducted with eleven men and women who were participating in the same program as the first group of Germans in the Michigan study. The human relations training program consisted of eight meetings, including an introductory session, three lectures by visiting

---

experts, and four sessions of discussion, role-playing, and analysis of group process. Dr. MacKenzie's observations show a striking similarity to those reported here, and are worth summarizing in detail.

**The American Image of a Problem-Solving Group Was Not Shared by the Germans.** Americans and Germans entered the training situation with different backgrounds of experience and different expectations concerning this group experience. The Americans sought a problem-solving group which would proceed inductively from their immediate experience, with group members sharing leadership functions. The Germans sought a deductive method with an authority external to themselves. They defended themselves against exposing their own frame of reference. Consequently, influence on their behavior was not made explicit and it remained unchanged.

**Conflicting Goals among the American Staff Hampered the Development of Training.** Because the American staff held conflicting goals of training, they operated on different basic assumptions and used inconsistent methods of training. This resulted in ambiguity for the Germans, prevented the American training staff from diagnosing needs accurately, and increased anxiety for both.

**The Germans Lacked Motivation to Become a Group.** The Germans saw no possibility that forming a group might benefit them in the future. Perhaps this was because they resisted facing the reality of their return to Germany. They also resisted bringing current problems to the group. This was partly because this particular function of the group was never clearly communicated to them, and partly because their interpersonal competitiveness and their need to preserve status with the Americans and their colleagues got in the way. However, when negative feelings toward each other threatened to split them apart, a group self-image held them together. This self-image was developed from their perception of what was expected of them as Germans in the United States.

**Escape from Problems Was Facilitated by Unsuccessful Training Procedures.** Effective training required accurate diagnosis of the overt and covert problems facing the Germans at a particular time, communicating this to the group for its acceptance and assessing the affect involved and communicating this to the group. Some typical problems were interpersonal competition for status and the leader's functioning contrary to German expectations. When the trainer's diagnosis was accurate and communication was successful, a sharing of feeling resulted,
and problem solving was accomplished. When this process failed at any point, the Germans were able to avoid facing the problem.

_The Germans were Unwilling to Express or to Share Feeling._ Although there were many situational conditions (such as being defeated people in the country of the victor) which prevented the Germans from expressing feeling freely, there also appeared to be one basic characteristic of personality structure which inhibited them, namely, their rigid separation of public objective facts and private, subjective facts. Feelings were essentially subjective, therefore private, and not to be considered pertinent to objective problem solving. Their dependence upon deduction and authority external to themselves was a defense against possible transgression into deeper personal levels where it would be necessary to express personal feelings.

_The Germans had Well-Developed Mechanisms of Escape from Affective Situations._ These included demands for "objective facts," intellectualization of content, and individual interaction with the leader, and manipulation of the leader into lecturing, which permitted them to shift their role to passive receptors of information.

_Relationship between the Training Group and Other Groups Was Unclear._ The Germans were unable to generalize from their training group experience to their experience in other groups, either in the United States or Germany. The goals of the training group were unclear to them, the work groups they were to return to in Germany were non-existent or poorly defined, and the training group was formed too late to integrate successfully into their total re-education experience.

_Some Issues and Implications for Human Relations Training_

We have reported on three efforts to help the German visitors focus on problems of achieving good human relationships. The first series of six discussion groups left the visitors bewildered. The second attempt to be self-conscious about making program decisions left the visitors resentful. The program at the University of Chicago also met resistance. Yet the very difficulty which was encountered with such elementary processes as cooperation, listening to the ideas of others, or resolving disagreements convinces one that the Germans needed help in this area. What can we learn from these experiences about how to offer such help successfully?
Be Sure There is Enough Time

Time is important in a double sense. There needs to be enough time in the daily or weekly schedule so that the visitors can afford to explore a new kind of activity without any urgent need for immediate accomplishment. The objectives are likely to be obscure at first, and the rewards slow in coming. During this first period of building up resources the human relations training should not be in direct competition with other aspects of the program. Thus, "group dynamics" should not have been competing with academic sessions on public administration. Each should have had its own time and place.

Time is also important in a longitudinal sense. Acquisition of knowledge and insight in a new field of study do not come quickly. It is important, then, that there be enough time so that one can reasonably expect results. There must be time, first, to build up a common body of knowledge and experience, and second, to explore it and test whatever new insights it provokes. A program which must stop before there has been time for learning and insight to develop is probably worse than no program at all.

Start Where the Visitors Are

This is particularly important with respect to patterns of interpersonal relationships. The program for the third group tried to start immediately with an unfamiliar pattern of relationships among the visitors, and between visitors and coordinator. This effort was not a success. More than this, the initial failure made it almost impossible for the group ever to return to these patterns and try them again.

The Germans arrived wanting a program with clear structure and a coordinator who gave strong leadership. They wanted to be told where to go, what to do, and what to see. Perhaps if this need for dependency had been met during the early weeks of the visit it would have been possible to make a shift to more active responsibility later on.

Similarly, the visitors did not want to be forced upon each other. They differed from one another in many ways, and each felt responsible only for himself. He could criticize the others, but he could not help them. Again, it might have been desirable to accept this isolation at first, allowing each to establish himself in his own way with no concern for the others. Later, when initial tensions were relaxed, perhaps they would have been able to find more acceptance for each other, and more willingness to work together on common problems.
The field of human relations was a new one for our German visitors. They had neither the concepts to describe it nor the background of experience to give the concepts meaning. The first step, then, probably should have been to locate and develop a legitimate field of inquiry. This could be under the heading of democracy and authoritarianism, as with the first discussion group. It could be focused on industrial situations, and the human relations research that has been conducted there. Or it could center on community organization, and the variety of ways which people have found to work together on common problems. The particular problems of interest would vary from one group to another. The important thing would be to find a context in which the visitors could explore some of the fundamental principles of human relations, bringing together their own past experience and the new concepts and research reports.

It might be possible after such an introduction, to focus attention more directly upon the behavior and experience of the visitors themselves. Incidents from the history of the group could be used as the subject matter for analysis. The group might decide to try out different patterns of organization and leadership. Individuals might decide to try different styles of behavior. All of these applications could be valuable learning experiences, but all have one prior condition. The visitors must have some framework for understanding what is being done, and some way for relating this to their own interests and objectives. This is often assumed with American trainees, but it could not be assumed with the Germans. It had to be created.

Maintain an Intermediate Degree of Ego Involvement in Training Group Activities

The two Michigan training ventures were at opposite extremes on the dimension of ego involvement. The discussion groups began with such academic questions that the visitors showed little interest or information. There was no pressure to come to an agreement and no reason to be influenced by anyone else. In short, the meetings were simply "bull sessions." They had very little value as examples of working groups or committees.

The second program faced the group with such important decisions that the outcome was more important than the means by which it was achieved. The visitors could not afford to consider the procedural suggestions of the staff because too much was at stake; they cared about the what and not the how.
It is clear that neither of these conditions is adequate for studying the process of group decision. In the first case there was no compelling reason to act, and in the second there was no time psychologically to do anything but act. Ideally, a training group should be concerned with questions having some direct significance for the participants, so that they care about what happens. On the other hand, the questions should be such that the "wrong" result can be tolerated. Thus the processes of organizing, deciding, or acting are realistic; but when they are complete, the particular result can be forgotten in the study of how it came to be.

Again it may be desirable to think about a shift over time, with neutral or trivial questions at the beginning, and more important ones later. That was in fact the sequence during the discussion groups, and there were several people who reported that this was helpful. The lack of interest in the first topics made it easier to think about process.

Establish Realistic Expectations

It is not always possible to create in advance an accurate picture of what a particular experience will be like. Nevertheless some preparation can be given, and some of the unrealistic expectations can be explicitly denied. It may also be possible to involve the participants in planning what is to be done, thereby shaping realistic expectations.

Our experience with expectations about research was generally successful. It was possible to present the need for collecting research data in such a way that the visitors could agree to its importance, and even, as with the first group, to expand the range of data which they would like to make available. There was some uneasiness in the second and third groups about the presence of a tape recorder and sometimes a research observer at early group meetings, but this soon disappeared. Participants in the discussion groups who commented at all on the inhibition resulting from being under observation also said that the inhibition passed after the first one or two meetings. People in the third group accepted the tape recorder very quickly.

It was much more difficult to set up clear expectations concerning the program as a whole. The social psychologist from the Research Center for Group Dynamics performed too many different roles. These included responsibility for research, for training in human relations and group dynamics, and for presentation of substantive psychological and sociological material.
Also, in the third program, the relationship between the coordinator and the social psychologist was not clear. Hence, there was much confusion among the Germans as to just what each staff member was trying to do.

Members of the second group reported that confusion about what we were trying to do made it difficult for them at first, but eventually they began to understand that the object of the meetings was to study how a group discusses. The initial uncertainty was a hindrance, but not a major obstacle. Similarly, Dr. MacKenzie indicates that there was confusion at first about staff objectives in the Chicago program, but that clarity and understanding increased over time.

For the third group at Michigan the confusion was of central importance. The entire program was involved. The ambiguity of the real situation made unrealistic expectations inevitable. Thus, there may have been some projection of hostility: In the absence of clear information about how the Americans feel, assume that they feel as we do—hostile. Certainly there were some exaggerated hopes for what would come from the program. The visitors seemed to want the coordinator to assume responsibility not only for his academic and administrative duties, but also for all the personal problems facing the visitors—the loneliness, the need for personal attention, and the distress about how other group members were behaving. When he did not do this, they felt cheated.

The coordinator likewise had some exaggerated expectations about the program. He seemed to expect that "group dynamics" would make the program work. He did less to welcome the visitors and make them feel at home than he had done with the previous group, and he had some tendency to pull his punches and so he did nothing, waiting for others to act. Then, when they failed to act, he, too, was disappointed.

If it had been possible for everyone to begin the program with realistic expectations, perhaps there would have been less disappointment, and more resourcefulness in coping with difficulties. The feeling that the special procedures of group dynamics would make everything run smoothly set everyone up for a big disappointment. Such procedures can help with specific problems, but they offer no magic cure-all.

Select Friendly and Out-Going Staff Members

Staff members working with foreign visitors carry most of the burden of establishing a satisfactory emotional atmosphere. They should be able to demonstrate friendly acceptance in an unmistakable and continuing fashion, regardless of the response
from the visitors. Members of both the first and third group criticized the coordinator for unfriendliness, and members of all groups criticized the coldness of Americans in general. Perhaps Americans are less demonstrative than Europeans, or perhaps they are slower to establish meaningful friendships. Whatever the reason, it is clear that the German visitors felt an absence of warmth. It is also true that the American staff felt some unfriendliness from the Germans. Our interest, however, is not so much in how this cycle of mutual suspicion got started, as in how to break through it and establish feelings of mutual acceptance. It seems that this must be the responsibility of the American staff member, and one which can only be discharged by a person who is warmly friendly, interested in the visitors and able to show it.

Select Staff Members Who Can Understand the Language of the Visitors

The members of the third group of visitors were asked whether they thought the coordinator should be someone of German background. They said no, feeling that the important thing was to relate to Americans, rather than Germans. They thought that an American coordinator could do more than a German to help them understand the American culture.

On the other hand, it seems that the coordinator should be someone who can understand the culture of the visitors, even if he is not part of it. He should be able to anticipate and understand the difficulties which will come up in trying to move from one culture to another, and he should be able to help the visitors cope with these difficulties. Thus, he should be well-oriented to both cultures.

Mixed German-American Training Groups

Mixed German-American training groups appeared to be better than staff presentation or interpretation in conveying certain kinds of implicit learning. German members of the mixed groups began to change their style of participation before the end of six sessions, for instance, whereas members of the third group showed no apparent change over the entire three-month period. Probably the same thing would be true for learning about group process and interpersonal relations. It would be much easier for the Germans to think and observe in these unfamiliar areas if American peers were present to show the way. There is less defensiveness and less formality in interaction
with peers than with staff members, and hence learning is easier.

These generalizations apply only to areas where status and formal training are irrelevant. When it came to matters on which expert knowledge exists, it was the experts whom the Germans wanted to hear. It would probably have been quite threatening to have peers suddenly shift to the role of experts or superiors. However, human relations training tends to emphasize the experience and reactions of the learners, rather than the book knowledge of the teachers. This being true, American peers were in a better position to help the Germans proceed than were American staff members.

The disadvantages of the mixed German-American groups were noted earlier. In our experience, the tendency was to focus upon national differences as the content of learning. Generalizations were not applied to ordinary groups and collections of people, but only to a very special type of training group. Perhaps a longer lifetime for the training group would have overcome these difficulties. Once the problems of national difference had been worked through, perhaps attention could have shifted to more general problems of human relations.

Should Human Relations Training be Undertaken with Such Groups as the German Visitors?

Our experience does not provide any definitive answer to this question. We are convinced that this is an area of learning which the Germans could have found interesting and important. We had difficulty in making this learning available to them. More thinking needs to be done about how to relate this one kind of training to the total program in America, and about how to adapt our usual procedures to meet the needs and expectations of the visitors. Many of the methods and some of the objectives which are appropriate for Americans may be inappropriate for Germans, and other variations may be required for people from other countries. Whatever the difficulties of adaptation, however, it seems worthwhile to try to move in this direction. People in all countries have much to learn about how to get along well together, at the personal as well as the national level, before we can be confident of our ability to live together in peace. It seems probable that the still-young science of human relations can help to bring about this learning.
PART FOUR

LEARNING PROBLEMS FOR THE FOREIGN VISITOR
Evidences of Difficulty

Our experience as trainers trying to offer the Germans some help in the field of human relations constantly drew our attention to the learning process. The relationship between trainers and visitors was obviously affected by many factors outside their formal responsibilities to each other. How else could one explain the large amount of emotional tension and irrational behavior?

If our knowledge had been restricted to the one group at the University of Michigan we could not have drawn any conclusions. We might then have attributed our difficulties to individual ineptitude or special personality problems. The fact that similar difficulties were encountered by a different staff trying to do the same thing at the University of Chicago, however, made this "accidental" explanation less likely. We then looked for further examples of duplication in reported difficulties. We thought of the coordinators of the first and third groups of Germans, strangers to each other, yet finding themselves in similar difficulties during automobile trips with the visitors. We remembered other examples of patterns of tension which had reappeared in one group after another.

At about this point, in the spring of 1952, we were offered the opportunity to work with what was then the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) in an evaluation of their program of productivity team training. This study* gave us a chance to test further the generalizations emerging from the study of German visitors. We found that problems which had baffled and angered the Americans working with German visitors had been equally disturbing for Americans working with visitors from France, Norway, the Netherlands, or other European countries. This was true even though the type of program was different, and the relationship of the particular European country to the United States was different.

Clearly, then, there was a need to think about general problems of cross-culture learning. There seemed to be tensions created simply because one was a visitor in a foreign land. These tensions interfered with the learning process and with relationships to Americans. More important, they lowered the general level of morale and satisfaction among the visitors.

The following chapters represent an effort to understand why these tensions arise, and what can be done to reduce them. Our conclusions are based upon our own experience as trainers, our contact with program coordinators at the University of Michigan, our study of the productivity team program, and our general knowledge of social psychology. They represent an attempt to explain behavior which otherwise would appear meaningless and irrational.

In discussing these problems of psychological tension we shall refer to the experience of the productivity teams, as well as to that of the German visitors.

The Productivity Teams

The program for rendering technical assistance to European industries went into effect under the Marshall Plan in 1948. One aspect of this program was to bring teams of visitors from the fourteen Marshall Plan countries to the United States so that they might study the factors behind American industrial productivity. By the time of our study in 1952 several hundred teams had participated in this program. Different teams had different experiences, of course, but a typical pattern was clearly defined.

Each team represented one industry. Initiative for the visit might come either from the United States or from industrial leaders in the country of origin. Once arrangements were under way, the national industrial association nominated management representatives for the team, and labor unions contributed suggestions for labor representatives. A team of ten to fifteen members was set up, and a team leader was elected or appointed.

In the preparatory period before sailing for America the team collected information on their industry at home, and on what members of this industry wanted them to find out from America. Often they were able to travel around and visit the plants of the various team members. This gave them a basis of comparison to use in their study of American plants, and it also gave them an opportunity to develop effective techniques of plant investigation.
When they arrived in America, the team members were met by a project manager from ECA. He had studied their backgrounds and special interests, and was prepared with an itinerary for their American visit. Inevitably, this itinerary failed to meet all the expectations of all the team members, and usually there was very little freedom to change it. The way in which the itinerary and the reasons for its selection were presented to the team members established their expectations about the project manager, the flexibility of their program, the boundaries of their freedom during the trip, and what was expected of them by the sponsoring American government agency.

The program usually began with a visit to the offices of the American industrial association for an over-all orientation to the industry. Further orientation came from labor leaders and university experts. Then began a series of plant visits. In each case, the team and the local plant management were carefully briefed in advance by the project manager. Everything was ready for the team to swing into action, splitting up into three or four sub-groups to observe and inquire about different aspects of plant operation. After the visit, members of the team reviewed and shared observations, bringing their notes together in preparation for a report to their colleagues at home. A team usually made a total of from ten to twelve plant visits in the course of its six-week stay. The last stop was Washington, and an evaluation session with ECA officials.

The boat trip home provided an opportunity for the team to organize its final report, making an outline, deciding on a division of labor, and setting deadlines. Most teams completed a report for distribution within their industry, although sometimes this was not ready until a year or two after their return. Often the report was supplemented by speeches and consultations, and sometimes by the establishment of "productivity committees" within the industrial association to utilize the experience of the team members. Generally there was widespread interest in the industry in hearing about what the team members had learned in America.

The experience of productivity team members differed significantly from that of the German visitors in several ways. The productivity teams were directly responsible to a parent group at home; they were originally selected to represent the industry and its unions, and they were expected to make a report back. The German visitors had no special audience to whom they could take their new ideas.

The productivity teams had a chance to establish team
organization and interpersonal relationships before leaving home. Even in America most of their internal problems were referred to one of their own members, the formal team leader. The German visitors, on the other hand, did not meet each other until they reached the American college campus; they had no common responsibility which would require them to work together; and they were responsible to an American coordinator rather than to a German group leader. Their own group never became a positive reference point for them.

The productivity teams had a much shorter stay in America. They also had a more limited range of experience, and a more highly structured and repetitive learning program. Plant visits early in the trip were conducted in much the same way as visits later in the trip. In all cases, the visitors were observing relatively familiar processes: the operation of an industry in which they had become experts. They remained busy and relatively secure. The emotional problems of dependency, strangeness, and defensiveness which were so clear in the visitors' program did not appear to any great extent.

The German visitors, by contrast, had a longer visit and a more varied program. All groups passed through at least two phases in their relationships with Americans. There was the first period of about three months, during which they were highly dependent upon the coordinator to take the initiative in planning. Then, after a chance to get away from campus and consolidate the various learnings which had been accumulating, there was a period of more active initiation and participation. This shift in role was partly a function of a change in program activity, and partly a real change in adjustment to the American culture. The strangeness which kept them isolated at first eventually disappeared.

Despite these differences in program, the two kinds of visitors had some reactions in common. Both productivity teams and Germans agreed that the trip had been profitable, and had met or exceeded expectations. They felt strong disappointment at the limited opportunities to share American family life. When external requirements of the official program hampered the freedom, some visitors criticized bitterly and irrationally. Among the productivity teams this meant criticism of the itinerary and of the failure to include plants which the team thought they should see. Usually such omissions were required for reasons of geography, refusal to cooperate with ECA, or unsatisfactory labor-management relations. For the German visitors, the targets of criticism were the University requirements, the "group dynamics program," and the restrictions on money and on travel.
The Americans working with the visitors complained in a similar way. They reported that the visitors sometimes got all worked up over "nothing." They said the visitors became angry or frustrated or unhappy about things of little importance. On the other hand, they sometimes failed to observe some of the minimum requirements for close and interdependent living, thus causing unnecessary difficulties for their companions.

Why did these things happen? What lay behind the "irrational" difficulties experienced by our visitors from foreign lands? To answer these questions we have examined what it means to travel abroad, to learn from a foreign culture, and particularly the psychological problems which must be solved by the foreign visitor before he is ready to learn. In our discussion of these problems, we have tried to indicate not only the causes which lie behind the difficulties, but also the steps which might be taken by the American hosts* to minimize or overcome these difficulties.

*We shall use the terms host, coordinator, and trainer indistinguishably to refer to the persons who have responsibility for the welfare and learning of the visitors. "Host" also refers more generally to all persons receiving the visitors.
Establishing a Place for Oneself

The first problem for the stranger in a foreign land is to find some satisfactory way of relating to the people around him. Because he is a stranger many activities and behaviors which were automatic at home suddenly become sources of difficulty. He must become deliberate and watchful at points where he had been accustomed to rely on habit. Thus, he must conduct verbal interaction in a foreign tongue, shaping his thoughts to fit the limited vocabulary at his command, and listening to the words of others before he can attend their meaning. The non-verbal language of gestures, facial expressions, and forms of speech is perhaps even more difficult to learn. There are no books, no guide-posts except trial and error. He must learn to drop the inappropriate interpretations which were taken for granted at home, to separate and maintain the interpretations which apply in both places, and to use the new cues and connotations which apply in the host country. This process takes time, but it is just as important as learning the formal language of the host country. Verbal and non-verbal communication go on simultaneously, and are closely interdependent.

Communication is the means whereby an individual gets information about other people, and also about his own performance. When communication channels are blocked or confused, both kinds of information are restricted. The visitor does not know what his hosts are thinking and feeling. He does not know whether they feel friendly or indifferent. He sees their behavior, and he knows what this would mean at home, but he learns quickly that it does not mean the same thing here. Until he learns how to interpret the behavior of his hosts correctly, he will experience considerable tension and frustration in his attempts to understand and interact with them.

At the same time, he will restrict his own behavior. If he is not sure how it will be received, the safest thing is to do nothing. Thus he cuts down on his opportunities to get "feedback" from others -- that is, to find out how they react to him and to learn from these reactions what actions are successful. At the same time, the hosts cut down on the amount of feedback they make available: They feel that one should be polite
to strangers, especially those whose ways are unfamiliar, and avoid both criticism and helpful suggestion. They do not feel the same responsibility for guidance and discipline which would exist for a member of their own group. Thus, behavioral cues which the stranger finds hard to read even at best become particularly guarded and inaccessible. The hosts protect the stranger from knowledge of how they react to him, and thereby make his learning task even more difficult. The blank wall of politeness can generate considerable tension and unhappiness among visitors who are trying to find friends.

Communication of course is only a means to an end. The ultimate objective is to establish satisfactory relationships. Man is essentially a social being, and most of his rewards come to him through other people. This is true whether the rewards be intellectual, involving the interchange or display of ideas; economic, involving the exchange of goods; or personal, involving the satisfaction of individual needs and desires. At home, the individual has established regular channels for receiving such rewards. There are people whom he values, and people who value him. He knows where to go for intellectual stimulation, for active recreation, and for quiet love and acceptance. He knows how to develop new friendships with people of the same sex and with people of the opposite sex, and he knows what to expect from each.

When he enters a foreign country he is cut off from both the habitual sources of reward and the habitual patterns of seeking reward. It becomes of primary importance to establish new sources of reward, in whatever way is required. Mastering the problems of communication is a first step in this process.

Beyond this, the problem may take many different forms. For people on a busy and active schedule, like the productivity teams, there may not be time to think of much beyond getting a task done. Others find themselves with a great deal of leisure time, but no one with whom to share it. Still others seek particular kinds of reward situations, but don't know where to find them. The visitor is concerned about how to meet people "like himself;" or how to participate in particular kinds of activities such as, for example, American family life; or how to establish friendships with members of the opposite sex. These examples cover the points of major concern to the German visitors, but other groups could probably add other ways of stating the problem. In each case, the common theme is an attempt to replace habitual types of gratification which were given up when the individual left home.
There is another common theme which we encounter again and again. The visitor can feel tension, frustration, and unhappiness, but he cannot see any simple cause for the situation nor any simple remedy. He cannot be angry at his hosts for having different customs than his own, nor for being carefully polite. He can reject them as cold and unfriendly but he cannot change them. In short, there seems to be nothing to do about his own discomfort except to endure it.

There are several different ways in which tension may be expressed during this period of getting acquainted. Some people show a general increase in emotionality. The combination of increased difficulty in everyday living, plus increased need for rewarding relationships with others, give rise to heightened sensitivity on both scores. The visitor has less tolerance for frustration than usual, and he is more easily rebuffed. At the same time, he needs friendship so much that he may exaggerate the friendly responses of others, placing heavier demands upon casual relationships than he would usually do. Such reactions get perceived as oversensitive or overdemanding, thus scaring off the unprepared Americans and increasing the original isolation of the visitors.

There are various kinds of regressive response which may be associated with feelings of intense frustration. The individual who feels more helpless than usual may lean more heavily upon available authority figures. Ordinarily, however, such dependency would not be acceptable to the individual, and he must still try to fight such tendencies in himself. This internal conflict is expressed sometimes as dependency, with requests for help and attention, and sometimes as rebellion, with great defiance of authority. Whether an individual chooses one of these forms of expression exclusively, or alternates between them, tension will be associated with any situation offering potential opportunities for dependence.

Another variation on this theme appeared among the Germans, and particularly those in the third group. They showed the general sensitivities mentioned earlier: They were quick to feel left out, unwanted, and alone, and they were disappointed in their attempts to find friends among Americans. In fact, they found American social behavior very hard to understand. The ease and warmth of initial contacts created an impression of great friendliness. Later, the lack of follow-through was bitterly diagnosed as superficiality or hypocrisy. They felt that Americans held out a promise of warm friendship which they were unable to fulfill.
Their attention then became focused on the American home. Actually, interest in "getting into the American family" was expressed at every opportunity, from the interviews at time of arrival through the follow-up interviews. But they seemed to feel a special urgency about contacts with American families during the period of initial frustration. This urgency suggests that the visitors saw some connection between the family contacts and their own emotional difficulties. Perhaps there was some vague hope that an American home could substitute for a German one, that in becoming acquainted with an American family they would set up relationships which would provide the kind of emotional support they had known at home. Certainly, it is clear that for the visitors the home was the symbol of stable, warm relationships. It was perceived as the emotional base from which an individual could derive security.

This was their view of Germany and it provided their major question about America. Did America really have a solid foundation of close, personal relationships, or was everything as cold and superficial as it appeared? If such warmth really existed, how could visitors share it? Thus, their curiosity about the American family included both an intellectual interest in understanding America, and an intensely personal desire to establish satisfying relationships with other people. This latter hope must be judged unrealistic. Visits to families were no more likely to relieve the isolation of the visitors than friendships established around the university, or at other points of contact with Americans. Such resort to unrealistic hopes is commonly observed under conditions where realistic solutions do not seem to exist. And for at least some of the German visitors there seemed to be no way out: They felt alone and unhappy and there was no one to care.

We have been talking in general terms about the difficulties which a visitor may experience during his first weeks or months in a foreign land. There are wide differences in the extent of such difficulty. People in the productivity teams had less difficulty than the German visitors. People from one country will have less difficulty than people from another. Within any one program, some individuals will have more difficulty than others. What are some of the factors which determine how much emotional tension is produced?

The Actual Difficulty of Getting Along in the Strange Environment

A number of factors contribute to the actual difficulty of adjustment in the new culture. First there is the actual extent
of strangeness: How much difference exists between life at home and life abroad? There is language: How much command of English exists initially and how much similarity is there between the home language and English? There is the question of how much the individual must do for himself: The individual who has all living arrangements made for him by a team manager finds it easier than one who must shift for himself among rooming houses, restaurants, and laundromats. Finally, there is a personal matter of warmth and spontaneity: How easy is it for the individual to relate to other persons, and thereby find new friends?

**Time Perspective**

Given an equal amount of difficulty, we may expect it to cause different degrees of frustration depending upon the time perspective. People visiting for a short period of time can tolerate temporary difficulties, knowing that things will be all right when they get home. On the other hand, people who expect to visit a country for several years are in no hurry. They can sit out the first phase of the visit, and wait for what will come later. It is the people in the middle, who are seeking full social integration into an alien culture but who do not have time to move slowly, who feel the greatest pressure. Every difficulty or barrier then becomes of exaggerated importance.

**Expectations about Americans**

Perspective on immediate difficulty and frustration may also come from one's general expectations about American (host) motivation. These expectations, in turn, will depend upon the general relationship between America and the home country, and upon specific information about Americans gained from personal acquaintance or from interpretive explanation. If Americans are expected to be hostile or superficial, then any difficulties which occur will confirm the expectation, and will be perceived as part of a general and permanent pattern. If Americans are expected to be friendly, on the basis of initial contacts or for other reasons, later experiences of unfriendliness are likely to be taken as personal rebuffs. If, on the other hand, there is some preparation for an initial period of getting acquainted to be followed by friendly acceptance, initial difficulties may be more tolerable.

**Internal Resources for Coping with Frustration**

There are many different ways of responding to frustration. Some people will be able to separate themselves from the
frustrating situation, and maintain some inner balance of personal security. Others will succumb with feelings of helplessness and despair. In part, these differences reflect different kinds of personality structure. In part, however, they may be a function of different kinds of group membership. The individual who comes from a nation which has been badly defeated in war or which has lost stature in some other way, or who comes from a “backward country,” will be more vulnerable than someone from a highly prestigious nation. Or again, the individual who has chosen to go abroad because he has no satisfactory relationships with people at home is more at the mercy of his hosts than the individual who has a number of important and satisfactory relationships with people at home. We do not know to what extent the Visitors Program tended to draw applicants who were out of step with people at home. However, we do know that the productivity teams usually were elected by an entire industry, and therefore, presumably, were well anchored at home and well-equipped to withstand frustration abroad.

**Trainer Implications**

Our examination of the initial difficulties faced by the foreign visitor and of the factors which make these difficulties more or less intense suggests some ways of reducing the problem.

1. **Selection Procedures**

Selection procedures should be designed to get mature people who are well integrated into the home culture. On the other hand, the persons selected should be sufficiently interested in and curious about another country to make the most of their time abroad. Exclusive identification with either the home or the host culture will make things difficult for the visitor.

The visitor should have some command of English, and some conception of American behavior before he comes and further briefing in it after he arrives.

The extent of preparation necessary will vary with the type of program. In the productivity program, for example, the teams needed relatively little help in adjusting to a foreign culture. People who were familiar with a particular industry at home went abroad to study the same industry elsewhere. Similarities were greater than differences. The details of everyday living and travel were handled by the project manager. This was quite different from the situation of the German visitors, who had to make their own ways as individuals on an American college campus.
The role of the trainer or program coordinator, then, will vary from one group to another. He will have to find the appropriate way in each case for minimizing initial discomfort and tension, and establishing a positive emotional tone for the visit. The decision about what techniques are best will depend upon who the guests are, what they already know, and what they expect to do in America.

2. Finding the Reasons for Frustration

Many visitors who find themselves unhappy in a strange country cannot think of any good reason why this should be so. They are likely to project the blame onto the hosts in general, or the trainer in particular. It is often helpful, then, if the trainer can help them to see their difficulties objectively. This means facing frankly the points at which frustration and tension occur, and trying to find ways of improving the situation.

In this connection, one of the jobs of the trainer may be to provide in clear and unequivocal form the feedback which the visitors are not getting from ordinary interpersonal contacts. If the visitors are blocked because of inability to utilize indirect and non-verbal communication with their hosts, then the trainer can offer direct communication. He can explain the host patterns of behavior, and at the same time estimate the typical reactions to what he knows of the behavior of his guests. Such information is often given in early orientation talks. However, it should not stop there. Help in clarifying the meaning of host-guest interaction is needed as long as the visitors find difficulty in reading the unspoken language.

The ultimate objective of this kind of feedback and interpretation is to get the visitors to look at themselves objectively, as visitors to a foreign country. This self-examination should be geared toward problem-solving, and as such, should be devoid of emotions like self-pity, defensiveness, or helplessness. Where solutions are possible, they should be planned and undertaken. Where there is no solution, that too should be understood. It is easier to face a situation with clear but limited discomfort, than one in which discomfort is vague and all-pervasive. Also, it is easier to face a situation in which the causes of tension and frustration are clearly recognized as inherent than a situation which the person feels he himself - through his own inadequacy - has created.

3. Clarification of Role Relationships

Another source of difficulty for the foreign visitor is divergence between the way the hosts define a role and the way he
sees it. The host-trainer is the middleman here. His job is to help the visitors understand and fit into the roles which the hosts (Americans in our case) expect of them. At the same time the host-trainer must adapt himself to the role the visitors expect him to play, and, if change is required, make this change gradually, and with the visitors' understanding and acceptance.

The role relationships of particular interest to us are those in which the visitor might appear as one part of a system, with an American or Americans completing the system. Some examples follow.

HOST-GUEST. The German visitors showed some conflict over the relative amount of initiative to be shown by host and guest, and there are probably other national groups who feel the same conflict. The Germans felt that etiquette required the host to take the initiative in making guests feel at home, in providing them with relevant information and introductions, and generally showing his guests around his country. The guest, on the other hand, should be polite, appreciative, and accepting of all suggestions made. For him to take initiative would be rude.

American expectations tend to be quite different. In general, it is assumed that every individual, American or not, is self-directed and able to make his wishes known. When he makes a request, others will respond in whatever way seems possible or helpful. However, to try to anticipate the wishes of the visitor would be to violate his autonomy. It is the responsibility of the guest to make his wishes known. Retreat into polite appreciation may be considered unfriendly.

Beyond this, Americans may be less impressed than Europeans by visitors from far away, and less inclined to give them special consideration. There is much greater mobility in America than in Europe and because we cannot extend special attention to so many travelers we tend to treat all people - travelling or otherwise - alike. In Europe, where travel remains the exception, visitors are customarily given more special recognition. Therefore those who make the long trip to the United States, as the Germans did, may expect to be received with elaborate attention and consideration. When they are not, they feel we are unfriendly.

FOREIGN VISITOR. It was hard to decide what to call the foreign visitors. Every label that was tried seemed to set up misleading expectations. People in the first group were called "experts." This set up an image of self-importance associated with a desire to make public speeches, answer questions, and
preserve the appearance of infallibility. Later, groups were given the more neutral title of "visitor." They then saw themselves as guests of the United States Government, and expected a corresponding amount of prestige and consideration. For example, this was the argument used in complaints about the minimal financial allowance: Could the United States Government really intend that its guests should be forced to live on three dollars a day, beyond room and travel? Americans were likely to reason quite differently: The visitors were lucky to have been given some of the hard-earned American dollars, and with that much help from the United States the visitors should seize their opportunity and make the most of it. The Americans felt that the money gift should cover their obligations to the individual, while the Germans in their status as visitors saw it only as the beginning.

FRIEND TO FRIEND. The meaning of friendship and of certain friendly behaviors differs from one culture to another. Kurt Lewin formulated the difference between Americans and Germans in the following manner:* Germans, he said, have a rigid barrier between self and others at the outer edge of their personality. They are difficult to get to know, but once the barrier is penetrated, friendship ties are strong. Americans maintain this barrier further from the surface. They are friendly and easy to get to know, but this casual friendship is a long way from intimacy. The inner barrier is difficult for Europeans to penetrate, both because Americans often restrict the number of close friends, and because the barrier is difficult to see. Judging by European standards, the German visitor was at first impressed with the ease with which he had formed new friendships in America. Gradually he discovered that the superficial friendliness did not mean real emotional involvement, and he concluded that Americans are cold, superficial, or hypocritical. He has only one category of friendly behavior, namely, that which signifies genuine emotional attachment. He therefore found it difficult to distinguish among different degrees of American friendliness.

MAN TO WOMAN. There seems to be widespread difficulty among European students in understanding the sex *mores* of the American university. Again, there is provocation without any payoff. There is greater emphasis upon superficial aspects of sex and physical attractiveness; there is a great deal of necking,

---

with a casualness and lack of privacy which the Europeans find shocking; but there is avoidance of the sex act itself. Again Americans were often perceived by the German visitors as hypocrirical and, by some, as puritanical.

AUTHORITY VS. RESOURCE. German interpersonal relationships more than American ones tend to stress the hierarchical qualities of dominance and submission. This fact creates certain difficulties around the role of host-trainer. Some visitors will expect the project coordinator to take the role of authority, with themselves dependent upon him. This expectation, to the extent that it exists at all, is likely to be ambivalent. There is readiness for submission, and also for resistance. The special tensions of the initial adjustment period may also activate older non-relevant reactions to authority, namely the expectation associated with “good father” or “bad father.” The coordinator is supposed to take a warm personal interest in each individual, giving direction to his activities and praise for his achievements. Yet the father-figure is also somewhat inaccessible: He is the one to make advances, and the child must wait upon his pleasure.

The coordinator in a visitors’ program will often try to avoid being placed in the role of authority. He seems himself as a resource person, assigned to help the visitors better achieve their own ends. He does not want to impose himself and his ideas upon the visitors. He will do a certain amount of advance planning, because the situation requires it, but within that framework he wants the visitors to take the initiative. He keeps himself accessible, and waits to be called upon for help.

The result may be a situation in which each waits for the other to take initiative, and interprets the failure of the other to act as a sign of hostility. Or it may be a situation in which the coordinator feels that his suggestions get undeserved reactions, either of submission or of resistance and criticism. In any case, it seems clear that good communication between host and visitors requires that they develop some shared agreements about the role of each with respect to the other. This may mean that the trainer has to start by accepting the role definitions of the visitors, and proceed from there to develop a kind of role for himself which is acceptable to all. This would permit common understandings to be developed from common experience.

4. Building an Interested and Receptive Group of Americans

The visitor automatically assumes most of the responsibility for bridging the gaps between his culture and that of his hosts.
He cannot get Americans to go his way; therefore he must go theirs. Occasionally, he finds Americans who reach out to him across the strangeness and try to make him feel at home. Most often these are people who have some fairly explicit connection with foreign student affairs. This is particularly true in a large university. In a small college perhaps there is more readiness in the student body as a whole to make overtures to strangers. Outside the academic world, the same pattern applies. People whose job is public relations will reach out to visitors; others wait to be approached.

Sometimes the coordinators may be able to improve this situation by developing special populations of Americans interested in relating to the foreign visitors. The Group Dynamics discussions by visitors and Americans (in the second German group), explored German-American differences or controversial issues, and served to promote German-American interaction. The Americans would not ordinarily have come into contact with the German visitors, but once the situation had been created with opportunity and motivation for such contact, they were much interested.

At another time and place it may be the living group whose awareness of the strangers in its midst needs to be stimulated. Foreign students can be placed in college dormitories, for example, and unless special effort is made they may still be ignored or rejected by fellow-residents. Americans tend to exhibit at least two blind spots in their behavior as hosts: They do not care to learn about the unique qualities of the countries from which the visitors come, and they do not see the difficulties which are associated with the position of visitor in the United States. It is possible that challenge and interpretation could help to remove these blind spots, leaving the Americans more aware of the reward and obligations which are involved when they choose to act as hosts to foreign visitors. If this could be done, it would make the life of the visitors much easier.

5. Housing Plans for the Visitors

Every program coordinator must make some plans concerning the housing of his visitors. Sometimes the decisions are entirely routine, as with traveling ECA visitors who stay in hotels, or students who are placed in dormitories. Sometimes, however, the housing arrangements may constitute an important part of program planning. In the case of the German Visitors, for example, housing arrangements were seen by all as a major means for creating situations of informal contact with Americans.
The first group of visitors was placed in dormitories, despite the fact that their age and experience exceeded that of the ordinary undergraduate. Some of the Germans protested at first, but eventually they all agreed that such an arrangement had been very good. They had a chance to meet many students informally, and a number of personal friendships developed.

The second and third groups could not be placed in dormitories because the timing of their visits did not fit the university schedule, and because their frequent trips away from campus made dormitory living inappropriate. They were therefore placed in rooming houses, where they could meet graduate students, and where the owners were Americans carefully chosen for congeniality and interest in foreign students. Much to his surprise, the coordinator found these arrangements the target of considerable criticism. The Germans complained about the other roomers: They were not Americans and they wanted to meet Americans. They complained about the choice of house and landlord: They house was too far away, the rent too high, the landlord too fussy. A number of minor misunderstandings developed between particular visitors and their landlords. Apparently opportunity for contact was not enough to ensure the development of good relationships.

It may be possible, as we have said, to develop some common understanding of the situation as a basis for good interpersonal relationships in a living situation. Lacking this, the trainer is faced with a serious conflict. He knows that his visitors want to be placed with friendly, congenial people. Yet if he feels that they will cause only trouble in the houses where they live, he will not want to pass on such a burden to his friends. Rather, he will seek an impersonal arrangement where individual irritations will be at a minimum. In short, the close interpersonal contacts which result when people live together under the same roof may be a source of friction, or satisfaction, or both. The coordinator must weigh one against the other before he makes his decision.

6. Arranging Informal Contacts

One of the problems in the German Visitors' Program was the difficulty in arranging satisfactory entry into private homes. Ann Arbor is small, and the number of foreign visitors relatively large. The town was relatively indifferent to foreign students; people accepted them as students, on the same grounds as others, without any particular fuss. Hence, they offered no special opportunities for becoming acquainted. The staff members had to work through their personal resources, and through
more general institutions such as the International Center, or standard community agencies. Their circle of friends was small and its ability to absorb groups of new people was therefore limited.

In many cases there is another kind of difficulty. In his professional role, the staff member has an equal responsibility toward each of the visitors. Ideally, he should feel liking and respect for each individual, and should be able to make these feelings clear. In practice, however, he will often experience feelings of hostility, criticism, or indifference toward at least some of the visitors. That was certainly our experience with the Germans. Such feelings are usually considered incompatible with official responsibilities, and are kept separate from official behavior. There are some people who can express hostility directly, and still convey sufficient warmth to maintain rapport, but there are many others who control hostility only by careful restrictions on spontaneity. This makes a successful shift from a public to private relationship almost impossible. The person who cannot afford spontaneity in public cannot afford it with the same person in private; and without spontaneity, genuine feelings of friendship are not likely to develop.

If the town does not make overtures to the visitors, and if the staff members do not feel able to do so, what other resources exist for informal contact? Certainly there are many possibilities within the university. Students make friends more quickly than many other groups, and there are a variety of channels available in most colleges and universities for meeting students. The difficulty is that many foreigners will not be able to take advantage of these channels until after they have been around long enough to "learn the ropes." The coordinator can help some in introducing the visitors around, and such "launching" of the visitors will sometimes be sufficient.

An International House does a great deal in offering facilities and assistance to foreign students. Its ability to provide contacts with ordinary American students is limited, but by no means non-existent.

There are also various community organizations, such as the churches, which welcome newcomers. Special interest groups at the university offer the visitor a chance to meet Americans on their own terms but this he is often unwilling or unable to do. Americans are polite to strangers, but do not take them in as close friends unless they find some chord of similarity and mutual response.
And here, of course, is the problem. The visitors who are sufficiently similar to Americans to interact with them freely and successfully will not need any help in finding friends. The people who need help are the ones who are really social strangers, whose efforts to establish relationships with others misfire. For them, opportunity is not enough; they must also have help in making use of the opportunity. The problem of what help to give and how to give it must be solved anew with each individual visitor.
Finding Security and Self-Esteem as a National Representative Abroad

Individual security and self-esteem depend partly upon one's personal situation, and partly upon the situation of any group with which one is closely identified. In the preceding chapter we have looked at the personal situation of the foreign visitor. Now we want to shift our sights, and look at the visitor as the representative of one culture visiting in another. It will be just as important to him to gain respect for the culture with which he is identified, as to gain satisfactory personal relationships.

The foreign visitor finds that many people react to him only as a representative of his home country: Their liking and respect for him depend upon their attitudes toward his country as a whole. He also finds that his own attitudes toward the home country are called into question. He has been brought up to value his national heritage, and to identify his own future with that of his country. He does not expect to change his national citizenship. His past opinions of himself, as well as his plans for the future, are all built upon his faith in his own country. It is therefore of great personal importance to him to validate this faith. However, he is more likely to find it challenged than validated. New and often unfavorable interpretations of national behavior are suggested. He is exposed to an organization of values and achievements which emphasizes the strengths of the host country, often at the expense of other countries. In short, the new culture challenges the assumptions of the old.

The visitor will try to meet this challenge. This is a necessary condition for interaction with the hosts, and for his own peace of mind. The difficulty of his task will depend upon the degree of inequality between nations which is initially assumed. People from countries where there is presumptive evidence for inferiority will have a more difficult time than people from countries where there is presumptive evidence for equality, or even superiority. The ultimate objective of the visitor is to establish some kind of equality of status between his country and the host country. He cannot affect the state of international
relations, of course, but he will try to affect the attitudes of those with whom he comes into contact.

Inequality between nations may be of various kinds. Perhaps the most obvious involves the assertion of political, economic, or military power by one nation against another. Thus, visitors to America from Germany or Japan start with the handicap of being defeated enemies. They must somehow rationalize both the defeat, and the factors which led them into the war. People from Latin American countries do not have the specific problem of defeat to overcome, but they do have a long history of struggle against the power of the United States. In their case, economic power was more important than military power.

A second kind of inequality involves differential achievement. The United States claims superiority in technical knowledge, and in general standard of living; western Europe claims superiority in culture. Such claims are always difficult to evaluate. Evaluation requires an assessment of the actual state of affairs, and also of the meaning which this state of affairs has for the citizens. The question of whether Americans or Germans live "better," for example, could be debated indefinitely, and never resolved. Thus, there is room for a great deal of give and take in the struggle for equality of status. The general tendency is for visitors to take their own areas of superiority, and give them as much weight as is necessary to counterbalance any claims of the host nation. Thus, they aim for the general conclusion that each country has both strengths and weaknesses, and that no generalizations about inferiority or superiority are tenable.

A third possible basis for judgments of inequality involves some general value criterion accepted by both countries, such as democracy. If both countries have democratic aims, then one can be judged as having made more progress than the other toward achieving them. Germans after the war, for example, would accept America as the homeland of democracy, and would expect to find democracy epitomized here. Such admiration implies its own counterweight. If perfection is expected, then deviations from perfection are untenable, and serve as grounds for criticism which will minimize American superiority.

Visitors from countries with long democratic traditions will react somewhat differently. They will value their own democratic achievements, and will see themselves as having made equal or superior progress toward democratic objectives. Their problem will be to win recognition for themselves, more than to discredit what America has done. It is the Americans rather than themselves who are to be convinced.
This brings us to the question of the national self-image prevailing in the home country. Up to now we have assumed that self-evaluation was generally positive, and that difficulties were created when comparisons with another culture seemed to imply inferiority. Actually, things are not so simple. People from some nations are vulnerable to such comparisons, because uneasiness or even self-hatred already characterize the attitudes toward their own culture. People from certain other countries will not be threatened by cross-culture comparisons, because their own national self-image is securely grounded at home. Thus the severity of the problem of maintaining national self-esteem abroad is partly dependent upon the severity of this problem at home.

The Germans probably had special difficulties in this matter of national self-image. They were taught under Hitler to glorify power; and yet by the criterion of power, they were inferior because defeated. The American strengths were ones which they admired and which they had possessed and lost: power, technical achievement, high standard of living. Inevitably there would be ambivalence about Germany, and specifically about Germany in relation to America. In addition, earlier studies of German national character have pointed to the sadomasochistic trends in German psychology, and the resulting alternation between glorification and rejection of Germany. All of these things would lead one to expect postwar Germany to have a particularly unstable self-image, with corresponding tension among German visitors to the United States. Once in America, of course, this tension would be aggravated by any evidence of American hostility toward Germany. Actually, the fact that the visitors found less American hostility than they expected indicates that their major source of difficulty was the attitudes and expectations they brought with them from Germany rather than those they found here.

Our discussion of the difficulties in maintaining national self-esteem has indicated some of the ways in which tension may be manifested. Many manifestations of tension in maintaining national self-esteem fall into the general category of defensiveness: refusal to admit their own weaknesses, exaggeration of their own achievements, and critical attack on the host country. Defensiveness also implies considerable emotional tension about comparative evaluation of the two countries, and especially about any negative judgments of the home country.

There may be systematic distortion in the interpretation of what is seen in the host country. Such distortion centers around aspects of the host country which the visitors find particularly
threatening or difficult to accept, and is designed to minimize threat. For example, the criticism of American materialism may be used in this manner. There is undoubtedly much justification for criticism of American materialism. However, if visitors feel impelled to reject every instance of material comfort or material resources as "just more materialism," then it seems clear that distortion is being introduced. Particular events are not understood in their own terms, but in terms of a single defensive attack. The visitor who behaves in this way is in effect protecting himself from finding out how attractive American material comfort can be.

Another example of defensive distortion is productivity. It is important for visiting teams to believe that if American productivity is higher than what is known at home, there are special explanatory circumstances. They will look for the trade secrets, or for the technical innovations which make this possible, and will resist explanations in terms of attitudes or human relations. The reasons must be factors beyond their control, in order for their own lower levels of productivity to be acceptable.

One frequent form of distortion is to reject any possibility of evaluative comparison. This attitude is one which isolates events at home from those abroad, maintains that the present state of affairs in each country is the inevitable result of historical circumstance, and that therefore no comparison can be made. This defense serves to prevent any negative attack. That it also prevents positive learning is, for the visitors, unimportant.

The defenses mentioned so far are designed to maintain the initial prejudices and rationalizations of the visitor. Sometimes visitors actively promote this defensive point of view, through public speeches and presentations. They recognize that their views of the home country differ from those of the host. Their conclusion is that the hosts must be educated. In a very real sense, they consider themselves as ambassadors for their own country, with a responsibility for developing goodwill and understanding among their hosts. This kind of influence from guest to host can be a very important part of the process of cross-culture learning. It becomes a symptom of difficulty only if the visitors are so busy talking that they have no opportunity for listening or for learning; or if they work so hard at maintaining a good front that they cannot afford to look beneath it.

Defensiveness on the part of the visitors is only one way in which the cross-culture learning situation may be affected by inequalities between nations. There may be corresponding
behavior on the part of the hosts. They may be more smug, intolerant, or unfriendly toward people from less prestigeful nations.

Some of the most important effects of inequality appear before the visitors ever leave home. The processes of selection or self-selection of visitors will vary according to the general relationship between the two countries. The people who eventually make the trip will tend to be those who feel at home in the general context set by international relations, and by the particular program.

Thus, for example, the ECA study showed that differences in methods of team selection affected the general success of the visit. In cases where the initiative came from the home country, membership on a team had more prestige, and teams could be composed of the most capable and responsible persons in a given industry. In cases where initiative rested with the U.S. government or its representatives, the trip was more likely to be seen as a personal opportunity, with individuals selected in terms of personal needs rather than general ability.

The point can be made even more clearly with respect to U.S. government programs for people from occupied countries. Here the initiative comes from a power which is not only located outside the country, but which is openly hostile. Wartime hostilities may have ceased, but the continued occupation of the defeated countries can only mean a continuance of hostile and suspicious attitudes on both sides. Under these conditions, what motivations will make a person accept a free gift of travel to the occupying country?

In the early days there was probably some motivation to sell out to the stronger power. Persons willing to come to America from Germany would be those who could give up their primary loyalty to Germany and transfer it to the program of "Americanization." They would ask a price for this surrender, however. They would want to be paid in America by the kind of support and belongingness which they were giving up in Germany. They would want to be praised for "seeing the light." They would want personal friendship while in America, and guarantees of continued support after their return to Germany. Finally, they would want instructions on what to do: Their commitment would be to the American program, and not to any general goals of national improvement in Germany. Self-esteem in this case would be organized around the image of self as distinct from and superior to "ordinary Germans." The individual would not want recognition just as a German citizen, but as a member of the
German minority who could be counted upon to work with the Americans.

Closely related to this pattern would be that of subservience. Probably many people in occupied countries found that the way to get along with the occupying authorities was to be yes-men. Anecdotal evidence suggests that in at least some areas the free trip to the United States was perceived as a reward for services rendered, with service being defined as subservience to the occupying authorities. People who have won a free trip in this manner would not necessarily show the responsibility for reform activities. Rather, they would be conforming to American demands, as they understood them. Self-esteem would be based upon success in pleasing the Americans. Often, of course, such surface conformity would be associated with underlying hostility, and a desire to deceive and eventually defeat the Americans. In that case, greater success in pleasing the Americans would only testify to American stupidity, and the opinions of the Americans could not actually have much influence upon self-esteem.

Hostility toward the Americans could also take other forms. Perhaps the visitors would decide to exploit the American offer for whatever they could get. In some cases, this would mean a free ride and a chance to make contact with a rich country. In other cases, it might mean an effort to find out everything possible in some area of specialized interest, and take this back home. In any case, hostility rules out any reciprocal obligation. The person who feels that he is entering the enemy camp when he comes to America feels no need to be fair to America nor to meet American demands except insofar as this is necessary for him to get the trip.

The important point to be made about this is that the particular relationship between countries, and the particular arrangements of a given program, will condition the selection of individuals. In all countries there are some people who are hostile to the United States, and others who are ready to be friends. There are people whose motivation is primarily opportunistic, who would exploit a free trip for personal gain, and other people with a strong sense of social responsibility. There are people who will wait to be told what to do, and others who will reach out for new experiences and new learnings. The problem is to understand how members of any particular country will interpret a visit to another. If the general feeling is that a visit to America means a visit to an enemy camp, then we can expect the visitors to be people ready to enter the enemy camp, either to join forces with them or to exploit them for
whatever gain is possible. If the general feeling is that America is trying to buy good will, then the people who accept the trip will be those who can be bought. If, on the other hand, the trip has the meaning of a dignified and responsible study of potentially useful resources, then we can expect visitors who are well integrated with the home culture but ready to explore new possibilities.

Implications for the Trainer

Implications of inequality between nations may arouse defensiveness, if the visitor is still identified with the home culture and trying to maintain a positive evaluation of it. On the other hand, inequality of status may mean that the visitors who choose to come bring with them either a willingness to sell out, abandoning home ties and substituting new ones, or else that they bring with them a great deal of hostility toward their hosts. All of these situations create difficulties for the host-trainer if he wants his guests to explore the resources of the host country in an open objective manner.

1. Selection Procedures

It is easier to select persons who have the desired motivational patterns, than to re-educate them after arrival. In a cross-culture learning situation, the task is to learn from the resources of the country, and to find ways of integrating this learning with activities back home. Strong hostilities toward either country interfere with this process. Once again we note the importance of finding persons who are well identified with their own culture, but who can see a place for new ideas from abroad.

Increasing efforts were made in the German Visitors Program and in the ECA program to make selection the responsibility of the home country. Nomination procedures were set up, so that names could be submitted by job superiors in the Governmental Affairs Program, or by people throughout the industry, in the ECA program. Such procedures have a double advantage. They focus on people who are well accepted at home, and who presumably have no difficulty in identifying with the home culture. At the same time, they maximize the motivation to learn from the visit, both by selection of people who are interested, and by setting up requests to the visitors to bring back specified information.

In cases where nomination and selection cannot be made the
responsibility of the home country, certain considerations emerge as important. If the Americans are doing the selecting, for example, it is important to be on guard against an over-acceptance of the American point of view. Learning is an active process, and should start from a position of independence rather than submissiveness or defiance.

2. Giving the Visitors Prestige and Recognition

Whoever the visitors are, they will appreciate being given prestige and recognition in the host country. In part, they want the chance to be ambassadors for their country, and in part, they want the kind of personal status which they have achieved at home. All too often the expertness which an individual has developed in his own culture is ignored abroad. If he cannot produce the particular symbols or certificates of status which the host culture recognizes, then he is judged to have nothing.

The ECA program developed several techniques for giving recognition to visiting teams. In one sense, their task was relatively easy: The limitation of any given team to one industry, at home and abroad, meant that there were certain common standards of expertness. There was a basis for exchange of ideas, so that the hosts and guests could learn from each other. This possibility for mutuality of influence was emphasized wherever possible, and in a number of cases resulted in helpful suggestions to American plants. Also of course it helped to put the visitors on an equal basis with the hosts.

The common field of interest also created possibilities for ceremonial events honoring the visitors. Thus, teams were frequently being welcomed by prestigious management personnel. Lunches were given in honor of the visitors, and opportunities were created for the visitors to talk about themselves and the country from which they came. Such activities emphasized American readiness to respect and honor the visitors, and presumably helped to make them feel welcome.

There was less opportunity for mutuality of influence with the Visitors' Program. A number of speaking engagements were arranged for members of the first group of Germans, but this approach was dropped with later groups. It was felt that the first group had been too much on display. The speaking engagements served to promote one-sided exposition of the German situation, rather than any real interaction with Americans. The Americans were only audience, and not, as in the ECA program, a group of specialists who would do their own talking immediately before or after the German presentation.
The German-American discussion groups that were arranged for the second group served as one kind of opportunity for mutuality of influence. Both Americans and Germans felt that the discussions were valuable chiefly as a place to talk about interesting questions with people from the other country. There was an interesting sidelight here on mutuality. In one group, where the Americans sat back and listened to the Germans for the first few hours, the Germans became very much upset. They pointed out that the Americans were not contributing their share, and that they were anxious to hear what the Americans had to say, as well as wanting to talk themselves.

The third German group was the most restricted in opportunities for interaction with Americans. It could be noted several times that an official seminar meeting "got off the track" when the discussion suddenly switched from a presentation of information about American institutions to a heated discussion about Germany. In one meeting, for example, an hour and a half was spent in argument about the actual operation of local government in Germany. The object was to be able to inform the coordinator correctly about the state of affairs. There was no logical necessity for this information at this particular time, and when the discussion was finished the Germans were disgusted with themselves for "wasting" so much time. However, it is likely that this phenomenon reflected at least in part the need for counter-influence on the part of the Germans, and that this need was being expressed in the only situation where they had good opportunity for interaction with Americans at the professional level, namely, in the seminar.

It is not always clear what targets would be appropriate for counter-influence, or what organizations relevant to honor the visitors officially. Often these things occur only at the individual level. However, anything which can be done by the trainer or coordinator to recognize the resources existing among the visitors, and to make these available to appropriate and interested Americans, is desirable. Even the more general formalities of welcoming the visitors are important. General and specific recognition go together to reduce the visitor's defensiveness and make him feel at home.

3. Avoiding Nationalistic Value Judgments

The host can do a great deal to create a situation in which national differences are sources of respect. He can make a point of finding out enough about the home country of the visitors to be able to understand it, and he can often show his genuine admiration of that country. If he can succeed in communicating his interest and respect, the visitors will be reassured about
their own status with him, and will have less need for de-
fensiveness or hostility.

The example of the host also will set the pattern for con-
sideration of national differences. If he can make it clear that
he is able to recognize the achievements of others, without be-
ing threatened himself, and if he is able to recognize weak-
nesses in his own country without any loss of self-esteem, then
the visitors may be able to do the same things. If, on the
other hand, he is defensive about national differences, he may
expect his visitors to be the same.

There are wide differences in initial readiness for objective
evaluation of national characteristics. Several Germans pointed
out that they had been trained to believe that Germany was the
greatest nation in the world, and any disagreement with this
point of view was assumed to be an expression of hostility. One
woman said that the most important thing for her in breaking
down this attitude was contact with other foreign students in
America. When people from three or more countries talked to-
gether about national differences it became clear that the inter-
est was in understanding national characteristics, rather than in
attack or defense. She finally learned that it was possible to
talk about the strong points and weak points of any country with-
out necessarily making an over-all judgment. She could criticize
Germany without any threat to general German prestige.

The ECA teams had unusually good preparation in this area.
The trip around to different plants at home created a clear,
objective, and differentiated image of the home situation. There
could not be any sweeping generalizations about the facts, and
accordingly, no sweeping evaluations. The habits of differenti-
ated observation were easily carried over into the foreign country.
Teams frequently expressed interest in exploring the variations
of the American industry, asking to see good and bad, large and
small, North and South. They were looking for specific informa-
tion about a range of differences, and not for generalized evalu-
ations.

The general objective of the trainer is to reduce national-
istic value judgments. He can do this in two ways. He can
create a situation where the prestige of the home country is not
threatened, by making it clear that he shares a positive general
evaluation of that country. The visitor is then free to react non-
evaluatively (objectively) to conditions both at home and abroad.
Attention to the range of events makes generalization difficult, so
that the visitor is required to pay attention to accuracy instead of
value judgments. The visitor who is unconcerned about value
judgments and absorbed in gathering information will not have much opportunity to worry about threats to national prestige.

4. Accepting the Visitors' Frame of Reference as the Starting Point for Learning

The trainer is anxious that new information shall not be selected to prove that one country is better than another. On the other hand, he knows that new information must be related to some general frame of reference if it is to be significant. A man, unlike a dictionary, cannot stop with the accumulation of unrelated bits of knowledge. He must place specific facts in some general context which will give them meaning.

This principle holds true for many different kinds of learning, but it raises special problems in the cross-culture situation. The learner brings with him one frame of reference, which he has used before and will use again after his return. Presumably, this frame of reference is one which he shares with other people in his home culture. It is the one which he will use in presenting or acting upon new ideas acquired during his visit abroad. Thus, it is the one which will determine the acceptability of these new ideas. Also, because it is familiar to the visitor, the original frame of reference is easy to use.

The visitor can best organize his impressions of the host country in his own terms, selecting that which is relevant and making whatever interpretations are required by his own values.

On the other hand, the fact is that particular practices and ideas actually exist in the context of the host culture. If the visitor to America is to interpret American behavior correctly, he must know what it means to Americans. The host-trainer will be aware of the distortions which are introduced when American behavior is judged by foreign standards, and he will be eager to supply his visitors with the correct interpretation. In effect, this means insisting upon the accuracy of the American frame of reference.

The trainer, then, is faced with a delicate problem of balance. There will be many occasions when he has the responsibility of supplying the context for particular observations about the American scene. He will want to make the American point of view clear to the visitors. On the other hand, he does not want to insist upon the adoption of the American point of view. He respects the right of the visitors to make their own judgments.

One illustration may help to clarify this general point. A
team of food processors from the Netherlands were impressed by the American supermarkets. They could see how this style of selling worked in America to open up markets for new goods, and they decided to try the same thing at home. The experiment proved a failure. Why? Because the Dutch housewife continued to telephone her order to the store, and have it delivered to her door. She never entered the store to be exposed to the array of new products. Thus, the assumption that Dutch housewives would behave in the same way as American housewives involved a crucial oversight. The Americans who had seen the success of supermarkets in their country could talk forever about the reasons for success, and never discover the critical factor which would cause failure in the Netherlands. Only the visiting team would have access to that knowledge, and, as in our example, even they might overlook it. However, if they had recognized the strength of the habitual shopping by telephone, they might have asked a different question: How can we do for the shopper at home what the supermarket does for the shopper in the store? Or, perhaps they would have preferred to work on the problem of getting the housewife to change her shopping habits and come to the store. In either case, the problem would be one which host and visitors could work on together, but which would be quite different from anything which the Americans had encountered in their own country. American success could pose the question, but it could not give the answers.
Experience with both the productivity teams and the German Visitors' Program indicates that the visitors are strongly ambivalent about how much autonomy they should have. Certain things make them feel dependent; other factors make it very important to them to be independent. As a result, their behavior often appears irrational and contradictory. It is important to understand both parts of this pattern.

We have already seen how the difficulty and frustration of getting along in a strange country may stimulate feelings of dependency. Also, we have talked about the difficulty in defining a satisfactory relationship between host and visitors, and the tendency toward an exaggerated desire to be taken care of by the host.

In addition to these emotional factors, there are certain reality factors which require that the visitors be dependent. Planning must begin before the visitors arrive, and like those of the productivity teams, must be completely planned in advance. Visitors who stay for a longer time have more opportunity to participate in planning the later phases of the visit. Even here, however, the broad outlines of the program, and the specification of possible alternatives among which they may choose, are set before their arrival. Once in this country, the visitors need considerable time for orientation and adjustment before becoming active in planning their own activities.

During this initial period, the visitors are dependent upon their host for orientation. They must get help on a variety of subjects, ranging from problems of personal maintenance to questions about national institutions. Here there is no question of reciprocity. It is the visitors who need help.

Another kind of required dependency arises from the fact that the individual is part of a larger group or team. He cannot make plans in terms of his own needs alone. Decisions are made with the objective of doing as much as possible to meet the general needs of the group, or to meet the range of different
individual needs present in the group. The individual has no alternative but to accept these decisions and adjust himself to them as best he can. Even if he participates in making these decisions, he does so only by subordinating his needs to those of the group. Thus, the question of whether his needs and interests will receive as much attention as he would like depends upon the constitution of the group to which he belongs, and upon the kinds of flexibility which the coordinator is able to introduce into the program. Neither of these things is under his control.

There is another kind of dependency which is introduced by the responsibility to learn from the visit. The visitor has traveled far in order to expose himself to new ideas. Once he has reached his destination, he cannot very well refuse to learn. Yet he may think that to learn means to be subordinate, passively accepting the ideas that others present to him. Even when he recognizes learning as a more active process, he is still dependent upon his environment and its representatives.

Counteracting these pressures toward dependency, some forces emerge which we have examined under the heading of self-esteem. The visitors are mature individuals, many of them engaged upon professional careers. Their self-respect demands that they demonstrate some degree of autonomy and independence. Similarly, their role as ambassadors of the home nation forbids them to be subservient. They must maintain national prestige by demonstrating their equality of status.

The visitors bring with them also certain demands. There are things they want to see and do, if their visit is to be a success. They cannot afford to give these up simply because it is easier to be dependent.

Ambivalence about dependence and autonomy will often take the form of resistance against restrictions which cannot be helped. Examples have already been given. They include the demands by some productivity teams that all interesting plants be included on their itinerary, even when this was manifestly impossible; the bitter protest about lack of funds which the third group of Germans made to the coordinator; and the refusal of this group of Germans either to make their own plans or to accept the plans proposed by others. The third group of Germans seems to have experienced the conflict between the desires for dependence and independence in particularly acute form. They demanded more individual attention, but they refused to make use of the office hours maintained by the coordinator for individual consultation. They wanted the coordinator to take more responsibility for lecturing and for planning of trips, but
they objected to each specific phase of the program: the University arrangements, the pattern of internships, and the time schedule. Every decision became a new stimulus for emotional conflict between the visitors and the coordinator.

There is no doubt that planning to meet the varied needs of a number of different people is difficult, particularly when there are severe limitations on available time, money, and resources. Our only concern is to point out that the inevitable difficulties are heightened when emotional tension has been generated around the problem of dependence and independence. Then every issue which might test the balance of power between visitors and hosts becomes an emotional problem, not subject to rational evaluation or solution. The relationship between visitors and host remains a focus of difficulty, rather than a means of achieving personal satisfactions or for working out satisfactory program arrangements.

**Trainer Implications**

In general, the trainer can work at this problem from two angles. He can reduce the amount of tension by minimizing the extent to which dependence-independence becomes an issue. He can also work with the visitors to help them understand the conflicting needs which they feel, and find ways to meet them. In either case, he must have some understanding himself of the meaning of this conflict for the visitors, and be able to accept the symptomatic behavior without becoming personally disturbed by it.

1. **Avoiding the Issue**

There are various ways in which the coordinator can bypass the struggle for autonomy. In general, this is done by minimizing the amount of influence which he personally exerts upon the visitors.

In program planning, this means he represents reality requirements. He makes clear the pressures operating upon him, and through him upon the group, and allows the group to deal with these pressures in any way that it sees fit.

The coordinator may be able also to separate himself from internal discipline in the group. If a team or group has one of its own members as a leader who will assume the responsibility for group discipline and general morale, then the coordinator need not accept blame for the emotional state of affairs. He
can limit his role to that of neutral resource person. This designation of a team leader occurred for all ECA teams, but not for the German visitors.

With respect to learning, it is again possible to leave the difficult task to others. The ECA productivity teams found one way of doing this. The project manager made arrangements for the team to visit plants, but he himself never tried to give information. He arranged for contact between the visitors and the sources of new information; he helped the teams plan how to use each source most effectively but he did not originate any direct influence himself.

Theoretically, it is possible to follow similar procedures in a university program. The coordinator could invite people to come in and talk to the group, and then help the group find out what they wanted to know. However, this assumes a common field of discourse among the visitors, and between the visitors and the outside expert. The productivity teams found this common interest in industry, but less specialized visitors might have to wait longer to become sufficiently familiar with the American scene. Also, in more general discussions an inadequate knowledge of English is more of a handicap; the visitors can't understand a stranger who talks along at his own pace about unfamiliar material. Thus, the coordinator may have to take most of the responsibility for orientation and teaching in the early weeks of the program, postponing the invitations to outside people until the visitors are more at home. By this time, the conflict over dependency should be pretty well worked out anyway.

2. Interpretation to the Visitors

The kind and amount of interpretation possible will vary a great deal from one program to another, and from one trainer to another. At points where irrational behavior on the part of the visitors is causing real difficulty for the trainer he may want to discuss the problem with them and try to get them to think with him about its causes and possible remedies. If the visitors can accept the reality of the problem and the trainer as a person to help solve it, then the trainer is in a good position to suggest possible explanations to the visitors. Sometimes the emotional problem may involve the trainer so directly that the visitors cannot talk freely with him about it. Or again, the emotional problem may be too difficult for the visitors to talk about easily. In either case, recognition from the trainer of the legitimacy of the emotions involved (wanting help and also wanting independence) might stimulate discussion. Or, the
trainer might prefer to withdraw from a situation in which he is highly involved, rather than to attempt the unfamiliar procedure of discussion and interpretation. Each situation, of course, must be handled in its own terms, depending upon the visitors' insight and cooperation as well as the trainer's own competence.

3. Insight about Symptoms of Difficulty

Regardless of whether or not the trainer is able to give interpretive help to the visitors, he himself needs to be able to see the situation clearly. Planning a successful program is ultimately his responsibility, and failures in planning seem to be his failures. Thus, when he encounters resistance which seems to threaten the success of the program, he is likely to take it as a personal affront. If he does this, of course, he only makes things worse. He increases the distance and misunderstanding between himself and the visitors and makes it virtually impossible for them to accept him as a giver of help.

What are some of the forms which resistance can take? We have noted several. The visitors may be "apathetic," refusing to take an interest in any part of the program or to assume any responsibility for what happens. They may be hostile, rejecting certain decisions which are required by the reality situation. They may make issues out of a succession of minor incidents, thereby engaging in repeated attack on the coordinator and his way of handling the program.

In the face of these difficulties, the coordinator may easily give way to anger and frustration, implicitly assuming that the motivation of the visitors is a malicious attack upon him. On the other hand, he may recognize this behavior as a sign that the visitors are having trouble finding a satisfactory role for themselves and that the forces which require dependence are so strong as to interfere with their normal ability to assume responsibility.

If he can be diagnostic about the reasons behind the resistance of the visitors, the coordinator will have made two major gains. The first is peace of mind. He does not need to feel under attack, and he does not need to see the difficulty as a personal failure.

The second gain concerns his ability to deal with the problem. Instead of prolonging the symptomatic difficulties with the visitors, he can go to work on causes. He may or may not be able to bring the visitors along with him, but he can do much to
relieve the conflict in which they are involved. Various ways of doing this are discussed in the remaining sections of this chapter. All of them are based on this one prior assumption, namely, that the coordinator is able to take an objective and non-defensive approach to the problem.

4. Response to Legitimate Dependency Requests

Much of the visitors' dependency is legitimate, as we have said. The visitors need help with orientation and planning. They don't know their way around and, though it may be uncomfortable for them to admit this, they want to be shown. Some kinds of orientation can be given early, as general background; others must wait until the visitors have enough familiarity with the host country to be able to ask questions or at least assimilate answers.

The history of the first two groups of Germans suggests that it takes three or four months before the visitors are actually able to make plans for themselves. With the third group, an effort was made to speed up this acquisition of independence, with the result that independence was indefinitely postponed. This experience suggests that perhaps the visitors are actually dependent more completely and for a longer period of time than is easily visible. The American host sees learning as an active experience, and is eager for the visitors to assume the initiative. He may be inclined to overestimate the speed with which this can occur. He begins too soon to reject many legitimate requests from the visitors for help and many efforts to remain passively dependent. Apparently it is the visitors who must set the time table; if the need exists for them, it should be met. The assumption is that the general pressures of our society and of individual self-esteem are such that when the visitors feel able to take the initiative, they will do so. Any attempt to rush the process will only threaten the visitors more, and thus defeat itself.

The other kind of request which the coordinator must often meet in some way is the request for personal time and recognition. Each individual needs to feel that he is important for himself, and not only as a member of a group. Often the attempt to get additional time set aside for individual activity is motivated more by the desire to get individual needs recognized than to get them satisfied. Similarly, a certain amount of obstructive or resistant behavior by individual visitors comes from a desire to get the coordinator's full attention.

The extent to which the coordinator or trainer can give
individual recognition will vary from one program to another. The German visitors were assigned to the care of one coordinator, who spent a great deal of time with them, in seminars and on trips. Thus, he knew them quite well and had power over them in a wide range of activities. His good opinion was inevitably valuable to the visitors, and they wanted his personal recognition. Setting up office hours when he was available for individual consultation did not suffice. The visitors did not want to take the initiative in contacting him; they wanted him to contact them. Group meetings were unsatisfactory; the coordinator was then paying attention to the group as a whole, and to the things which individuals had in common rather than those which made them unique. Occasionally the visitors felt that a satisfactory personal relationship had been established when a few of them went on a trip with the coordinator and had a chance for more informal contact. This feeling disappeared, however, when the entire group reassembled. They did not want formal counseling and planning sessions, so much as informal warmth and attention.

It is not clear how far the coordinator could have gone in meeting demands of this kind. However, it seems likely that more could have been done than was actually done, even within the bounds of the role as the coordinator defined it. A little personal interest goes a long way, and certainly does not seem an unreasonable request.

The project managers with the ECA teams did not get so many requests for personal recognition. Their position with respect to the team was less central, with the team leader doing one job and the plant visits another. It was not so critical to the visitors to obtain the good opinion of the project manager. Also, it is possible that the reduction in formal relationships between manager and team members left more room for informal contacts, so that the need for personal friendship could be met more easily than on the Visitor’s Program.

There will be variations from one individual to another in the kind and amount of dependency needs expressed. Some will value the opportunity for autonomous activity; others will look for directed activity. Some prefer close personal relationships with the trainer; while others like to keep their distance. One part of the trainer’s responsibility is to take note of the different needs of different individuals, and try to respond differentially.

5. Clarity of Planning

Ambiguity is the perfect breeding ground for emotional conflict. When realities are sharp and unambiguous, the individual
must adjust himself to them. When ambiguity exists, he tries to fill in the gaps from his own knowledge. This process is satisfactory if his own knowledge in turn is clear and unambiguous. However, if he is in conflict himself, he will simply project this internal conflict onto the external situation. He will alternate between one interpretation and another, and will be unable to act upon any one view.

Thus, if questions about who has the power and the responsibility for planning a foreign visitors' program are the focus of tension, then the actual process of such planning should be made very clear. Visitors should know at any given point just what decisions have been made, what alternatives are still open for choice, and how such forthcoming decisions will be made. This means that shortly after arrival the visitors will be told what decisions have already been made, and what still remains to be done. If they are able to participate in subsequent planning, there will be no problem of communication. If on the other hand certain decisions remain with the staff, then there is need for clarification. What kind of decisions are made by the visitors, and what kind by the staff? How are these two kinds of decisions different? If the visitors want a larger or smaller share in the decision-making process, how can they get it?

It is easier to be clear about planning if the activity being planned is itself clear. For example, the ECA teams had a very specific task, which they repeated over and over again. They visited a plant, and tried to find out as much as possible about how things were done there. It was easy for visitors and hosts alike to see what the task was, and to plan ways for accomplishing it. Actually, most of the teams divided up into committees for each visit, and each committee had responsibility for gathering a specific kind of information. At the end of the visit the success of the data gathering could be determined, and any necessary revisions made before the next visit. Thus, clarity of the task led to clarity of assignment, which in turn made it possible to evaluate success or failure, and to plan efficiently for the next trip. Planning was not only a necessary preliminary to a plant visit; it was the reason behind whatever success was achieved. Successful planning led directly to anticipated rewards, and thus became valuable in itself.

The German visitors' experience with planning was different. Again we shall consider primarily the experience of the third group. When they were asked to plan a visit to a strange city, the assignment was vague. They did not know what to expect from the city, and they did not know what to expect from themselves. Thus energy was wasted in considerable random activity.
and the time spent in planning did not yield good results. After the visit the visitors had criticisms to make, but they did not know how they, themselves, could have made the visit better.

The trainer resisted the planning job, because he felt that the visitors were evading an essential part of the process of learning. However, he could not convince the visitors that his reasoning was sincere, because their own experience indicated that they learned less when they had to take time for planning. An impasse developed in which the very mention of planning sent tempers to the boiling point. The ambiguity of the task (learning about America), and of the ways in which visitor planning or staff planning could facilitate achievement of this task, was so great that rational problem solving became impossible.

Decision-making power should be passed on to the visitors in proportion to their readiness to accept it. Such power or responsibility is easier to accept when it concerns a highly structured activity. If the visitors know exactly what to do and how to do it, there isn’t much cause for emotional conflict. If, on the other hand, an ambiguous assignment is made in a problem area where tension already exists, then there will be difficulty.

6. Shifting Responsibility over Time

The balance between needs for dependence and for independence will shift over time, as the visitors begin to find a place for themselves in the new country. One responsibility of the trainer is to meet this shift in need with a shift in program. In general, he will need to take more responsibility in the early days of the program for planning activities and giving orientation. Later he can expect the visitors to do more planning of activities, and to call upon him as a resource person when they need him.

In order for this shift to occur there needs to be a continuing possibility for evaluation of the existing procedures. In the course of such evaluation, trainer and visitors learn to work together in defining procedures to meet their particular needs at a particular time. When more help is wanted, it is given. When more freedom is the object, that, too, can be arranged.

The difficulty comes from the fact that few trainers can be as flexible as this statement implies. The general outlines of the program are laid out in advance. There is time pressure to cover as much as possible, and this operates to keep the
trainer making decisions. He is restricted both in the amount of help and the amount of freedom which he can offer. It is important to recognize, then, that this shift of responsibility to the visitors is conceived in relative terms. It is a pattern which both hosts and visitors may want to keep in mind, and which may make it easier to settle the day-to-day issues which come up. However, it is a shift which must be contained within whatever range of freedom a particular program can offer.

Possibly the idea of shift in responsibility is most applicable to a general program, like that of the German visitors. In that case the learning objectives are so numerous and so inclusive that there are always problems of choice. At first the coordinator decides what to teach; later the visitors decide what to learn.

The ECA pattern is somewhat different. The actual learning activity remains the same all during the visit. However, the whole visit builds up to the final report which the team must write after its return home. This responsibility is one of which team members are aware from the beginning, and which represents the real product of their trip. They are completely responsible for this report; they must write it themselves. The change over time is not a change in their present activities or in their relationship to the project manager, but in their closeness to this final definitive task. Eventually their return home brings about a complete reversal of role: They shift from learners to teachers. Anticipation of this shift may influence their behavior during the visit, and make things easier for the trainer. However, it is worth noting that the institutionalization of the program is clear enough so that the process moves along independently of anything which a particular trainer might do. He does not have to bring about a shift of responsibility through his own actions.

The internship arrangements served some of the same purpose for the German visitors. The fact that they entered new situations where they had to shift for themselves required some increase in personal responsibility. In a sense, it required them to grow up and to leave home. Fortunately, this change of environment had been planned to occur at a time when the visitors were ready to change their role. It was possible for the individual to complete his assertion of independence and autonomy at a time when he was ready for it.
Meeting Learning Objectives

The individual who is visiting a foreign country for a limited period usually feels pressed for time. He tries to do as much as he can within the limited time available. For some people this pressure leads to a great deal of frantic activity which gets nowhere and gives no time to assimilate anything. For other people, there is simply a heightened sense of urgency, and continuous tension about the things which are not getting done.

The problem often takes the form of an impossible choice. The visitor would like to do many things in the foreign country, and this may be the only chance in his lifetime to do any of them. Yet there is not time for all. Which shall he relinquish? The now-or-never atmosphere makes it almost impossible to give up anything, and this, in turn, makes it difficult to admit the necessity of choice. Instead, the visitor carries around a feeling that maybe he really should be doing something else. He feels guilty or deprived, but he does not really come to terms with the fact that there are some things which he cannot do.

Time Pressure and Choice

There were two problems of choice expressed by the German visitors and the productivity team members. The first was the conflict between a general desire to learn about America, and a feeling of obligation to investigate specific problems, German visitors who were sent by their job supervisors with specific assignments and whose salary continued during the visit felt strong obligations to obtain the requested technical information. On the other hand, the whole rationale of the Visitors' Program was designed to encourage a general interest in the American scene, and this motivation was very strong for most of the visitors. The result was often an ambivalent alternation between one interest and the other, and a constant fear of missing something in the area not currently being explored.

Members of the productivity team found that technical assignments absorbed all their time and attention, so that there was no room for personal desires to see America. Or at least if
such personal desires existed, they were not often expressed. Perhaps the fact that there was really no possibility of choice meant also that there was no tension about whether the current activity was the best one.

The second choice problem was between extensive and intensive experience. Usually it was manifested as frustration about being forced to skim over the surface, with no time to stop and really understand. This was particularly true for the ECA teams. The opposite difficulty appeared for the Germans, who expressed frustration about spending too long on one thing or in one place, and not having enough time to cover the full range of events. They felt somewhat uneasy about being confined to one atypical small town. Also, in the seminars they seemed to want everything: more information about more things in less time.

**Trainer Implications**

The trainer has the responsibility to be rational about time, even if the visitors can't be. It is important for him to develop a realistic idea of what can be accomplished within the time allotted, and then hold on to it. Both he and the visitors will have some tendency to exaggerate what is possible. This is not bad in itself; it may be stimulating to reach for the impossible. However, the trainer must see that this does not occur at the expense of doing a good job with what is possible. At first he must allow time for the visitors to become familiar with their surroundings, and, if necessary, with the language of the host. He may have to resist pressures for premature activity, insisting upon leisure for assimilation as the prelude to active learning and investigation.

Later the job of the trainer may be to help the visitors recognize and accept their various learning objectives. Sometimes he can help them find ways to progress on each; sometimes it will be a matter of making a choice among them.

**Learning Objectives Imposed upon the Visitors by Others**

The visitor is the person who must ultimately do the learning on the trip, but it is not always clear whether he is learning things for himself or for other people. The technical requests which he brings from job supervisors or from an entire industry at home are generally accepted as legitimate. The visitor feels that he should learn these things. In a sense, this aspect of the trip is part of his job, and it will receive the
same conscientious attention he would give to his job if he were at home.

The personal desire of the visitor, when he considers only himself, may be quite different from his professional obligations. He may be interested in travel for its own sake, whether this means for him sightseeing or getting to know new groups of people. Also, he may be concerned about personal advancement—acquiring personal contacts, or prestigious kinds of knowledge and experience. Family ties present another kind of personal motivation. Many of the Germany visitors had relatives or friends of relatives whom they wanted to visit while in the United States.

Then there is that kind of motivation which is attributed to the hosts. Here we have a more complicated problem, since it concerns a combination of what the hosts actually want, and what the visitors think the hosts want.

If the hosts, in the form of the United States Government, are paying money to cover most or all of the visitors' expenses, then it is natural to assume that they want something in return. This is a debt which the visitors must pay. The obligation is stronger than in either of the preceding cases, but the spontaneous motivation may be less. That is, the visitors are eager to discharge the debt, but it is the hosts and not themselves who must suggest the method of payment.

Sometimes the goals of host and home country will coincide, as with the productivity programs, or student exchange programs. The visitors are encouraged to do as much as possible to meet professional and personal goals, and this discharges any existing obligation to the host country. At other times, as when relationships between two countries are somewhat strained, the visitors' program may be perceived as an invitation to change allegiance. Then there is trouble, as we have seen. The visitors may be hostile toward the host country, and may do as little as possible to comply with the host's requirements, or they may decide to change sides, and do whatever the host requests. In either case, they will want explicit instructions from the host as to what they must do.

The German Visitors' Program was an example of a situation where the visitors expected specific requirements, but none were forthcoming. There were various reactions. Some accepted the general statements at face value, and decided that they really did not have to perform specific tasks to pay off obligations. Others were resentful. Some felt that the American
government had secret objectives which it was afraid to reveal. Others criticized the arrogance of a government which thought it could bring visitors to a strange town, set them down in a room with $3.00 per day, and assume that that would be enough to convert them to friendship for America.

If the host is seen as having specific objectives different from those of the visitors, this will affect reactions to the trainer as well as to the host government. Every action of his will be judged in the context of his presumed motivation. If he is perceived as a propagandist it will be extremely difficult for him to do much teaching. Similarly, if he is expected to present a one-sided point of view, then the visitors will be suspicious of everything they see, sure that there are important contradictory things which they are not allowed to see. If the tension about host and trainer expectations is high enough, it may overshadow other aspects of the motivation to learn. Visitors may spend all their time trying to outwit the trainer, and thus lose sight of other interests and obligations.

If there is conflict between the personal interests of the visitors and their professional obligations, the implications are much the same as those discussed in the preceding problem. The trainer can help the visitors to understand the conflict and the points at which choice is necessary.

If there is tension about what the host government or the trainer expects of them, the visitors, then there are special problems. The first responsibility of the trainer is to make clear what his own motivations are. Usually this means stressing his role as an aid to the visitors in achieving what they want, whether this means that he acts as a travel agent, contact person, or as a resource person. Sometimes he may want to separate himself completely from the role of providing information. This kind of role separation may be appropriate in a variety of situations, but is particularly necessary in cases where suspicion is high. It is a way of demonstrating that the trainer's responsibilities are to the visitors, and not to a program of indoctrination.

The trainer can try in other ways to show his respect for the objectives of the visitors. We have already mentioned the importance of working with the visitors' frame of reference. In the next section we will discuss more fully the possibilities for referring new ideas back to the home culture, rather than restricting them to the context of the host culture. Also, the trainer can include the visitors in the planning, to whatever extent they are ready to participate.
Once the trainer has established a good personal relationship with the visitors, his next task is to interpret the objectives of the government or other sponsoring agency. Usually this means that he must serve as the representative of imposed restrictions, or requirements. He administers the funds and schedules the time. When special reports are required for the sponsoring agency, he is the one who sees that the reports are written.

The trainer usually tries to be impersonal in presenting these limits and demands. He wants the visitors to see that they are objective requirements of the situation and not merely arbitrary personal demands. On the other hand, he runs into danger if he tries to separate himself from the situation by joining with the visitors in criticism of the program arrangements. Then he simply reinforces the idea that the original motivation was unfriendly or uninformed. The hostility moves away from him and gets expressed, for example, in letters to the State Department. This is more comfortable for the coordinator, but it creates difficulties with other people who may be working equally hard on behalf of the visitors. Essentially the coordinator's responsibility is to help the visitors see why particular restrictions or requirements exist. Then, if they are unacceptable, there may be a second job of trying to discover ways of bringing about a change.

Sometimes the coordinator will not be able to avoid arousing hostility, suspicion, or resistance on the part of the visitors towards himself. Then it becomes important not to perpetuate these tensions in a cycle of mutual suspicion and hostility. The coordinator should be able to tolerate the difficulties and help the visitors find ways to work them through, without returning the emotion in kind. If he can maintain his own emotional balance, and work at the problem rationally, he may be able to help the visitors to do the same.

**General Comments on Learning**

Much of what we have said about learning can be summed up in the statement that different people are ready to learn different things at different times. The visitor must begin by working on problems of how to relate to his environment, his hosts and sponsors, and his particular program coordinator. He must find a role for himself which he can accept, and which is consistent with the requirements of both home and host countries. Sometimes these problems will occupy most of his attention for the first week or two and continue at a lower level of intensity for a number of months.
When these problems have been sufficiently resolved for the visitor to turn his attention to other things, he is ready to listen and be shown. This is the first learning period. Then, after two or three months, there is another shift, with the visitors beginning to take more initiative in exploring their environment. The final step is taken when the visitors are ready to assimilate their new experience, and integrate it with what has gone before.

In addition to the changes over time it is important to be aware of the multiple learning objectives which are being pursued at any given time. These include the exploration of American life, the acquisition of technical information, the desire to travel, and the desire for personal contact with individual Americans.

Procedures which will work at one time and for one problem will not work for a different time and problem. The trainer needs to be ready to change his methods as the needs of the learners change. We have mentioned the change in his role, from authority to resource person, and the change from passive to active participation by the visitors. In addition, there may be a change in the quality of participation from one task to another.

For example, the productivity teams had a very highly organized procedure for making plant visits. There was careful planning ahead of time, during which the team decided just what kind of information they should try to obtain from this particular plant. Then the team divided into subgroups of two or three persons each, with each subgroup assigned specific questions to investigate during the visit. The team manager would call the plant to tell people there what the team wanted, and then report to the team on the call. During the visit each subgroup would look out for its area of special interest. Then, immediately after the visit, there was a summary session during which the visitors could compile and share their feelings. Suggestions could be made about how to improve procedures in the future, with the assurance that they would be adopted.

This highly organized procedure worked well for the productivity teams, and would probably work well for certain other kinds of field trip. On the other hand, if the trip were to see something unfamiliar, it might be better for the visitors to go with open minds, prepared to listen to whatever their hosts could tell them.

There is similar variation in discussion meetings. Sometimes a group might want to interview an expert, getting him to supply answers to questions already formulated. At other times
it might be better for the lecturer to take the initiative in outlining what he has to offer. Or again, the visitors might prefer to discuss a matter among themselves, getting clear on elementary facts before moving on to more complex issues.

Sometimes it is better for the visitors to work as a group, and sometimes as individuals. Sometimes they should move through a subject rapidly, and sometimes slowly with careful attention to detail. The problem of procedure is never finally solved. There must be constant adjustment to take account of changes in the emotional readiness of the visitors, as well as changes in the content of the material to be learned.
Maintaining Relationships with the Home Culture

The problems which face the visitors when they try to establish satisfactory relationships with the new, host culture are only a part of their dilemma. They never give up their allegiance to the home culture or their membership in it, and this relationship-at-a-distance has some difficulties. Essentially the difficulties arise from the fact that the home culture itself is not present, so the visitors must substitute for it some remembered image. This image has limitations, rigidities, and distortions not present in the original, but its influence on individual behaviour is no less strong.

Transferring Ideas and Inventions from One Culture to the Other

Much cross-culture education includes the expectation that the visitors will bring from their visit something to take home and apply. This may be made explicit, as with the productivity teams, or it may be implicit, as in re-education programs.

The chief difficulty here is to evaluate the vast array of practices and procedures of the host country, and select those which would be appropriate at home. Sometimes considerable adaptation is required before transfer is practical: Practices used for one purpose abroad can be used differently at home. Often the thing which seems to constitute a unit for the host must be broken down into separate parts, with only some appropriate for transfer. The whole process of adaptation requires careful and continuous reality testing, or evaluation of what the home situation will permit. It is difficult to do this at a distance.

The productivity teams know the relevant aspects of their home situation well enough so that their work is relatively easy. The image which they carry around with them has been forged in the preliminary tour of home industry, and is fairly detailed and accurate. Other visitors do not have this advantage. They are trying to think about innovation when they are not even certain about the situation into which they want to introduce it.
They may discover certain crucial areas of ignorance or uncertainty which can be cleared up only after they return home.

Probably the hardest thing to judge at a distance is the readiness with which a given change will be accepted. Distortions can occur in both directions. Visitors may think that people at home will never change or that they will accept new suggestions without any question. Only trial and error can determine what is true. This must wait until they go home.

There are various pressures to postpone all thinking about application and transfer until the return home. However, there are also objections to this delay. By the time the visitors get home, they no longer have access to the source material. They cannot check on the details of certain ideas or operations which seem in retrospect to be valuable. Neither can they follow through any new lines of investigation which may be triggered off by the success of some particular innovation. Thus, for the visit to be successful, it is important that thinking about application begin while the visitors are still abroad.

There are several ways of encouraging this. The ECA teams, for example, wrote two interim reports in the course of their visit, and they joined in one final summary session. Also, as we have mentioned, many plant visits were followed by summary sessions. All of these were focused on possible application, and thus served to hold the attention of the visitors on this problem.

The use of teams serves the same purpose. If several people come from one place, they can work with one another continuously in considering possible applications, difficulties which might be encountered, and ways of avoiding these difficulties. If each can see the interest of the other in making some changes, each is reassured about his own ideas. If there has been planning in advance of the trip with people at home about what sort of change might be desirable, this of course makes the task of the team even easier. It already has sanction for certain kinds of learnings, and the members may go ahead and work on these, or extend the original ideas if this seems necessary. The team idea was used extensively in the ECA program, but is also appropriate in other areas. Teams may come from communities, government agencies, private organizations or from industry.

Accepting Influence from the New Culture

It is relatively easy to admit that certain ideas or inventions or procedures are valuable and might be transferred to a new setting. It is harder to allow one's central system of values and
attitudes to be influenced. The visitor must convince himself that any attitudinal change is still consistent with his loyalty to the home country, and does not represent desertion to the other country.

The visitors themselves may be a testing ground. They can discuss new ideas among themselves, and examine them from their own point of view. If this group of representatives of the home country can accept certain changes in point of view, then maybe people at home can be expected to do the same, and the ideas may be considered "acceptable." Group discussion is valuable only if (1) the group members accept and respect each other; and (2) an influential part of the group is interested in an open-minded exploration of the subjects at hand. Granted these conditions, the group of visitors may well serve as surrogates for the total home culture.

The trainer cannot insist upon any given point of view in these discussions. If the group chooses to be critical and rejecting of certain things which he admires, that is its privilege. His only object is to be sure that no one pattern of accepting or rejecting gets established to the exclusion of genuine consideration of the issues. His concern is with procedures or with accuracy of information, but not with conclusions.

There is another step which the trainer can take to help the visitors. He can keep the home context active and salient by constant referral to the home situation for comparisons and evaluations. This gives explicit recognition to the importance of keeping in touch with things at home, so that the visitors don't need to make an issue of it. Also, the frequency of movement from one context to the other reduces the barriers between them. If the two lines of thought are carried along simultaneously, it is easier to see connections between them, and it is easier for each to influence the other.

There is always the possibility that when visitors go home they will return to their original views. Attitude change begins with a situation in which influence and change are possible, but the crucial test comes when persons leave the influence situation and must choose whether or not to maintain the change. If the original change situation has included full awareness of the home context, the problem of maintenance is minimized. The home situation then is not very different from the influence situation; the battles against home prejudice have already been fought and won.

Emotional factors are also important for permanent attitude change. If the visitor feels that his hosts have a continuing warm personal interest in him, then he is better able to associate
himself with their views, even if they turn out to be unpopular with his friends at home.

**Getting Along with Other Members of the Training Group**

The visitor who comes to America on a government program usually is thrown into close and unavoidable contact with a limited number of his fellow countrymen. The result may be friendship and mutual support, but it is often tension and hostility.

The reasons for positive response are clear enough. Congenial persons sharing a similar experience will be easily drawn together. Also, difficulties in making contacts with foreigners throw the visitors back upon themselves, forcing them to seek friends in their own ranks.

On the other hand, the very tensions aroused by the difficulty of getting along in a strange culture may be reflected back on the group. The visitors must be polite and reserved with their hosts. With each other, they may express all the pent-up tension and hostility which belong elsewhere.

The enforced interdependence of group members serves to exaggerate grievance. One person's actions affect the reputation of the entire group. The others cannot separate themselves from him; they must maintain personal contact and they must share in the reputation which he has created. Thus, personal differences in values or styles of behavior become reasons for resentment.

The group members are also interdependent in their efforts to make the most of their visit. Their individual goals may be quite different but somehow a program must be fashioned to serve the entire group. Thus the group, and the other members in it, may serve to block the achievement of the goals of any particular individual. Again there is reason for resentment.

Finally there are the possibilities for friction which always exist when people are thrown closely together in a group. We are inclined to talk of personality clashes; our German visitors talked of excessive heterogeneity within the group. Our evidence on the prevalence of interpersonal hostilities among the Germans suggests that perhaps they had more difficulty than most with these problems.

There are wide differences from culture to culture and from group to group in two relevant attitudes. First, there is variation in the clarity with which the visitors see the need to function
as a group. The ECA teams could see this need quite easily. Their final report had to be a joint one; good coverage required division of labor, and thus, cooperation. Their job was to study particular plants in the United States. It was hard to open a plant to ECA inspection; this could be done only a limited number of times, and it could not be done independently for each individual visitor. Travel possibilities were limited, and the group could get more value per miles of travel by working together than separately. These things strengthened their motivation to make the group enterprise succeed and to find ways of getting along with fellow-visitor.

Other groups do not see clear requirements for group activity, and resent any attempts to force unnecessary cooperation. The third German group, in particular, insisted at great length that they did not come to America to be a team and the staff should not waste time trying to make them a team. Actually much of their program required them to do things as a group, just as had been true of the previous groups of visitors. The only difference was that the third group was asked to take cognizance of what was going on, and assume some responsibility for it. This they did not want to do. They could see themselves only as a group of independent individuals, and each refused to be limited by the other.

The second kind of difference between groups concerns the extent to which individuals are willing to work through their own interpersonal problems. Some cultures take a repressive approach toward emotional tension, assuming that emotions kept out of sight will also be out of mind. Thus, the Germans felt that when difficulty arose in the group, the official staff leader should take repressive measures against the offender, and should structure the group activities rigidly against further irrational or wasteful behavior. When the Americans refused to do this, the Germans gave up any hope of successful group activity.

Members of other groups are better prepared to face their own difficulties, and to devise procedures for meeting them. Presumably such readiness is a function of past experience in group situations and in objective self-analysis. Both kinds of experience build up resources which the individual can use in later situations, just as experience with repressive measures builds up habits later reinvoked.

All of this suggests that the trainer will want to know what the state of relationships is within the group. If there is a feeling that not enough attention is being paid to individual learning needs, then the trainer will want to arrange more individual
activities outside the group. If the group is blocked in its activities because of internal tensions, then he may want to help the group examine and work through some of its problems. If the group members are working well together, then he may ask the group to assume responsibility for more complex planning. In short, there is a great deal of emotional energy tied up in the group. It can serve as either an asset or a liability.

Preparing to Return Home

When the visitors are getting ready to go home special problems arise. They are concerned about whether they are ready to leave, how they will be received when they get home, and how to maintain desired contacts with members of the host country. Sometimes they worry too about whether they will really be happy back in the old setting again.

There is not much to be done at this point about the first problem. Success of the trip depends upon the total experience, and cannot be changed by a burst of activity at the end. The presence of a specific goal probably helps the visitors to accomplish what they want within the time available. Thus, the constant anticipation of the final joint report which must be written by a productivity team helps it to cover all relevant aspects of the industry in America. If other visitors, with less specific assignments, could have a clear image of what was to be accomplished during the trip they would certainly find it easier to plan their activities. Then departure time would be a part of a total sequence of events, and not a sudden interruption.

Review and summary sessions shortly before departure might help in any case. The visitors could then check on each other, pool information to fill in gaps, and generally try to pull their ideas together. Outsiders could perform two functions. They could be an interested audience for whom the visitors were organizing their observations, and they could provide an objective check on accuracy of information. Many programs try to hold such wind-up sessions. However, without sufficient participation from all of the visitors such sessions often serve as a place for recitation of what has been learned, rather than an examination of it.

Other aspects of departure tension may be helped by explicit consideration. For example, if the returning visitors are likely to have trouble interpreting what they have seen to the people at home, some discussion and even practice may be relevant. Examining the factors which influence people at home will help to clarify what may make them suspicious and what could
reassure and convince them. The visitors can think through what kind of role they should take, and perhaps try it out in role-playing sessions with other visitors.

The Germans felt there was too much staff concern about the problem of acceptability at home. They felt they were returning to friends and relatives and would have no trouble. This may have been true. However, over-optimism could lead to disillusionment. Over-caution, and preparation for meeting difficult situations, could only make the real situation seem unexpectedly easy.

Most programs assume that there will be follow-up activities in the home country. Productivity teams plan on follow-up projects in their industry. Students may make plans which they expect to carry out at home. In such cases there may be need for follow-up contact with representatives of the host culture. This may mean people who are located in the country of the visitors, or it may mean written contact with people who stay in the host country. In either case, the program staff can help the visitors to arrange for such contacts in advance. Often resources are available, but it is the visitors who must take the initiative.

The American hosts, on the other hand, may want to arrange for continued contact with the visitors. Again, this is part of the final program activity.

Perhaps the biggest problem arises with people who are not sure that they want to go back. The trainer's function, as always, is to help the visitors be rational and realistic, while at the same time providing emotional support. Sometimes it is enough that others see and understand the frustrations which the returning visitors will face. Sometimes there is need for closer examination of the home situation to find ways in which the visitor can act in an effective and satisfactory manner and still stay within the bounds of his culture requirements. Sometimes there is need for closer examination of what it would mean to stay in the host country. The life of the immigrant is often more difficult than that of the visitor. And sometimes, if the best decision seems to be to stay there may be a need for help in making this possible.

Actually, the attitude is not so likely to be a real desire to stay in the host country, as a general discontent with things as they are. This discontent will extend to affairs both at home and abroad. The problem, then, is to find a way in which the visitor can find some satisfaction in things as they are, and further satisfaction in working to make them better. The country finally chosen as a place of residence may be one of the two primarily involved, or it may be some other place entirely. The trainer can help examine the range of alternatives available.
Learning Problems: Summary

In part IV we have examined emotional tensions which may be generated as part of a visit to a foreign culture. First, there are the tensions associated with finding a place for oneself, as an individual and as a representative of one's own nation. The foreign visitor finds that everyday living suddenly presents many problems. He needs to discover friends who will help him find his way around, and who will offer him the warmth, acceptance, and understanding which are necessary for his personal security. At the same time, he needs to be sure that his new friends have the proper respect for his national heritage, and for him as a representative of this heritage. The search for personal and national acceptance will occupy much of his energy in the early days of the visit, and will continue to be a major preoccupation until some minimal degree of security is achieved.

With these first problems solved, the visitor is free to become involved in the program of activities and learning for which he came. Here again he may find an unexpected amount of emotional tension. There may be difficulties in his relationship with the program coordinator, or with other authoritative representatives of the host culture. In particular, there may be conflict between his need for receiving help and instruction, and his need for autonomy, or even for giving instruction. The host may be called upon to alternate between meeting one need and the other, while making a gradual long-range shift of initiative from himself to the visitors.

Many of the visitors' programs place the participants under pressure to do a great deal in a minimum of time. The visitors are highly keyed up, trying to make maximum use of an opportunity which may never come again. Under such conditions every restriction upon the freedom of the individual to do as he likes becomes a major irritant. There may be feelings of conflict between one's own objectives, and the objectives of others-of people to whom one is responsible back home, of one's fellow group members, or of one's host. Tensions may arise in the group or may arise elsewhere and be reflected in the group. These anxieties are probably greatest at the beginning of the trip, when choices are being made, and again at the end...
of the trip when the visitors must take note of all the things they failed to do.

Running through the visit is the necessity for maintaining simultaneous membership in two different cultures, with the continuous problems of translation which this involves. Ideas, attitudes, and procedures must be viewed in one context, and then mentally transferred to another. Tension about this kind of translation is probably greatest for people who are expected to come home with specific new ideas and recommendations. For everyone, however, there may be some rise in anxiety toward the end of the visit, when it is time to think about going home. Whether the people at home have positive or negative expectations or both, the visitors are likely to feel some discrepancy between the expectations and the actual state of affairs. They will have to work out some way for bridging this gulf. Also, they may be concerned about finding ways for maintaining contact with the host culture after they return home.

Our examination of these potential difficulties in the learning process was not intended to imply that foreign visits are always tense and difficult. On the contrary, they can be immensely stimulating and satisfactory. It is our belief, however, that the success of a foreign visit can be greatly increased if adequate procedures exist for recognizing and helping with the more disturbing emotional tensions. When difficulties do arise the trainer is in a stronger position if he can be diagnostic about the symptoms of tension and if, having made a diagnosis, he knows what to do about it.
PART FIVE

DIRECTIONS OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT
Some Elements of an Effective Program for Cross-Cultural Students and Visitors

We have been concerned at various points in this report about how the programs we studied might have been made more helpful in meeting needs and objectives. Certain basic aspects of an effective program have emerged.

Would these ideas about a good program be appropriate for other groups of German visitors? Or for different types of American hosts and coordinators?

Program objectives vary greatly. The specific problems which arise are different for the various groups of visitors, and for different American helpers. But certain common elements of experience emerge which will contribute to the success or failure of most programs of cross-cultural visiting and learning. We review these under the five headings below. Then we ask the crucial question—What can we Americans do, as leaders, or administrators, or host-citizens, to help assure that experiences are improved in these ways?

Five Phases of an Effective Program

1. Before Leaving Home

The objective of most cross-cultural programs is that visitors learn something from their visit. There are, of course, many variations of this purpose: to gain technical skills, to acquire a broader international perspective, to observe political life, to develop a plan for a new program of activity back home, to get a college degree, and so on. All require that the visitor be motivated and able to learn. This requirement is usually considered to some degree in selecting the visitors who will participate in the program. But the routine selection and planning procedures are not enough. Special emphasis is needed on certain qualifications.
Maturity and Curiosity

More emotional maturity than might be required at home is necessary in order to handle constructively the frustrations and deprivations which occur in a strange country. Such maturity should mean integration into, awareness of, and acceptance of one's own culture as a springboard for being curious about and able to learn from another culture, without being over-impressed, favorably or otherwise, by the cultural differences one experiences.

Information and Expectations

Clarity about responsibility, and about the amount of freedom of choice, is the right of each program participant. Even a mature visitor will face undue stress if he has received unclear or incorrect information from which to develop expectations and goals. Prospective students want information about how certain institutions or activities will fit their study desires. It has been our uncomfortable experience to meet several foreign fellows, on special study tours, who only discovered during the last week or two of a four-month visit the thing they have been looking for all the time. The channels of information had not functioned when they were planning their trip. There will always be uncertainties, and unclarities; that is part of the adventure. But purposes, expectations, and understandings of obligations must have a reasonable correspondence to reality, or there will be unnecessary trouble ahead. It is vital that better informed representatives of American resources be available for early consultation and correspondence.

Intragroup Relations

Members of a group of visitors should be clear as to the extent of their interdependence, and should develop -- preferably before they leave home -- procedures for handling shared responsibilities. We have seen the advantages achieved by those productivity teams which had an opportunity to travel together before leaving home--thus developing information about the home country, goals for learning in the foreign country, procedures for attaining these goals, and internal team leadership and organization. If the German visitors had experienced such organization before they left home, cooperative effort might have come easier in this country.

A Point of Return

A clear anchorage at home is important if later problems of divided loyalty and alienation are to be avoided. Selection
procedures should take this fact into account. Will a job be kept open? Or will a job be waiting? Or is there a guaranteed student status on return? Is there a family anchorage point? Is the visitor representing others who expect him to bring back ideas and information which they want? We believe much more can be done to assure secure and receptive points of return.

Knowing the Language

In some programs there is a real conflict between selecting persons who have the most security and influence back home, and those who would have the greatest ease of communication over here. Visitors without language skills will experience psychological discomfort and will tend to withdraw from many learning opportunities. Some programs, such as the productivity teams, have been able to provide special communication aids -- the team interpreters. Other visitors are fortunate in being sent to American universities where rapid training in language skills is provided. If the visit is to be long enough, and the training resources are available, "learning the language" is a helpful means toward other goals.

2. Getting Settled and Getting Related

Psychological research on the critical importance of first impressions and first contacts supports the observations we have reported in this study. Getting things off to a good start should have a central place in the planning and operation of any program for foreign visitors. In addition to housing and other matters of "material comfort," attention should be given to finding appropriate social-emotional contacts and relationships. Our data suggest several important elements of this initial period.

A Stable and Available Source of Help and Support

The visitor frequently experiences a gratifying but confusing variety of attempts to help him in getting settled. He is often surprised, and hurt, by his experience with American friendliness, as we have noted. He is surprised by the Americans' warmth, which he interprets as a commitment to a relatively deep and continuing relationship; but he is hurt to learn it has no such "stability meaning" for the American. He then feels rebuffed. He needs one unambiguous, stable, continuing relationship for guidance and interpretation during the early period of getting related.

We have noted that early emotional stresses may be much reduced for those visitors who are here as members of "teams"
from the same home culture. Team membership can support a more active initiative in establishing and using relationships with members of the host-country. This team relationship is potentially harmful as well as helpful to good orientation and learning. If the team supports withdrawal from a relationship with an American helper it may slow down the process of learning.

Goal-Perspectives and Role-Definitions

We have seen that the American advisor or coordinator usually has to "represent reality," indicating how much travel will be possible, how many courses can be successfully taken, or how much money can be earned. Can he do this and serve as friendly counselor as well? Many administrators can. Being a host, being a friend, being an administrative authority, being an American, being a man (or woman), all may be dominant themes of relationship with the same visitors, or group of visitors, at different times and in various situations. The American coordinator must clarify the meaning of these role-shifts for himself, and then must be ready and able to help the visitors clarify them.

Recognition and Acceptance of Differences and Contributions

The trainer who understands the pressure the visitor feels to "do things as they do them here" will make things easier for his guest. Three kinds of help are needed: (1) evidence that the trainer understands the problems of "fitting in;" (2) "feedback responses" which will help the visitor know how he is succeeding; (3) demonstration that the hosts are interested in learning something from the visitor.

The most helpful skill we can learn is how to put aside our "politeness" and give our visitors friendly information about how they are doing in their efforts to solve the many problems of fitting into our way of life.

The best learning situations are those where there is mutual give and take. Because he is a stranger, learning the map of the strange culture, the visitor is usually busy "taking" and doesn't get much feeling he has anything to "give" that anybody wants. This is the place where a good program leader takes the initiative to set up situations in which the visitors can legitimately exert influence, and can be appreciated for what they have to offer. Because we have so many visitors over here we have a great opportunity to learn a great deal from many sources, if we can learn how to be good learners.
3. Working toward the Learning Goals or Program Objectives

After realistic initial goals have been set, there is the big job of working toward them effectively, and continually revising plans and decisions. Our data lead us to emphasize four elements of the job of helping the visitors accomplish their objectives efficiently.

Shared Decision-Making

Participation in decisions about our own fate is always important. It is particularly important where we are uncertain about whether the decision-makers understand us and are thinking in terms of our welfare. The ambivalence we have noted in the reactions of the German visitors to decision-making authority will be found to some degree among all learners who must relate to a teacher or trainer or leader. It is important not to ask the visitors to share too much decision-making responsibility too early, if they feel unable to participate. But it is important to have a regular procedure of shared planning and decision-making which can be used increasingly as time goes on. The program leader will have his own program of "planned withdrawal," gradually giving more and more responsibility to the visitors for steering their own learning program.

Shared Evaluation of Learning Experiences

The American program leader usually has difficulty getting adequate and accurate information from the visitors about whether the program is going along satisfactorily. Visitors are "polite" just as hosts are polite. In any good program the American leader must have his finger on the pulse, however. He must interpret to the visitors his need to get their reactions to the program's progress. During recent years a variety of procedures has been developed for ensuring such a flow of information.

Using Resources and Integrating Experiences

In a good program a great deal of time is spent on the methods of locating and using resources—experts, field trips, written materials, audio-visual aids, etc. Even if a visitor knows about an expert who could give him the information he needs, he may be quite hesitant about initiating a relationship, or he may be very inept in communicating his needs. Also there may be many unhappy repetitions of the "Toledo trip" described in this report. We have noted the care with which the productivity teams prepared themselves to make field observations, and the care with which they reviewed and integrated their
findings immediately after the visit. There is an important lesson here for all programs. Anticipatory preparation, at-the-elbow interpretation, and review of experience are key aspects of most educational uses of resource persons or situations.

Maintaining Home Connections

Firm anchorage in his own country is very important to the visitor during his learning experiences in the host country. It is too easy for him to become so immersed in observing and adapting to the host culture that he forgets to test his experiences as to what they can mean or how they can be applied back home. Program leaders can do a number of things to encourage "keeping in touch" with home. In some cases this means correspondence. Even more important, the leader can discuss with the visitors how various experiences relate to the way things are done in their country. The effective leader often puts himself in the role of learner, asking for information on differences between American practices or ideas and those of the other nation. By being a learner he can also stimulate thinking about the meaning of the differences, and the possibilities of borrowing or modifying the practices of the host country to fit the home country. This kind of reality testing sometimes disturbs American leaders, because it requires a readiness to be critical and non-defensive about American ways. Readiness for self-criticism, however, might well be considered a basic characteristic of democratic Americanism.

4. Anticipation and Return

The transition to "back home" is another critical stage in the total cross-cultural learning process. Anticipatory preparation for returning home can often help. The time is now approaching for each visitor when he will have to test out the value and acceptability of outlooks and skills acquired during his visit. Is new prestige, or a rude shock, ahead of him? Will he dare to take initiative, or will he keep the fruits of his visit hidden? It is understandable that often tension and apprehension begin to mount. This may tend to block thinking about return, and send him, in fact, to last-minute escape in new experiences. Looking ahead is bothersome and may be avoided. Therefore the program leader has an important job to do here.

Anticipatory Testing

Every program should provide some type of opportunity for thinking through and solving the problems of transition. In one program we know about visitors were given opportunities to work
out and to practise ways in which they might act without creating resentment and misunderstanding. They put themselves in the shoes of the folks back home and considered what they would need to do to create positive rather than negative first impressions on return.

Reports and Commitments

If the visitors are expected to bring back reports, to give speeches, or to make recommendations on their return home, time and assistance in preparing them should be given. This is the case with the productivity teams we have described. This kind of activity could appropriately be stimulated in visitors' programs where no such official expectations have been set.

Plans for Keeping in Touch with the Hosts

Specific channels of communication and friendly support in the host country should remain open. If friendly working bonds could be counted on by the visitors after their return home, morale and future effectiveness would be heightened.

5. Returned but Not Forgotten

It is our feeling that no American program representatives should permit themselves to "wash their hands" of further psychological involvement and responsibility when their visitor-learners have left our shore. If we have been successful in helping stimulate and develop plans for trying out new ideas, then we should try to provide support at the crucial point of tryout.

Several Visitors with the Same Experience

One means of support provided by several programs is to choose a number of visitors from the same location back home, either at the same time or over a period of years. They then can serve one another as an important source of support for trying out new ideas and weathering the criticism and frustration which frequently develops.

Consultation Resources

Some programs, like that of the productivity team, have found it possible to provide consultant resources in the home country. Sometimes these are American representatives. Sometimes they are referrals to consultation resources which already exist among fellow nationals. There is also a growing program of short institutes in the home country by American teams.
there. These institutes can often reach the top administrative personnel, 'who do not come over as visitors, but who are in the strategic position to support the effort of the returned visitors if they understand it.

Suggestions for Improvement

We should ask visitors to report back to us how their experience here stands up as they try to apply it back home. One program we know about had nearly one hundred per cent success in getting from the "alumni" memos reviewing the program and making recommendations for modification as they saw it after their return.

How Can We Help Ourselves to be Better Helpers?

Being a leader or coordinator of a cross-cultural educational program, or being a good citizen-host to cross-cultural visitors, are roles for which very few of us have received specific training. The training curriculum, if one existed, would have to contain many types of knowledge and experience which are currently quite separate in most educational institutions. There would be some anthropological orientation to comparative cultures; a special orientation to our own contemporary American culture; some work in political science and history; in sociology and social psychology; in educational methods and applied group dynamics; and something in the field of counselling and guidance. But let's start by accepting ourselves and our resources as they are now, and see what kinds of steps might be taken to improve our ability to develop programs in the ways that have been mentioned in this chapter.

1. Selecting Those Who Should Represent Us

The job of the American helper has become much clearer to us as we have seen the nature of the problems he must meet and solve. Obviously this is the type of job which not everyone can be expected to handle. The friendly outgoing ability to demonstrate acceptance in an unmistakable and continuing fashion is an aptitude which many of us do not have. To be interested in and to accept cultural differences, and to be non-defensive about weaknesses of "the American way" is a combination of qualities not easy to find. One needs as well a great deal of specific knowledge about countries, technology, and so on.

It takes a careful assessment of the particular job, and of ourselves, to select those who can best represent us in this important work.
2. Providing Special Training Opportunities

The in-service training or workshop has been invented to help us up-grade ourselves in many jobs which are so complex that no particular basic training is enough, or which depend upon changing conditions and thus require periodic effort to "keep up to date." Why not organize a program of workshops on the methods of cross-cultural education, with workshop training teams representing the skills and kinds of knowledge we have mentioned?

3. Creating Program Leadership Teams

It is obvious that the variety of leadership roles or responsibilities which are required could best be assumed by a collaborating leadership team, rather than one program coordinator or administrator. We have illustrated two types of teams in this report. In the German leadership program we had an administrator who was a political science specialist, supplemented by a social psychologist, and by supervisors of internship experiences in various settings. In the productivity team program there was an American team coordinator, supplemented by a leader chosen from among the visitors, and also by American liaison personnel and consultants back in the home countries. Foreign student advisors and other program leaders would doubtless find it helpful to build teams of complementary personnel who would share in planning and carrying out programs of cross-cultural experiences.

There is another important part of such a leadership team notion. Most programs make some use of American families who volunteer to play host to the visitors on various occasions. In most cases we could use a greatly expanded team of cooperating families. One of our responsibilities to the visitors and the families should be to help the families understand the visitors and to be prepared to offer them good experiences. This is a tremendous resource for the type of experiences many visitors most want and need.

4. Setting up Feedback Procedures

We have suggested several types of information flow which require special attention:

A. To the visitor from the Americans, about how he is progressing in his attempts to understand and adjust to the American culture. In the German program our discussion groups of Americans and Germans on human relations problems were
a helpful procedure. American dormitory roommates have also been helpful. Regularly scheduled sessions with a program counselor have been used. Other ways can be invented.

B. To the program leaders from the visitors about how well they are meeting the visitors' needs and expectations. Some leaders use periodic group meeting evaluation sessions on how the program is going. Others regularly use anonymous questionnaires. There are many other possible procedures.

C. To the program leaders from their "alumni" after returning home. We have already discussed ways in which this can give guidance in making the program more relevant to the home country conditions, and more sensitive to changing conditions.

We cannot assume that good intentions alone will develop good human relations and keep communication channels open. We must exercise all the inventiveness we can in bringing about this mutual exchange of information which is so essential as a guide to learning.

The more effective we can make cross-cultural learning experiences for more and more visitors from abroad, the more we can widen and deepen international understanding and collaboration. We have much to teach and much to learn.
APPENDIX 1:

1. Interview Materials

There were eight different interview schedules used with Germans in this study, and one with Americans. It would be cumbersome and unnecessary to reproduce them all here. They differ in detail, but not in general outline.

One complete interview schedule is presented here. This was the initial interview with the first group of Germans, and it also served as the basis for the American interview. Questions about family life and personal attributes were repeated on the departure interviews with this group, but not with later groups.

An additional set of questions was added in the departure interviews about reactions to the visit and expectations concerning the return home. The version of these questions used with the second group is reported here.

The follow-up interview added still more questions. These questions are reported in the form used with the first group.

In general, the early interviews set the pattern for later ones. Thus, the material reported here gives a reasonably complete picture of the type of questions asked in the interviews.

Initial Interview

1. Let's talk a little about the problems facing Germany today. First, what do you see as the most important things that need to be done there during the next few years?
   (a) Is there anything else that should be done during this time?

2. What do you see as the main difficulties in the way of getting these things done?
   (a) Is there anything else that might cause trouble?

3. What do you think would be the best way of overcoming these difficulties?
4. Let's take the general problem of getting a country to change from a non-democratic state to some form of democratic government. How could this best be done?
   (a) What are the necessary steps in the process?
   (b) What can the people who have been given government responsibility contribute to this process?
   (c) What contributions, if any, can the average citizen make?

5. Suppose you were working on a program of democratization in a German city or town. What would you try to do?
   (a) Suppose for a minute that the people there simply don't seem to be affected by the things you are doing. What could be causing the trouble?
   (b) Why do you say that?

6. Let's be more specific. Suppose you were chairman of the local group of some organization in Germany, and you wanted to help them improve their democratic way of working together. What would you try to do? (To help them work better as a democratic group)
   (a) What signs would you look for as indications of whether or not you were succeeding? What would show success or failure?
   (b) Is there anything else that you might look for as a symptom of failure?

7. Take another example. Suppose that someone who has several people working for him comes to you for advice. He is having some difficulty getting employees to stay on the job. What suggestions could you make to him to help him keep people on the job and working efficiently?

8. It is often said that Germans can work more effectively with the problems of Germany than Americans can, because they understand the country better. What do you think are some of the important things which Americans don't understand about Germany, and which they would need to know if they were going there?

9. As German democracy and American democracy continue to develop, what do you think will be some of the main differences between them?

10. As you see it now, what do you think are main characteristics of democracy here in America?
(a) What would you consider as some of the weak points in American democracy?
(b) What would you consider as some of the strong points?
(c) What are the main differences between American democracy here, and American democracy as it is applied in Germany?

11. Once you get back to Germany, what do you think will be the effect of the fact that you were here for a year?
   (a) Will it be harder or easier to get along with the people there?
   (b) Will it affect the amount of influence that you have?
   (c) Will it make life there seem harder, easier, or will it be about the same as it was before?

12. What is going to be the biggest problem for you when you get back?

13. Who are the individuals or groups of people with whom you will be in closest personal contact when you get back home?
   (PROBE SEPARATELY FOR EACH ONE MENTIONED:)
   how he feel about the fact that you came to the United States?

14. As far as you can tell now, how much of an opportunity do you feel that you, yourself, will have, to do something about your ideas when you get back to Germany?

15. In general, how do you feel about the way things are going in Germany, and about the future of Germany?

16. On the international level, do you think the various nations of the world will be able to get along with each other peacefully, or do you think that probably there will be another way?
   (a) Why is that?

17. What about the last war? What do you think were the chief causes of that war?
   (a) Do you think the war could have been avoided?
   (b) (IF NO) Why not?
       (IF YES) How could it have been avoided?
All right, that finishes the political questions. Now we'd like to talk a little about things on a more individual level.

18. Let's consider the problem of the education and development of children in Germany today. Do you think the schools should contribute to the education and development of the child?
   (a) What is the best way for the schools to do this?
   (b) How good a job do you think they are doing now in Germany?
   (c) What might be done to strengthen the contribution of the schools to democratic living?

19. What about other groups, such as the church, educational and recreational groups, young people's organizations, and so on: What part do you think they should have in the education and development of the child?

. (PROBE SEPARATELY)

20. What about the family and home? What do you think they should contribute to the education and development of the child?

21. How do you think the parents should handle disobedience?

22. How does this general way of bringing up children compare with the way you were brought up?

23. In general, what do you think are the things that will help make a marriage successful?
   (a) Anything else?

24. What part should men take in bringing up the children?

25. Do you think it is undesirable for a man to do some of the same things that women do around the house?
   (a) Why is that?

26. What about women? Should a woman have an occupation other than housewife?
   (a) Why is that?

27. Some people predict that in the future technological improvements will mean that people spend fewer and fewer hours at
work, and will have more and more free time. Do you think this would be good or bad?

(a) Why is that?

28. What do you find are the problems of working closely with other people?

29. Most of us get a worried, nervous feeling inside us about certain situations. What kind of situations give you that feeling?

30. All of us have good points that people think about when they think of us. What are some of the good things your friends might say about you?

31. Now if they were to do it the other way, what are some of the bad things your friends might say about you?

Additional Questions — Departure Interview

1. We want to be able to use your experience in improving the program for people who are coming next semester. Therefore we would like to know your honest opinion about how well things have worked out this semester.

   How successful do you think the total program has been in helping you achieve the kind of thing you have been talking about?

   (a) What things were done well this time?
   (b) What things were not done so well?

2. What do you think could be done next time to make this whole experience more valuable for the people who come?

3. Considering yourself now and as you were when you first came to this country, what would you say actually have been the main effects for you of this experience in America?

4. Do you think there has been any change since you came in the way that you see Germany?

5. What kinds of change, if any, would you say are going on in Germany these days?

6. How does this compare to what you yourself would like to see happen in Germany during the next few years?
7. What can be done to promote changes like the ones you mentioned?

8. What do you see as the main difficulties in the way of getting these things done?
   (a) Can anything be done about that?
   (b) Who can do it?
   (c) What can someone like yourself do?

9. We've been talking about change in Germany. What do you think are some of the basic German characteristics which will not change, and which Germans want to preserve.

10. Would you say your thinking about the situation in Germany has changed much since last fall? In what way?

11. Now let's turn to America. Do you think there has been any change since you came in the way that you see America?

12. People in a program like this talk a lot about democracy. Do you think there has been any change since you came in the way that you see democracy?

13. Do you suppose you could describe just what democracy means to you, now?

14. To what extent do you think that the kind of democracy you have been talking about would be appropriate for Germany?
   (a) Do you think there is much democracy in Germany now?
   (b) Is there any way in which you would like to see Germany change toward being more democratic?
   (c) Do you suppose Germany has developed any forms of democratic behavior which work there, but which would not work so well in America? What are they?
   (d) What are some of the things which work in America, but which would not work so well in Germany?

15. What changes will the people in Germany expect to see in you when you get back?
   (a) What changes, if any, do you think they will see in you?
   (b) How do you think you have really changed?
   (c) Will this create any special difficulties for you?
(d) IF YES: Do you have any ideas about how you might deal with these difficulties?

IF NO: Suppose difficulties do come up. Do you have any ideas about how you might deal with them?

**Additional Questions — Follow-up Interview**

**Present job and community activities**

1. What are you doing now—are you working, or in school, or what?

2. Did you have a different job before this, either when you left to go to America, or after you came back?

   IF YES: (a) How did you happen to leave your other job?
   
   (b) What did you do about looking for a new job?

3. IF R. IS WORKING: How did you happen to get into the particular job you have now?

   (a) What are the things you enjoy most about the work you are doing now?
   
   (b) What are the difficulties or problems that come up in doing work of this kind?
   
   (c) How do you handle difficulties (situations) like that?

4. Are you taking part in any community activities, outside your regular job?

   IF YES: What are you doing?

5. Do you ever find yourself working as a member of a group, as for example on a staff committee or in some local organization?

   (a) What are some of the problems in getting people to work together as a group, here in Germany?

   (b) How can you help get around these difficulties and make things go more smoothly, if you are a member of such a group?

   IF R. IS IN A GROUP

   (c) Have you ever tried anything like that?

   (d) What happened?
6. What about the young people in Germany? When they look ahead into the future, what are the things they are concerned about, or the things they want to see happen?
   (a) How much power do they have to influence events, and make things go the way they want?
   (b) What is there that a young (wo)man could do, that might make some contribution to German reconstruction and development?

7. What about in your own case? If you had to summarize in a few words your goals in life, or what you are trying to do in life, what would you say?
   (a) Do you know other people who feel about the way that you do?
   (b) Specifically, what kinds of things do you plan to do?
   (c) What are some of the difficulties involved in doing that kind of thing?
   (d) What are some of the advantages that you will have, that will make things easier for you?

8. What about your professional plans? What sort of work do you expect to be doing in the next few years?
   (a) What will that lead to, eventually?
   (b) How did you happen to get interested in doing work of this kind?
   (c) Was your interest in doing this kind of work affected by anything that happened either in America or after you got back, or was this pretty much what you had planned before?

9. In general, how do people around here feel about your having been to America?
   (a) Does the American experience help you any?
   (b) Do you ever run into any difficulties or problems with people because of it?
   **IF YES:** (c) What do you do about problems like that?
10. Who are the individuals or groups of people with whom you have most personal contact now?
   (a) Are these the same people you knew well before, or has there been some change?
   **IF CHANGE:** (b) What was the reason for the change?

11. We have mentioned the reactions of other people to you. What were some of your own reactions to the people and the life here in Germany when you first got back?
   (a) Do you still feel this way?

**Opinions about the Program**

In this (last) part of the interview, we would like some specific reactions to the training program and the whole experience you had in the United States. Your help will be particularly useful in making plans for what to do with future groups of trainees in the United States, from Germany or from other places.

12. What parts of your experience in America have you found most valuable, for your activities here in Germany?
   (a) Is there anything else that has been particularly valuable?

13. Now that you have been back in Germany for a while, do you have any new suggestions about ways in which future programs could be improved, and made more effective?

14. Do people who have been to America on the various kinds of training programs ever get together with each other after they get back to Germany?
   **IF YES:** (a) Is there a group like that around here?
   (b) Have you ever been to a meeting with them?
   (c) What kinds of things does a group like that try to do?
   **EVERYONE:** (d) Do you think there is more that should be done with groups like this, to give more help to the people after they get back from America?

15. One thing that we have wondered about in connection with the foreign exchange programs is the question of how much tendency there is for the people who have been to America
to want to leave Germany again, either to stay or for a visit. Do you think that is a problem at all?

(a) Have you considered leaving Germany again, either for a visit or to stay?
(b) What would be the advantages for you to staying here?
(c) What would be the advantages of leaving?

A Sample of the Code

It would be impossible to reproduce an entire code. However, an illustration may help to give the reader an idea of how the coding was done.

The codes below refer to the first three questions on the initial interview, which were asked in all eight interviews, and which were always coded as a unit.

Internal German Situation

Column

15,16,17. German problems (i.e., barriers, causes of difficulty)
   1. Material difficulties resulting from having fought and lost war (refugees, housing, trade)
   2. Hunger
   3. Authoritarian historical tradition; present German mentality
   5. East-West division; others handicap Germany
   6. Fear of Russia
   7. Political institutions (parties, bureaucracy, etc.)
   8. Nationalism—provincialism to imperialism
   9. Poor relations with U.S.
   0. N.A. or none

18. Spontaneous mention of democracy as goal for Germany
   1. Specific mention—internalized, important
   2. Specific mention—not internalized
   3. Specific mention—importance unclear
   4. No specific mention—goal seems internalized, important
   5. No specific mention—something mentioned that might be democratic
   6. No mention of anything democratic
   7. Rejection of democracy as goal
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19. Is there freedom for Germans to do something about problems?
   1. There is freedom to act, possibility to accomplish something.
   3. There is nothing we can do
   0. N.A.

20. Where is responsibility for doing something about Germany's problems?
   1. Germany should work on her own problems
   2. Others should work on Germany's problems
   3. No one can do anything now - nothing is possible
   4. Both Germany and others should do something
   5. Major responsibility rests with others; Germans can work on internal problems
   0. N.A.

21. Attitude toward engaging in social change activities
   1. Disinterest
   2. Do so, but not aggressively (avoid labeling)
   3. Pride and active responsibility
   0. N.A.

22. Attitude toward the mass of Germans
   1. Distinguishes self from subordinate or unintelligent class
   2. Does not distinguish self from others

23. Type of Change Agent role envisioned
   1. Impose
   2. Educate
   3. Stimulate them to participate in government
   4. Use small citizens' groups
   5. Structure, restrain; paternalism
   6. 2 and 3
   7. 2 and 4
   8. 3 and 4
   9. 2, 3, and 4
   X. 2 and 5
   Y. Work on individuals informally
   0. N.A.

24, 25. Signs of progress in Germany; good things
   1. Economic improvements
   2. Political improvements, government
   3. Organization of civic and youth groups
   4. Improved relations with other nations
   5. Attitudinal improvements - international re other nations
   6. Attitudinal improvements - democracy-relevant
   7. No progress, no good signs
   0. N.A.
# APPENDIX 2:

## 2. Sentence Completion Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Area 1. Leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>The leader who is not sure of himself should...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The leader who pays a lot of attention to what his followers say is generally...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The leader who follows the ideas of his subordinates is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>If a person has harmed others because of loyalty to his superiors, he...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>If a leader ignores the needs expressed by his followers, it is usually because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A leader who wants to be well liked must...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The leader who is very sure of himself will make people feel...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The leader who tells people exactly what to do and how to do it will make people feel...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In a democracy, a leader must...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     |       | **Area 2. Role conflicts** |
| 9.  | 2,3   | The suggestions made by younger and newer people in an organization should be considered as... |
| 10. | 2,3   | A person working for a boss who makes a lot of mistakes should... |
| 11. | 2     | A doctor, who finds that the chairman of an organization to which he belongs is a factory worker, should... |
| 12. | 1     | As leaders women are generally... |
| 13. | 1     | The university professor in politics is often... |
| 14. | 1     | The best boss is one who tells you... |
| 15. | 1     | A major responsibility of the management of a large industrial plant is to the people who... |

*Three forms of a sentence completion test were used, one with each group. The test was radically revised after the first administration, to eliminate or re-word poor items, and add new items originally presented in agree-disagree form. There was little intentional item revision between forms 2 and 3; ten items were eliminated and the entire test was translated into German. This list presents all items ever used, grouped and re-numbered according to content.
Area 3. Family relations

16. 2,3 When a child's father tells him to do something and the child thinks it is wrong, the child should...

17. 2 A man who helps his wife with dishwashing and babysitting is generally...

18. 2,3 A young man who grows up and finds that his elders are foolish and afraid should...

19. 2,3 Parents whose children disobey them should...

20. 2 When a father shows strong affection for his children, it is a sign of...

21. 2,3 If a housewife has strong political convictions, she should...

22. 1 The ideal wife is someone who...

23. 1 When your father gives you personal advice, it is generally...

24. 1 When a man gets home from work he wants...

Area 4. Interpersonal relations

25. 2,3 I feel most free to express my opinions when I am with people who...

26. 1 In choosing a friend, the most important thing to look for is...

2,3 In choosing a friend, one should look for someone who...

27. 2 A person is happiest when he is with people whose behavior toward him shows that they...

28. 2 If one is going to have to spend a lot of time with a person, the most important thing to know about him is...

29. 2,3 If a group member is not saying what he really feels, it is probably because...

Area 5. Disagreement and obligations of the dissenter

30. 2,3 When two friends are talking about politics, they are trying to...

31. 2,3 In case of disagreement within a committee the best way to come to a decision is...

32. 2 Tolerance and compromise as a philosophy of life are...

33. 2,3 When two friends find that they support opposing political parties, they should...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>If a friend continues to disagree with you about something important to you, even after you have explained your point of view, you should...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>When people representing several different points of view must work together on the same problem, they should take the attitude that...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>If a meeting is not going well, responsibility for doing something belongs to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>If a member is dissatisfied with a decision of his group he should...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Followers who disagree with the leader should...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>In order to be successful, one must...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A person who spends all his time working hard will feel...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>When a person doesn't get ahead in the world, it is usually because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A person who does not need to work for his living should...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A person can maintain his self respect only if...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>As you get to know more and more about human nature, you discover that people are generally...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A desirable job is one in which...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The good thing about having a lot of friends is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A person who has a lot of friends is lucky because...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A man who has no job usually...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A man who loses his job feels that he...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A person who has suffered a failure should explain to his friends that...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>People who irritate me most are people who...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>A free man is one who...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>When a person makes a bad mistake, he should...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>If someone devotes his time exclusively to his hobbies, he is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>When you have personal problems, the thing to do is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The most important thing in life is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A happy person is one who...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area 7. Political philosophy

56. 2, 3 A country which guides itself by traditions from the past will usually...

57. All Going against tradition usually leads to...

58. 2 Combining many different kinds of people into one nation makes that nation...

59. 2 A government with centralized authority has the advantage of...

3 A country has a good government when...

60. 3 To judge a new form of government one should first examine...

61. 1 A great nation is one which...

Area 8. International relations

62. 1 Most of the nations in the UN really want...

63. 1 Judging from Russia's activities in the world, she is trying to...

64. 1 The most important thing about war is that it...

65. 1 The main trouble with the UN is that...

66. 1 The basic principle upon which international policy should be built is that...

67. 1 A lasting peace can be achieved in the world only if...

Area 9. America

68. 1 United States activities in the world indicate that she is trying to...

2, 3 America has a unique position in the world today because she...

69. 2, 3 The thing that would contribute most to American national life would be...

70. All People in America have a tendency to...
Area 10. Germany and democracy in Germany

71. 2,3 A democratic German can be identified by his attitude of...

72. All In order to get the German people to follow him, a man must be...(someone who...)

73. 2 Democracy in Germany has its roots in...
    3 A basic feature of the present situation in Germany which might accelerate the democratic evolution is...

74. All People in Germany have a tendency to...

75. 2,3 The greatest obstacle to the rise of democracy in Germany is...

76. 2,3 The thing that would contribute most to German national life would be...

77. 2,3 The important thing that democracy has to offer Germany is an emphasis on...

78. 2,3 One reason why other nations don't like Germany is that...

79. 2 The behavior of other nations makes Germany feel...

80. 2,3 Germany has a unique position in the world today because she...

81. 3 If one observes the obstacles to democracy in Germany, one realizes that...

82. 1 Germany would be better off if her leaders were more...

83. 1 The president of Germany should be a man who...

84. 1 If we want to know what's best for Germany we ought to listen to...
APPENDIX 3:

3. Statistical Tables for Part Two

The tables in this Appendix are arranged to correspond with the order of the text in Part II.

Data come from the three interviews, the sentence completion test, and occasionally from the attitude questionnaire. Whenever possible the data covering the three different groups were combined, to give one general report. This often meant that questions with slightly different wordings or places in the questionnaire were treated as equivalent. We felt that such combinations were legitimate, in view of the highly general type of coding: Answers were coded for the underlying idea, rather than the specific form in which it was expressed.

There are three levels of presentation of interview material. The first and most frequent level of data involves answers to a specific question or series of questions. If the wording of the question is important for understanding the answers, the question is reproduced; more often, a summary statement of the question is used. The second level of coding is labeled overall code: This represents a judgment of the coder, based upon reading an entire interview or section of an interview. Generally this involves some judgment about the attitudes or values of the respondent, as inferred from a number of his specific statements. Finally, there is a third level which is called an index. In this case the coder combines the information from a number of separate coded responses to arrive at a single judgment about the individual. The index is used only for estimates of net change between one interview and the next.

The sentence completion data are presented according to question number, as given in Appendix 2. In each case the critical response is indicated, and frequencies are reported for people giving or failing to give that response. Reports cover Germans at the beginning and end of their stay in America, and comparable Americans. These "comparable Americans" are either the sample matched with the first group of Germans or the participants in the German-American discussion groups; they are not the college sophomores. The total N for both German and American groups varies, depending on which times the question was asked.
Probability figures are presented as an aid to the reader in evaluating the tabulated results. Chi-square was used where frequencies were large enough to warrant it, and the accompanying probability figures are based upon a two-tailed test. Where frequencies were too small for chi-square, Fisher's exact test was used. In these cases, the probability figures derive from a one-tailed test. The reasons for using the one-tailed test are obvious: The relationships were in the predicted direction, and there is no precise way to move from a one-tailed exact test to a two-tailed estimate of probability. However, there were occasional instances where an exact test was used and where no directional prediction could be made. Under such conditions, the obtained probability figure was doubled, and the test was labeled as a two-tailed test.

The hypothesis being subjected to statistical test is indicated in the table. Sometimes a starred figure represents one cell of a four-cell table, in which other cells of the table are collapsed to test the significance of the one finding of interest. Sometimes a $X^2$ test with two degrees of freedom is used, in which the material from the three interviews (initial, departure, and follow-up) represents the three columns of the table, and the two rows represent presence and absence of the variable in question. Finally, two parts of the table may be selected for comparison to each other, in which case both are starred.

For example, in the sentence completion results an asterisk may appear beside the critical entry for the initial German tests, and beside the critical entry for the American tests, as indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Democratic answer</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Democracy works</td>
<td>A*</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that a four cell table was set up as follows

\[ \begin{array}{cc}
A & B \\
E & F \\
\end{array} \]

and that the resulting probability figure was .01. If the table 
\[ \begin{array}{cc}
C & D \\
E & F \\
\end{array} \]
was also tested, then a double-asterisk appears at position C and E, and a second probability figure is added in the right-hand column.

The fact that many probability figures are reported should not be taken as a claim to precise and rigorous results. Our objective was to explore the implications of what this small
group of 29 Germans could tell us. In order to do this, we needed some yardstick by which to separate the important findings from the others. We used tests of statistical significance, and we now place these test results on the record. However, there are many considerations which would warn against a rigid interpretation of the statistical results. The sample of people is small and not representative. The precise question varied from one group to another. External events changed, and thus changed the meaning of questions whose wording remained identical. There was no uniform policy on directional (one-tailed) versus non-directional predictions. The measures were in English, and it is not clear what effect that had on results. In short, we would recommend that the reader direct his attention to the general conclusions supported by many specific findings, rather than to the specific details as such.

The study of the matched sample of Americans and Germans was conducted by a different person at a different time and place than the coding of later German interviews. Hence, the initial German interviews were coded twice. When comparisons with Americans were desired, the original coding was used, so that the standards of judgment would be identical for Germans and Americans. When judgments of change over time were desired, the second coding was used, to insure that the same standards of judgment would be applied for all times. The result is that in the case of the initial interviews with the first group of Germans, the same code applied to the same interviews may appear to give two different sets of results. It will be noticed, however, that again there are differences of detail, but the general picture remains the same.
Table 1. Defensiveness about Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As German democracy and American democracy continue to develop, what do you think will be some of the main differences between them?</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise of German character</td>
<td>22  18  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans handicapped by lack of experience, faith, tradition</td>
<td>18  19  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans feel Russian threat</td>
<td>7   10  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total praise, apology, and explanation</td>
<td>47  45  24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total other comments about Germany</td>
<td>62  95  81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments implying Germany worse than America</td>
<td>50  81  75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments neutral or favorable toward Germany</td>
<td>59  50  30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let's talk a little about the problems facing Germany today. What do you see as the most important things that need to be done there during the next few years?*

| Material difficulties following war                           | 16  16  17       |
| East-West division; others handicap us                        | 13  11  5        |
| Total, suffer at hands of others                              | 29  49           |
| Other problems                                                 | 19  96           |

Sentence completion items coded for defensiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Defensive answer</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>diff., ps, starred entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Good (vs. authoritarian)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7*  11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Good, neutral</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Envy, misunderstanding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Rejected, abused, alone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Divided, occupied</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential battlefield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For complete report see Table 25.
Table 2. Critical Attitudes toward America

What are some of the weak points about America and American democracy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotyped criticisms</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materialistic, uncultured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation of power groups, money, pressure groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People naive, gullible, easily influenced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are superficial in interpersonal relations; take it easy; superficial understanding, not critical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criticisms which state German strengths

| Wide range of incomes in America, low voting participation, puritanical, no understanding of dangers of Communism | 13 | 17 | 6 |
|**X**²: 14.65 |**df:** 2 |**p:** .001 |

Other criticisms

| 2 | 19 | 29 |
| 33 | 75 | 82 |

Sentence completion items coded for criticism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criticisms</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06-A</td>
<td>Self interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Negative characteristics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ambivalence about leadership and authority

(Sentence completion test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Authoritarian answer</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resign</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17**</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not acceptable</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Is excused</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Resentful; mixed answer</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Quit; tell him (no tact)</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Obey</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10½*</td>
<td>16½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Submit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>6½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>All right; no difficulty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Failure; difficulty</td>
<td>21½*</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4. Disagreement and compromise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items from the sentence completion test</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Convince</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Answer other than compromise</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Only fairly good</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Avoid politics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Convense; leave; avoid it</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Seek facts, solution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Chairman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Disagree (no mention of influence)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple choice questions: If I had to make a choice I would ordinarily prefer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germans</th>
<th>Americans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To hide my true opinions in order to appear unprejudiced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give my true opinions even though I might appear to be prejudiced</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Interpersonal tensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items from the sentence completion test</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 Bad</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Are like me</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 He is afraid; secretive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 His type; his honesty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 He has better Ideas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Is for Germany (vs. related)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Elected; limited powers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 He meets standards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Cater to the people</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Moody; evasive; enthusiastic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. External systems of reward and punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items from the sentence completion test</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56 have-salm., will -</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 it depends on fate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 satisfied, virtuous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 weakness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 obligations (not spontaneity)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 general failure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 admit it, learn</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 has no restraint</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 correct it, learn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 good thing to do</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 forget them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 success; status; helping</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4. CHECKING ON PRECONCEPTIONS

Information in these tables comes from answers to the following interview questions and probes:

As you see it now, what do you think are the main characteristics of (American democracy?)
(Americans and life in America?)
(Americans and the American way of life?)

What are some of the good points?

What are some of the weak points?

How would you describe what democracy means in America?

Table 7. Change over time in attitudes toward America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Salience</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undifferentiated positive comments</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other positive or neutral comments</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American democratic institutions seen as one related whole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation into parts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize America for egoism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not make this criticism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize America for nationalism or imperialism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not make this criticism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticize America for prejudice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not make this criticism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise America for world-mindedness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this characteristic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHAPTER 5. EXPLORATION OF AREAS OF DIFFERENCE

**Table 8. Individualism and groupism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualism as an American characteristic</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American good points</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarianism (races, nations, classes); equality of opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity of the individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL mentions of individualism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other mentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Groupism as an American characteristic      |            |
| **American good points**                    |            |
| Informal                                    |            |
| Community minded, cooperative, groupists    |            |
| **TOTAL mentions of groupism**              |            |
| **Total other mentions**                    |            |

**Does freedom include notion of responsibility?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning of freedom</th>
<th>1st group</th>
<th>2nd group</th>
<th>3rd group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights alone</td>
<td>4 4 3</td>
<td>5 5 2</td>
<td>2 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights and responsibility</td>
<td>6 7 7</td>
<td>3 2 3</td>
<td>5 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Democratic decision making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desirability of having decisions made by a group; by consultation; made democratically.</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good: flexible; gives wise decisions</td>
<td>2 6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-con: both good and bad</td>
<td>3 5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad: inefficient, weak, wastes time</td>
<td>7 4 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Democracy in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Static answer</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p. starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sta.</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Sta</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Sta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>tolerance, free expression</td>
<td>9½</td>
<td>5½</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>tradition (groups)</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>situational (vs. psych.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>7½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>situational (vs. psych.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>freedom, tolerance</td>
<td>12½*</td>
<td>0½</td>
<td>8½*</td>
<td>5½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Desirability of interaction qualities

Desirable citizen behavior: Change in German answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Interview</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better interaction with each other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More receptive to right ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More critical, know their rights</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More participation, behaving</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difficulty of transfer: Democratic practices which could not be transferred from America to Germany: follow-up interviews:

- Individual initiative and criticism: 12
- Civic organizations, groups, clubs: 5
- American system of education: 5
- Democracy in general: 5
- The American party system: 4
- Other specific political institutions: 4
- Free trade: 1
- Emancipation of women: 1

*Codes on citizen behavior and on social change are obtained from answers to the following questions:

What do you see as the most important things that need to be done within Germany (America) during the next few years?

What are the main obstacles in the way of achieving the various things you have mentioned?

Is there anything that can be done by an individual to help get around the obstacles you mentioned and help bring about further progress and improvement in Germany(America)?

(What contributions, if any, can the average citizen make?)

Let's take the general problem of getting a country to change from a non-democratic state to some form of democratic government. How could this be done? What are the necessary steps in the process?
Table 11. Conceptions of small group behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of influencing a group</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate participation, experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate without coercion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell the group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do with opposition in a group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to understand him</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to make him understand</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject him</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conception of good group functioning

| Leader behavior, re individual, group       | 5                 | 3       |
| Leader interacting with group              | 2                 | 4       |
| Peer interaction in group                  | 7                 | 10      |
| Both leader and peer interaction           | 5                 |         |

Criterion of success in group endeavor

| Self: Accepting my ideas                    | 5*                | 2       |
| Product: getting things done                | 4                 | 6       |
| Process                                     | 8                 | 15      |

Not change, ideas about group process

| Change toward more democratic, informal, interactional ideas | 8 | 6       |
| Change toward top-down, formalistic imposition       | 5 | 12      |
| No change                                             | 4 | 9       |

Special problems in working with a German group

| Authoritarianism: reject responsibility          | 2 | 0       |
| Rigidity, self-interest, egalitarian, class lines | 4 | 11      |
| Competing interests                              | 0 | 1       |
| Apathy, disinterest                              | 1 | 0       |
| Lack of experience working in a group           | 2 | 3       |
| Association of idea of group with Hitler         | 0 | 2       |
| No goal for group                                | 0 | 3       |
| Number of respondents:                           | 1 | 2       |
|                                                | 3 |         |

Table 12. Readiness for interaction as an American characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolerance as an American characteristic</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>3 vs. others,</th>
<th>P (X²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does democracy mean to Americans?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance, compromise, respect for ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American good points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention tolerance or give and take</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Friendly, responsible citizenship as American characteristic

| American good points                           |                   |               |        |
| Active, responsible citizens                   | 5                 | 16            | 14     |
| Friendly, trusting; goodwill                   | 4                 | 15            | 17     |
| Total mentions - active, responsible, friendly | 9                 | 31            | 31     |
| Other mentions                                 | 52                | 108           | 91     |
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Table 13. Conceptions of social change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures which might be used to initiate social change</th>
<th>General social change</th>
<th>Democratization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paternalism, structure, restraint</td>
<td>0 4 1</td>
<td>3 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose ideas, procedures</td>
<td>2 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>10 16 17</td>
<td>6 12 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate participation in govt.</td>
<td>1 2 2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work informally with individuals</td>
<td>5 3 5</td>
<td>2 9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of small citizens' groups</td>
<td>0 0 4</td>
<td>3 7 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 14 24 24 6 17 13

*Hi, Time 2, p: .03

German interviews: Focus of change efforts in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Government institutions</th>
<th>Non-government institutions</th>
<th>Attitudes and behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Attitudes toward the individual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibilities for respondent to contribute to German improvement</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is nothing I can do</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do something on the job</td>
<td>3 5 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can do something off the job</td>
<td>2 10* 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hi, .06 (X^2)

Ways in which an individual might contribute to democratization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>1 2 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal talk: talk about trip</td>
<td>2 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live democratically</td>
<td>2 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active citizenship re government</td>
<td>4 11 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use professional position</td>
<td>1 6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join organizations; political activity</td>
<td>0 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join non-political organizations</td>
<td>0 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propagandize</td>
<td>0 6 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 9 45 38

N: 6 18 15

General optimism about things in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>1 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Things are good; or are getting better</td>
<td>7 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things are bad; or are getting worse</td>
<td>8 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hi, .05

Mixed answer; uncertain                                           | 6 0   |

Time perspective on change in Germany: initial interviews, 1st group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social change</th>
<th>Democratization</th>
<th>Pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mention something that can be done now</td>
<td>12 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention anything to be done now</td>
<td>0 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15. Family and sex roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Authoritarian answer</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred diff, a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>meeting role obligations</td>
<td>3½ 5½</td>
<td>6 4</td>
<td>0 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>punish, educate, guide</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td>8 9</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>qualified approval</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>0 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>do one or the other</td>
<td>9* 7</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td>8* 6</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>supporting (vs. shares)</td>
<td>5 7</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>good-unqualified</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td>3 8</td>
<td>7 5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Approach to problems of role conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Authoritarian answer</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred diff, a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Invaluable; better than others</td>
<td>13 3</td>
<td>10 5</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>This is desirable</td>
<td>2 8</td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Good; have advantage</td>
<td>3 9</td>
<td>1 10</td>
<td>0 12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prejudiced; sells out</td>
<td>11* 0</td>
<td>11** 0</td>
<td>8 2</td>
<td>.001, .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 17. Change in general attitude toward America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-report: Has there been any change in your attitude toward America?</th>
<th>During visit</th>
<th>After return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More favorable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More unfavorable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More perspective</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computed individual change: understanding of and favorable reaction to America and American democracy.

| More favorable | 13 | 9 |
| More unfavorable | 2 | 11 |
| No change | 3 | 6 |

## Table 18. Change in general attitude toward Germany: self-report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has there been any change in your attitude toward Germany?</th>
<th>During visit</th>
<th>After return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More favorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More unfavorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More perspective (no criticism); got used to it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More able to give constructive criticism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 19. Reported changes in self

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of change reported, departure and follow-up interviews</th>
<th>German Groups</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;e&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of changes reported, departure and follow-up interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 change areas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 change areas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 change area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of change reported, departure and follow-up interviews:

- More cosmopolitan attitude: 23
- More actively form own opinions: 14
- More tolerance: 12
- More adaptable: 10
- More flexible: 7
- Less serious; take life easier: 5

**N**: 27
Table 20. Growth of critical internationalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>International emphasis</th>
<th>Germans-Init.</th>
<th>Germans-Final</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>p, starred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>Not</td>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>externally strong (vs. internal only)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-B</td>
<td>world power; world leader</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>world-mindedness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>cosmopolitan</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are some of the encouraging signs that show progress is being made in Germany?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>p (x²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Mention improvement in international relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Mention stronger international attitudes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the most important things that need to be done in Germany during the next few years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Mention improvement of relations with U.S.</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 21. Germany's relationship with the rest of the world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall code: who suffers from war threat now?</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe, starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absorbed in own fate, east-west split in Germany</td>
<td>7* 7 5*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common fate with others; importance of regional or world alignments</td>
<td>8* 11 19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributed attitudes of European nations</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe, starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable: friendly, goodwill, fair</td>
<td>6 14 25</td>
<td>$X^2: 9.21$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable: fear, envy, mistrust, unfair, give us a rough time</td>
<td>15 28 12</td>
<td>p: .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition of Germany by other nations</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe, starred diff.s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany is receiving recognition she deserves</td>
<td>1 2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany should change; or convince others she has changed</td>
<td>3 8 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany is ready; others should recognize this</td>
<td>2 6 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index, of internationalism, based on above measures</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in positive direction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in negative direction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think that the German people generally would see Germany's world position about the same way that you do?</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe, X^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General agreement</td>
<td>6 13 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General disagreement</td>
<td>1 3 13</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22. Judgment about returnee groups and the visitors program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Groups</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2, G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social change, propagandising in Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual support - problems re professional jobs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual support - psychological problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief new trainees going to America</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply information about U.S.; keep memories alive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General sociability, friendships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of maintaining the visitors program (departure interviews)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mention promotion of international goodwill, understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this; mention re-education, democratization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of American help for returnee groups (follow-up interviews)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing group has American help: is successful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing group has American help: is not successful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23. Shift in feelings attributed to America

**Attribution of friendliness and goodwill**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>P (χ²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mention friendliness and goodwill from America</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention friendliness and goodwill from Europe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attribution of fairness and respect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Groups 1, 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>America needs us, acts accordingly (fair)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America needs us but is unfair; or shows fears, envy, mistrust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronological shift in attitude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological shift in attitude</th>
<th>1951</th>
<th>1952</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution of favorable attitudes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution of unfavorable attitudes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H, χ²: 5.27; d.f.: 2; p: .05
Table 24. Attitudes toward democratization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democracy as goal for Germany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specifically mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalized</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not internalized</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratization as objective of young Germans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneously mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic living as a personal goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating for me in Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealistic in Germany now</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall index: commitment to democracy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable change</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable change</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward engaging in democratization efforts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active pride and responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterest</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let's talk a little about the problems facing Germany today. First, what do you see as the most important things that need to be done there during the next few years?

| Material difficulties following war | 18* | 16 | 17
| East-West division; others handicap us | 13* | 11 | 5
| Authoritarian historical tradition; present German mentality | 9 | 17 | 17
| Nationalism, imperialism, provincialism | 2 | 7* | 7
| Inadequate political institutions | 3 | 10 | 7
| Fear of Russia | 2 | 7* | 3
| Poor relations with the U.S. | 0* | 0 | 6
| Hunger | 3 | 7 | 0

Overall code: German characteristics

| Praiseworthy character traits | 22 | 16 | 8
| Explanation and apology for Germany | 25 | 29 | 16
| Egoism | 10 | 14 | 12
| Nationalism | 6 | 10 | 8
| Rigidity: class distinctions, formality, no compromise or respect for individuals | 15 | 38* | 20
| Apathy: citizens are passive and avoid responsibility | 14 | 14 | 8
| Authoritarian attitudes: submissive, dependent, suspicious, hostile, cynical, disillusioned, self-seeking | 17 | 21 | 33*

German interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Probability (X^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*Hi, .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>*Hi, .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Grouped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X^2 with 2 d.f., p: .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*Hi, .40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>*Lo, .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grouped, X^2 with 2 d.f., P: .01

Grouped, X^2 with 2 d.f., P: .05

*Lo, .02

*Hi, .001
Table 26. Potential for social change in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who has major responsibility for doing something about Germany's problem?</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other nations only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany with other nations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Germans have freedom to do something about their problems?</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, there is possibility to do something</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>2 <em>HI, .01 (X^2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, there is nothing we can do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Germans have freedom to do something about democratizing Germany?</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Germans can do something</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, there is nothing we can do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall index: potential and procedures for social change in Germany</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More confidence in Germany's problem-solving ability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less confidence in Germany's problem-solving ability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall code: barriers to democracy</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>3 Grouped, 2 d.f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis upon situational difficulties</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23 X^2=6.43;p:.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis upon psychological difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Type of change desired: political |
| More democratic behavior by officials | 6 | 14* | 12* .07 (Pe) |
| Introduce a two-party system | 3 | 3* | 1* .22 (Pe) |
| Better role for parties; compromise |
| More power for Germans; less for occupying authorities | 1 | 2 | 9* HI,.06 (X^2) |
| N: | 6 | 16 | 20 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall index: change goals for Germany</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal, psychological problems increase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of International tension increase</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are some of the encouraging signs which show that progress is being made in Germany?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political institutions, change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic institutions, change</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19 *HI,.10 (Pe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved relations with other nations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10* HI,.06 (X^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More international attitudes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy-relevant attitudes; civic groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 27. Motivation of the individual to participate in social change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>German Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude toward engaging in social change activities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active pride and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disinterest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall index: motivation toward social action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in action motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in action motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal goals: If you had to summarize in a few words your own goals in life, or what you are trying to do in life, what would you say?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follow-up Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional values: What are the things you enjoy most about the work you are now doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruistic values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International goodwill, understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to use US experience, contacts; to help US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal power and influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfactions, working with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal satisfaction: money, get ahead, interesting activity, good life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom and responsibility on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### CHAPTER 7. RETURN TO GERMANY

Table 28. Relationships with other Germans; antagonism from them

Once you get back to Germany, what do you think will be the main effect of the fact that you were here for a year? In general, how do people around here feel about your having been to America?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>P (X²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mention advantages with friends</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention disadvantages with friends</td>
<td>17-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention advantages with colleagues</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mention disadvantages with colleagues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneously mention possible resentment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No spontaneous mention of this</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change in circle of friends, following trip (Follow-up interviews)**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost old friends and gained new ones</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained new friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (geographical move)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What disadvantages will you have in working for your personal goals?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German interviews</th>
<th>P (X²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine professional hurdles; personal traits</td>
<td>20 25 10</td>
<td>0.01 (2 d.f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes (hostility, suspicion) of Germans</td>
<td>2 8* 18*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; International difficulties</td>
<td>3 3 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readjustment to German situation</td>
<td>1 4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: 18 25 27
Table 29. Relationships with other Germans; antagonism toward them

What are some of the things you dislike about your job?
(follow-up interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The way Germans behave with each other: way they are</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way Germans behave toward me; feel I am Americanized</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way Germans behave toward me; other reasons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This kind of work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong> 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do other people feel the same way that you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>( \text{P}(X^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About personal goals in life: Many do</td>
<td>3 8 0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few do; no one does</td>
<td>1 7 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About America's role in the world: Agree</td>
<td>5 7 4</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1 0 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About International affairs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6 13 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1 3 13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall code: feels superior to others

In talking about the situation in Germany and the possibilities for getting things done, he...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>( \text{P}(X^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished self from other Germans</td>
<td>8 7 16 1 vs 3: 0.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not distinguish self from others</td>
<td>7 18 7 3 vs 3: 0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments concerning the goals of youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>( \text{P}(X^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selfish interests; power, leadership, personal welfare, apathy, job</td>
<td>2 8 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests and goals that are not selfish</td>
<td>6 6 23 N. S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feasibility of democracy in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>( \text{P}(X^2) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democracy is meaningful goal now in Germany</td>
<td>10 15 10* Lo, 0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy is a far-distant goal in Germany</td>
<td>5 9 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy can only be synthetic in Germany; not a realistic goal</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 30. Civic activity

**Participation in group and community activities** (follow-up interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are active now</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect to be active in the future</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was active in past, but not now</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested, but time or other external factors prevent action</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of first group with later groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active in community at present</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not active in community at present</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status of young people (like yourself) in Germany**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No influence: unhappy; trying to gain some but can't</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11* P: .055*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence; and they don't care</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They have influence, or are gaining influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 31. The job market in Germany (follow-up interviews)

**Reasons given for leaving an old job**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason given</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visit to America not significant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional difficulties - job market</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education not yet complete</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to pick up again after being away</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit to America might be significant</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike the job</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike attitudes of Germans - hostility, suspicion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike authoritarian supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N:</strong> 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ways of finding a new job**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job with Americans</th>
<th>Germans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met employer - it was easy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met employer - it was hard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for job - it was easy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied for job - it was hard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32. Advantages associated with American trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mention professional knowledge to use on job</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expect knowledge of US to help on job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention this</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other effects anticipated by first group, in initial interviews

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More potentiality for reaching others</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American backing will help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in personal adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility &amp; obligation to Germany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General advantages for returnees in Germany

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My American experience; support from Americans</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German economic &amp; social conditions; support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My training, background, previous contacts, or personal traits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33. Job plans of the returnees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence of American experience on job plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better able to do what was already planned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opened new interest; I may follow them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old plans have been modified or changed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lo, .054

Interest in diplomatic service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mention diplomatic service as possible vocation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not mention diplomatic service</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hi, .12

Alienation of returnees from German job market (follow-up interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
<th>Pe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never returned to Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigrated after return</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for foreign service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite plans to leave</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now working for Americans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations exceed German possibilities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider foreign service</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed jobs in Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspirations can be met in usual ways</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with old job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 34. Attitudes toward emigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest in leaving Germany</th>
<th>German Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emigration is a possibility under consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not emigrate; might go abroad for visit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to leave Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Advantages and disadvantages of emigration (follow-up interviews)

**Advantages of staying in Germany**
- My career is here; better professional opportunities: 12
- Responsibility to help democratise Germany: 8
- I like Germany: 7
- Family ties are here: 4
- Friends and contacts are here: 3
- I would have more power and influence here: 2
- No advantages in staying: 1

N: 25

**Advantages of leaving Germany**
- Greater security from war, poverty, social problems: 13
- Better, happier way of life: 10
- Better professional problems: 9
- Escape the Russians and Communism: 5
- Freedom: 2
- No advantage in leaving: 4

N: 25
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