



6-1996

A Qualitative Study of Friendships and Student-Faculty Relationships: Experiences and Perspectives of Korean International Students Studying in the United States

Jinsook Kim
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, and the Counseling Commons

Recommended Citation

Kim, Jinsook, "A Qualitative Study of Friendships and Student-Faculty Relationships: Experiences and Perspectives of Korean International Students Studying in the United States" (1996). *Dissertations*. 1675. <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1675>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF FRIENDSHIPS AND STUDENT-FACULTY
RELATIONSHIPS: EXPERIENCES AND PERSPECTIVES OF
KOREAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
STUDYING IN THE UNITED STATES**

by

Jinsook Kim

**A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
Department of Counselor Education
and Counseling Psychology**

**Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
June 1996**

.

**A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF FRIENDSHIPS AND STUDENT-FACULTY
RELATIONSHIPS: EXPERIENCES AND PERSPECTIVES OF
KOREAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
STUDYING IN THE UNITED STATES**

Jinsook Kim, Ed.D.

Western Michigan University, 1996

Experiences and perceptions among a group of Korean international students studying in the United States were examined in terms of friendships and student-faculty relationships. The study used a qualitative approach and was guided by cross-cultural and cultural learning perspectives. Semi-structured interviews conducted in the Korean language were used for data collection. From a research population of 72 Korean international students enrolled at a large Midwestern university, 24 were selected using purposeful sampling, 6 from each of the four identified subgroups. These subgroups were male and female undergraduates and male and female graduates.

Participant experiences and perceptions concerning closest friendships with Koreans back home and those concerning relationships with American and co-national peers were compared. Terms of comparison included relationship durability, mutuality, instrumentality versus affectivity, and confrontation/conflict management. Also compared were participant experiences and perceptions concerning Korean

faculty with those concerning American faculty. Salient aspects compared were guidance/leading, tending, role-modeling, and being authoritarian versus being egalitarian. Individual variations were described according to participants' conceptions and personal preferences, within the dimensions of interpersonal boundaries and personal autonomy.

Valuing of relatedness and interdependence emerged as an overriding theme. However, differing visions and preferences were expressed concerning the specific terms of interpersonal relating. American peer groups were perceived as overemphasizing autonomy, whereas co-national peer groups were perceived as overemphasizing relatedness, with neither group adequately honoring both. The ideal professor was envisioned as competent, caring, and authoritative. American faculty were perceived as overlooking students' needs for relatedness, whereas Korean faculty were perceived as neglecting autonomy. Perceptions of Korean versus American cultural norms considerably overlapped. However, personal evaluations and reactions concerning these norms evidenced substantial variability. Both male and female participants evidenced strong, positive orientations toward relatedness. However, women, more often than men, explicitly voiced yearnings for balance between support for relatedness and support for autonomy within interpersonal contexts. The construct of *cheong*, or human sentiment, emerged as the most prominent Korean representation of human relatedness.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

**A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600**

UMI Number: 9636867

**Copyright 1996 by
Kim, Jinsook**

All rights reserved.

**UMI Microform 9636867
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Copyright by
Jinsook Kim
1996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to extend my appreciation to many people who have contributed to the completion of this study. My sincere appreciation goes to my dissertation chair, Dr. Robert Betz. He has offered me his unqualified support not only for this project but also for my other educational endeavors. I wish to thank the other members of my committee, both past and present, Dr. Karen Blaisure, Dr. Robert Wait, and Dr. Melanie Warnke. I am grateful to Dr. Blaisure for her valuable direction and generosity with her time. I am indebted to Dr. Wait and Dr. Warnke for their time, interest, and support.

I am profoundly grateful to my friend and consultant James Deckard for his support throughout this study and his expertise in helping to prepare the manuscript. He has read and critiqued numerous stages of my writing.

I wish to thank my friends and my dissertation support group members, Insook Kum, Jane Fisher, Beth Olson, Sherri Terrell, Joanne Dodgson, Carole Woolford, and Teresa Foley. They shared with me their own personal experiences in academic research and writing and offered me their emotional support and encouragement.

I wish to thank personally and individually each of the Korean international students who participated in this study. The stories recounted by them, their insightful narratives concerning their own experiences, are the essence of this

Acknowledgments—Continued

research. The richness and complexity of their interpersonal views and experiences as expressed to me have been a source of both inspiration and challenge. I am grateful for their willingness to reflect on their personal experiences and to allow me to have a glimpse into their private worlds. My primary purpose here has been to adequately convey the meanings these participants so articulately shared with me.

I also wish to thank my two Korean assistants who helped me in preparing interview transcripts. They understand my indebtedness to them for their careful efforts as well as the necessity of my keeping their names confidential.

This study was partially funded by the Dissertation Fellowship granted by the graduate school of Western Michigan University. I greatly appreciate the financial support provided, which sustained my research endeavor during the critical, year-long period of data analysis.

And finally, special thanks goes to my family members, friends, and former teachers in my home country, the Republic of Korea. Completing my study abroad in the United States would not have been possible without their continued love, support, and faith in me.

Jinsook Kim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Rationale for the Study	1
Conceptual Framework.....	8
Research Questions.....	11
Definition of Terms.....	12
Significance of the Study.....	13
Scope and Limitations of the Study	16
Organization of the Dissertation.....	17
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	19
Overview	19
Studies of International Student Sojourn Experiences.....	19
Social Interaction With Fellow Nationals	25
Barriers to Cross-Cultural Social Interaction.....	29
The Cross-Cultural Perspective	32
Individualism Versus Collectivism.....	33

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Conceptual Models of Views of Self and Relationships	39
Confucianism and Its Influence on Relationships in East Asia.....	47
East Asian and North American Orientations to Relationships	49
Korea.....	55
Sociocultural Background of Korean International Students.....	55
Prevailing Patterns of Interpersonal Relationships and Interactions.....	60
Child-Rearing and Socialization	66
Indigenous Relational Concepts: <i>Woori</i> , <i>Cheong</i> , and <i>Uye-ri</i>	70
Linguistic Codes and Communication Patterns	76
Summary	79
III. METHODOLOGY	80
Researcher as Research Instrument	80
Methodological Conceptualizations.....	84
Participants	86
Research Population	86
Selection of Participants.....	87

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Research Instruments	90
Demographic Information Form.....	90
Semi-Structured Interview Guide.....	90
Data Collection Procedure	92
Data Analysis.....	94
Characteristics of Participants	97
Age and Marital Status	97
Academic Major	98
Length of Stay in North America and Length of Stay at the University	98
Type of Residence and Living Arrangement	100
Religious Background.....	101
Social Class Background and Primary and Secondary Financial Support.....	101
Perceived Proficiency of Spoken English.....	102
Intent of Permanent Stay in the United States.....	102
Presentation of the Analysis	103
IV. FRIENDSHIPS AND PEER RELATIONSHIPS	104
Overview	104
Closest Korean Friendships	105

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Longevity	105
Mutuality	112
Affectivity	127
Confrontation and Conflict Management	130
Relationships With American and Co-National Peers	132
Relationship Formation and Durability	133
Issues of Building Mutuality	138
Instrumentality Versus Affectivity	166
Confrontation and Conflict Management	172
V. STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS	181
Korean Faculty	181
Guidance and Leading	183
Tending	188
Role-Modeling	191
Being More Mutual Versus Being “Authoritarian”	198
American Faculty	203
Being More Egalitarian	205
Role-Modeling	218
Tending	228

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

	Guidance and Leading.....	235
VI.	PATTERNS OF VARIATION ON CULTURAL AND INDIVIDUAL DIMENSIONS	240
	Interpersonal Boundaries	240
	“Separate” Versus “Overlapping” Boundaries	241
	In-Groups and Out-Groups.....	245
	“Privacy”	252
	Sharing Material Resources.....	256
	Tending and Knowing.....	261
	“Office Hours”	269
	Issues of Personal Autonomy	273
	“Sticky Rice Cake” Versus “Grains of Sand”	274
	Clothing Behavior.....	282
	Senior-Junior Relationships.....	287
VII.	DISCUSSION	294
	Summary	294
	Relatedness and Autonomy Within the Individual and Cultural Dimensions	296
	American and Co-National Peer Relationships.....	300
	Relational Compatibility and Incompatibility	300

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

American and Co-National Peer Groups: Strengths and Limitations.....	304
Authoritarian Versus Egalitarian Orientations: Korean and American Student-Faculty Relationships	314
Authoritarian Orientation Among Korean Faculty	316
Egalitarian Orientation Among American Faculty.....	318
A Need for a Balance Between Support for Relatedness and Autonomy	323
Normative Versus Evaluative Aspects of Cultural Orientations....	326
Gender Issues	334
The Common Valuing of Relatedness Across Gender.....	334
Gender Differences	337
The Construct of <i>Cheong</i>	341
Implications of the Study	347
Theoretical Implications.....	347
Educational and Clinical Implications	349
Limitations of the Study.....	355
Suggestions for Future Research.....	357
Reflections.....	359

APPENDICES

A. Verification Letter to Participants.....	362
---	-----

Table of Contents—Continued

APPENDICES

B. Demographic Information Form.....	365
C. Interview Guides: Original and Revised Guide	373
D. Informed Consent Form	388
E. Coding Categories	393
F. Letter of Approval From the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.....	396

BIBLIOGRAPHY	398
--------------------	-----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Korean international students studying in a United States university were interviewed to understand their experiences and perceptions concerning interpersonal relationships and encounters with American friends, peers, and faculty. For purposes of comparison, participants' experiences and conceptions concerning friendships and student-faculty relationships involving Koreans were also examined. Moreover, participants' experiences and perceptions were explored in terms of cross-cultural learning derived from interpersonal experiences while in the United States. Participant perceptions of culturally normative patterns of interpersonal relationships in Korean and American societies were obtained and examined.

Rationale for the Study

Over the past few decades international students have become a rapidly growing population within higher educational institutions in the United States. International students have been predicted to constitute more than 25% of the graduate student enrollment in the 1990s (Parr, Bradley, & Bingi, 1992).

International student growth in the United States is largely due to increases among Asian student groups (Institute of International Education, 1992). According to the recent annual report by the Institute of International Education (1992), the Asian student population rose in 1991-1992 by about 7% from the previous academic year, reaching 245,810 students. In the same academic year, Asian students accounted for approximately 60% of international students in the United States.

This large and growing number of Asian students on U.S. college campuses poses increased challenges for administrators, faculty members, and student services personnel. As has been widely discussed in the literature, international students experience considerable stress related to cross-cultural adjustment while in the United States (Church, 1982; Juffer, 1984; Hammer, 1992; Pedersen, 1991). Further, studies have consistently indicated that international students from the non-Western world tend to report more pronounced adjustment difficulties than do their counterparts from Western countries (Pedersen, 1991; Sharma, 1973; Surdam & Collins, 1984).

Among the many aspects of cross-cultural adjustment studied, international students' social interaction with Americans has been of major interest to researchers (Grisbacher, 1991). Their recognition has been that one of the critical challenges facing international students is that of making new contacts and creating supportive networks in a foreign cultural environment. From the social interaction perspective, the phenomenon of culture shock "occurs within a specific

domain, namely in the social encounters, social situations, social episodes, or social transactions between sojourners and host nationals" (Furnham & Bochner, 1982, p. 172). Furnham and Bochner suggested that total sojourn experience can be greatly affected by the nature and quality of social interaction which the sojourners have with people in the host culture.

Church (1982) maintained that the extent and nature of social encounters with Americans are "the most important yet complex variables related to sojourner adjustment. ... Many researchers consider positive social interaction with host nationals a necessary condition for effective sojourner adjustment; for some writers, it is the 'crucial' or 'decisive' factor in adjustment" (p. 551). Church's comprehensive critical review of sojourner adjustment research will be returned to throughout the present discussion.

One of the most consistent findings of the studies reviewed is that many Asian students tend to withdraw from the host culture and its members during their stay in the United States. Klein et al. (1971) contended that "social isolation from Americans is a fact of life for Asian students" (p. 84). While maintaining distance from the host society, Asian students typically formed enclaves of fellow nationals, which serve as their primary social network (Church, 1982). In a study of alienation among international students, Schram and Lauver (1988) found that when compared with their counterparts from other world regions, Asian students scored higher on an alienation scale. Hull (1978) indicated that Asian students, particularly those from China, Japan, and South Korea, were more subject than

were other internationals to experiencing misunderstanding and social isolation from Americans. Hull argued that this phenomenon might be partly due to the “cultural, psychological, and language differences between the East and the West” (p. 11).

Hull’s investigation, moreover, tended to empirically corroborate the concept of “cultural distance” (Church, 1982, p. 547) and the widely-held assumption in sojourner adjustment research that the greater the extent of difference in sojourner home culture from host culture the greater the adjustment difficulties in social and other aspects of sojourn experience (Beck, 1963; David, 1971; Morris, 1960 as cited in Church). Other empirical studies have also largely supported this notion (e.g., Furnham & Bochner, 1982). Nonetheless, comprehensive studies dealing specifically with the nature and extent of the impact of cultural distance on Asian students' social functioning in the United States have remained notably rare.

In more general terms, social contact studies have yielded much needed information concerning international student social functioning and adjustment in the United States. Yet even when viewed from this broader perspective, research in this area has been characterized by methodological shortcomings and conceptual problems (Church, 1982; Spaulding & Flack, 1976). Most studies have depended heavily on survey questionnaires and problem checklists, sometimes supplemented by interviews. These highly structured instruments may tend to force respondents to fit their experiences and perceptions into researcher-generated categories, thus limiting their response choices (M. Q. Patton, 1990).

Church (1982) maintained that, "such studies tend to be superficial and generally fail to relate sojourn behavior and adjustment difficulties to specific sojourn experience or cultural differences" (p. 561). Further, in these studies, the nature and extent of social encounters between international students and Americans have generally been depicted in "only static, quantitative terms," such as the number and variety of social contacts (Church, 1982, p. 563). Thus, the quality and dynamics of social interaction between international students and U.S. host nationals have remained inadequately understood.

Another major limitation rests with lack of consistency in terms of how the social interaction variable was quantified across different studies (Church, 1982). It was noted that results tended to differ depending on whether the amount of social interaction was operationalized in terms of frequency, range, depth of encounters, or the number of close host national friends. Lack of clear definition of terms used in the studies further complicates the task of interpreting the research findings. For instance, terms such as "friends" and "acquaintances" do not necessarily have the same meaning for individuals from different cultures. Church (1982) pointed out that studies of sojourner adjustment, including social adjustment, generally relied on concepts derived from the host culture, applying them to sojourners from different cultures. Church further argued that the criteria and measures of adjustment used in such studies may have been culture-biased. Moreover, as Ward and Wearle (1991) pointed out, "precisely what constitutes adjustment has remained ambiguous" (p. 210).

Overall, there have been very few qualitative studies devoted to understanding and describing social experiences of Asian international students in the United States. Unlike highly structured research methods which direct respondents to choose from among fixed responses supplied by the researcher, qualitative methods, including in-depth interviews and participatory studies, allow participants to respond in their own words to express their personal experiences and perspectives. Findings from studies using such qualitative methods could illuminate our understanding of Asian international students' social experiences and perceptions in all their richness and complexity.

To summarize, the large proportion of Asian students within the total international student population, their reported greater social adjustment difficulties, and the marked paucity of qualitative studies in this research area all point to the urgent need for qualitative investigations of Asian students' social experience in the United States. In response to such need, the present study was undertaken and focused upon Korean international students studying at a large Midwestern university. Among the many nationalities composing the Asian international student population in the United States, this national group was chosen for the following reasons: First, despite its historically strong presence and considerable size within the entire international student body, Koreans as a national group have been largely underrepresented in the research of sojourner adjustment. Underrepresentation has particularly been the case in terms of published studies, even though since the 1950s South Koreans have constituted a

notable portion of the international student body. Students from South Korea ranked among the five leading national groups contributing to international student enrollment at U.S. universities and colleges from 1985 through 1992 (Institute of International Education, 1992).

Second, in qualitative interviewing, using the language ordinarily employed by participants for verbal communication has been recognized to be crucial for capturing the complexities of the participants' perceptions and experiences in their own terms (M. Q. Patton, 1980; Spradley, 1979). For qualitative interviewing of international students studying in the United States, use of the participant's native language was essential. The use of participants' native language during interviews was particularly important for international students whose countries of origin are the Far East: South Korea, Japan, China, and Taiwan. For many students from this region of Asia, when restricted to English in its spoken form, lack of proficiency with the language and its idioms often creates major problems in communication. Since the present study relied on in-depth interviews for data collection, ensuring verbal responses of interviewees in their native language under conditions of minimal restriction seemed highly desirable for generating valid data. Moreover, beyond evoking a sense of comfort and familiarity, use of the language that participants spoke as their shared native language was instrumental to identifying culture-specific and contextual meanings within the participants' narratives. Data collection was further enhanced by the fact that the investigator for the study was an international student from South Korea, and was thus able to

conduct research with the Korean international subgroup entirely in the Korean language, thereby greatly reducing communication restrictions.

Investigation of interpersonal experiences in the present study of Korean international students focused on two types of student relationships: those with friends or peers and those with faculty. Reasons for this focus were as follows: First, unlike some other relationships (e.g., romantic relationships), relationships with friends or peers and with faculty had been experienced by all participants both in their home country and in the United States. Thus, participants were in the position of being able to compare such relationships cross-culturally. Second, such relationships were representative of two groups of individuals playing important roles in students' academic and social lives. Third, they represented an important hierarchical contrast: Friendships or peer relationships tended to assume equality whereas student-faculty relationships were primarily based on status differential. Examination of both hierarchical and egalitarian relationships from the perspectives of Korean international students promised to yield a more complete representation of their personal and cultural conceptions of relationships, than did studying one or the other alone.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptualization and formulation of research questions and goals were influenced and informed by both a cross-cultural perspective and a culture-learning perspective. In the cross-cultural perspective, cultural forces are

recognized as important variables shaping human mind and behavior (Segall, Dasen, Berry, & Poortinga, 1990). Culture is perceived to serve as a “perceptual frame of reference” (Adler, 1975, p.14). As Adler observed, “Every person experiences the world through his or her own culturally influenced values, assumptions, and beliefs” (p. 14). It is also recognized that cultures vary in terms of conceptions and patterns of interpersonal relationships (Triandis, 1995). Interpersonal interactions between individuals from different cultures are thus affected by the cultural orientation that each brings to the interaction (Adler, 1975; Triandis, Brislin, & Hui, 1988).

The culture-learning perspective is a relatively recent theoretical model through which sojourner experience in a foreign culture can be examined (Brislin, 1981; Hammer, 1992). The culture-learning model conceptualizes sojourner experience in terms of learning salient characteristics of the host culture. The sojourner’s major task, in this model, rather than assimilating into the new culture, is instead to obtain the cultural knowledge and skills relevant to individual goals within the host society. Problems and difficulties experienced by sojourners are not viewed as symptoms of any underlying pathology or deficit, as often had been the case in earlier investigations following a medical model (Furnham & Bochner, 1982). Instead, difficulties are viewed as indicative of the sojourner’s lack of vital cultural knowledge and skills necessary for effective functioning in the host culture. The culture-learning model may help to correct the ethnocentric notion that adjustment to the host culture necessarily means adopting the values and

norms of the host society while abandoning one's own culture (Hammer, 1992; Pedersen, 1991).

Recently, some writers addressed the complexity of cross-cultural adjustment issues facing international students in light of their short-term status as sojourners. International students' short-term status markedly differentiates them from most other acculturating groups in the United States, such as immigrants and refugees (Berry, 1985; Grisbacher, 1991; Paige, 1990; Thomas & Althen, 1989). International students, to the extent that they experience full acculturation to the host culture, while necessarily dissociating themselves from their own, may face increasing difficulty in readjusting to the native culture upon returning home (Grisbacher, 1991; Paige, 1990; Spaulding & Flack, 1976). For this reason, Paige (1990) contended that international students should be encouraged to "seek a balance between participation in the new culture and the maintenance of their own cultural identities" (p. 168). Similarly, Grisbacher (1991) maintained that international students who reject either cultural group, host or co-national, would likely have poorer adjustment in the new cultural environment.

The present study represents an attempt to go beyond enumerating interpersonal problems and difficulties encountered by Korean international students and to move instead toward examining life experiences of these students as "learning resources" (Paige, 1990, p. 166) or cultural informants. As noted by Paige (1990), although international students provide examples of cross-cultural phenomena such as cross-cultural interpersonal relationships, cross-cultural

communication, and cultural learning, this “extraordinary learning opportunity is all too often neglected” (p. 182) by both service providers for international students and researchers in cross-cultural relations. While functioning in a foreign culture, international students sooner or later recognize that their culturally-conditioned ways of thinking and behaving are not necessarily shared by others with different cultural backgrounds. As a result, they are likely to become increasingly aware of many of their culturally-bound assumptions, behaviors, and attitudes, which previously they had simply taken for granted. Thus, cultural distinctions emerge more naturally into the perceptual foreground (Adler, 1975). Although cross-cultural experiences do not automatically lead to increased cultural awareness, such experiences nonetheless present the possibility of developing heightened cultural awareness while fostering a change from monocultural to cross-cultural frame of reference (Adler, 1975). The present study has attempted to inquire into not only the interpersonal experiences and perceptions of Korean international students, but also into the learning they have derived from cross-cultural interactions in the United States.

Research Questions

As noted previously, the review of the literature revealed a marked paucity of qualitative inquiries of social experiences among Korean international students in the United States. The present study was undertaken as a step toward filling

this gap. The focus of the study was directed toward the following areas of inquiry:

1. What are some of the conceptions and expectations Korean international students hold concerning friendships and student-faculty relationships involving Koreans?
2. How do Korean students experience and make sense of their interpersonal encounters with American friends, peers, and faculty in light of the identified conceptions and expectations concerning friendships and student-faculty relationships?
3. What have Korean students discerned and learned from their cross-cultural experiences in the United States in terms of: (a) cultural variance in conceptions and patterns of interpersonal relationships; and (b) specific difficulties or challenges in developing meaningful relationships with Americans?

Definition of Terms

Terms important to understanding of the present study are employed according to the following definitions:

1. *Korean international student* refers to a student born and reared in the Republic of Korea, of indigenous Korean origin, whose elementary and secondary education, and in some cases all or part of an undergraduate or graduate degree, were completed in the Republic of Korea.

2. *Culture*, as explained by Ting-Toomey (1994), is defined as a "system of knowledge, meanings, and symbolic actions that is shared by the majority of the people in a society " (p. 360).

3. *Relationship/ Interpersonal relationship* describes that which is "created in the flow of intention, action, and response between people" (Josselson, 1992, pp. 2-3). Therefore, relationship is not simply an externally defined pattern of interpersonal transactions that occurs between individuals: Rather, the focus of attention is directed more toward the individual's subjective experience and internal construction of what transpires within the interpersonal context and not so much toward the observable and objectively measurable characteristics of a given relationship (Josselson, 1992).

Significance of the Study

The present inquiry was undertaken to examine Korean international students' experiences and perceptions of interpersonal relationships with faculty and friends or peers, involving both Americans and Koreans. Also examined were the cross-cultural learning and perspectives these students have derived from their interpersonal experiences in the United States. It was hoped that the findings from this study would advance knowledge concerning international student sojourn experience in the United States and cross-cultural psychology. More specifically, the study could lead to better understanding of the following areas:

1. Findings from the study would be of value for understanding interpersonal experiences and perspectives of the Korean student group. As indicated before, review of literature revealed a notable lack of studies specifically dealing with Korean international students in the United States. In contrast, students from neighboring countries, China and Japan, have been more frequently studied. Considering the historically strong presence and rapidly growing number of Korean students in the United States, increased knowledge of the dynamics and challenges of interpersonal encounters between Koreans and Americans might have important practical implications for those professionals involved in orienting Korean students to life and study in a foreign culture, either prior to departure from their home country or upon arrival in the United States.

2. With the use of in-depth interviews as a major source of data collection, results from this study could help illuminate some of the subjective and contextual aspects of international student experience that might otherwise go unnoticed in research using a more structured approach. Furthermore, by allowing Korean international students to self-describe their experiences and perceptions in their native language, the study could better facilitate identification of Korean indigenous concepts and themes pertaining to human relationships than would studies using an English-only format.

3. Although the testing of concepts and theories derived from cross-cultural research was not the primary purpose of this study, findings from the study might contribute to existing knowledge in the area of cross-cultural

psychology, particularly that which pertains to Korean-American interpersonal relations. With an ever growing interdependence between the United States and Korea in business and commerce, and with a sizable Korean immigrant population in the United States, increased understanding of issues involved in Korean-American relations would be extremely useful.

4. Findings from the study could have practical significance beyond their implications concerning the Korean national group. Understandings reached here might largely extend as well to other Asian international students, particularly those from the Far East region, although such generalization would be limited due to variations by nationality. Historically, Korea has shared a similar cultural heritage with other countries in the Far East region, China, Japan, and Taiwan. Most importantly, Confucianism has exerted a persistent and profound impact on interpersonal relationships among people in these countries (Yum, 1991). Considering the fact that students from this region of the world make up 3 out of every 10 international students (Institute of International Education, 1992), knowledge gained from the study should prove particularly useful for those who work with these students in educational and clinical settings.

5. Finally, the in-depth interview could be a potentially enriching and educational experience for the participants (Kvale, 1983). The semi-structured format of the interview, combined with the interviewer's interest in and willingness to understand the participants' experiences from their own points of view, could facilitate the process of the participants' cultural learning. Guiding questions for

the interview were designed to encourage participants to reflect on, clarify, and make sense out of often confusing cross-cultural experiences. By engaging in the interactive process of addressing the questions and issues raised during the interview, participants may have become "more self-aware than they were before they involved themselves in [the] procedures" (Unger, 1983, p. 28).

Scope and Limitations of the Study

In focusing on a group of Korean international students studying at a large Midwestern university in the United States, the present study is conceived to examine participants' interpersonal experiences with both Americans and other Koreans. The study is not structured to incorporate participant experiences with nationalities other than these two.

Research is structured to allow for a single interview with each participant. Such a design may not permit uncovering, as thoroughly as might have a longitudinal design, any patterns of stability and change within individuals' experiences and views that may occur over a more protracted unfolding of the sojourn.

The open-ended, semi-structured approach of this study may be limited by the willingness of participants to share information about themselves with the researcher. Furthermore, there can be no guarantees that self-reports would represent the full range of participants' interpersonal experiences, both within and across cultures.

All participants must agree to be interviewed. The self-selection process may produce a biased sample of Korean students who, for whatever reason one might conjecture or later discover, are willing to share their personal experiences with an interviewer from their home country.

Organization of the Dissertation

The remainder of this dissertation includes six chapters. In Chapter II, a review of selected literature is presented, encompassing the following areas: (a) studies of international student sojourn experiences, (b) the cross-cultural perspective, and (c) sociocultural background of Korean international students as well as prevailing patterns of interpersonal relationships in Korean culture. In Chapter III, a description of methodological conceptualizations and research procedures is presented, including discussion of the researcher as research instrument, selection of participants, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and characteristics of participants. Chapters IV, V, and VI include the presentation of data. In Chapter IV, salient aspects of participants' experiences and perceptions of friendships and peer relationships involving Koreans and Americans are presented. In Chapter V, participants' experiences and perceptions concerning student-faculty relationships involving both Korean and American professors are described. In Chapter VI, themes of variation on the cultural and individual dimensions in terms of orientations toward relationships are identified. In Chapter VII, an overall interpretation is provided and somewhat more extended implications of results are

discussed. Appendices are included with samples of the various forms which were used in the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Overview

Review of related literature for the study pertains to interpersonal experiences and perceptions of international students studying in the United States. Particular attention is given to research concerning the subgroup of Asian student population. From the broader area of cross-cultural psychology, theoretical formulations and empirical findings related to cultural perspectives on interpersonal relationship and communication are examined. Inquiry into the sociocultural background of Korean international students as well as of Korean cultural orientation to interpersonal relationship and communication is also carried out in some detail.

Studies of International Student Sojourn Experiences

As noted previously, research on social adjustment of international students has consistently reported that many international students from non-European countries, or the so-called Third World, experienced considerable social difficulties while in the United States (Adelegan & Parks, 1985; Klein et al., 1971; Pruitt, 1978; Sharma, 1973). However, there have been relatively few systematic

investigations of the specific nature and extent of such difficulties. Moreover, social interactions between international students and host nationals have been typically limited to quantitative descriptions, such as the frequency and variety of social encounters (Church, 1982). As a result, both the dynamics of cross-cultural social interactions and international students' own perceptions of such interactions have remained inadequately explored. Accordingly, comprehensive analysis of international students' social experiences and difficulties has been limited. The following discussion of problems and related issues in social relations between international students and Americans is based on the few available studies.

Although international students come to the United States anticipating a "responsive environment" (Manese, Leong & Sedlacek, 1985, p. 27), the incongruence, actual and perceived, between their social expectations and social reality may cause difficulties for some international students (Owie, 1982). Boer (1981) indicated that although type and quality of social relations with host nationals are of great concern for international students, "friendships in general, dating, and how to relate to faculty are everyday phenomenon that are often too little understood as being different in other countries" (p. 50).

In the study with graduate students from non-European countries, Sharma (1973) identified the most severe social problems encountered by these students. These problems were: (a) becoming accustomed to American social customs, (b) making personal friends with American students, (c) being accepted by social

groups, and (d) feeling inhibited concerning participation in campus activities. Sharma indicated that these problems require a long period of time for resolution.

In a study with Afghan and Iranian students in the United States, Payind (1979) reported that top ranking social problems were establishing satisfactory relationships with international student advisors and with professors, and overcoming shyness and finding companionship with the other sex. Students tended to attribute their social problems to cultural differences between the United States and their home countries, and to the lack of opportunities for developing satisfactory cross-cultural relationships.

On the basis of responses to a questionnaire and individual interviews with more than 40 international students from Taiwan and Hong Kong who were enrolled at the University of Wisconsin in Madison, Klein et al. (1971; see also Alexander, Workneh, Klein, & M. H. Miller, 1976; M. H. Miller et al., 1971) concluded that the majority of these students failed to develop close meaningful relationships with Americans. These investigators noted that even when students reported having American friends, most of these relationships were "more apparent than real" in that "they were superficial, limited to polite, uncommitted, undemanding-ungiving congeniality" (M. H. Miller et al., 1971, p. 129). Students who had experienced such relationships tended to be disappointed and disillusioned with what they understood to be the "limitations of the American character that stood in the way of friendship" (M. H. Miller et al., 1971, p. 129). These students characteristically described Americans as "insincere, superficial, and

incapable of making real friendships" (Klein et al., 1971). Their perceptions in turn led to the rather pessimistic view among these students that Americans "would be superficially friendly but would not be open to the kind of intimate interdependent friendship based on mutual consideration and trust that was valued at home" (Alexander et al., 1976, p. 85).

Such perceptions of Americans seemed to be shared by Korean students attending the same university. From the data obtained from survey questionnaires, supplemented by interviews, Bae (1972) found that some of the students in his sample ($N = 53$) perceived Americans as generally superficial. In particular, students who strongly identified with traditional Korean values felt insecure with Americans, reporting difficulty establishing warm, personal relations with them. These students also found it difficult to adapt to the relatively informal associations typically experienced with American professors and failed to form close relationships with them.

Research concerning international students in other Western countries, including England and Canada, has similarly demonstrated their widespread difficulty in social experience. In a study involving 150 students from 29 different countries who were attending English language schools in London, Furnham and Bochner (1982) found that social difficulty encountered by the international students was a positive function of cultural distance. In order to test their hypothesis that the greater the difference between the student's native culture and the host society, the greater would be the social difficulty experienced, the authors

classified students' countries of origin into three regional groups, Northern Europe, Southern Europe, and the East. The authors found that students from the East culturally differed the most from their hosts. Of the three groups examined, students from the East reported the highest level of difficulty in negotiating everyday social situations. The authors noted that in general the most difficult social situations facing students in the study all centered around establishing and maintaining personal relationships with host nationals.

Difficulty in establishing close relationships with host nationals was also experienced by international students sojourning in Canada. Using participant observation and both unstructured and structured interviews with 46 students from Southeast Asian and African countries attending a Canadian university, Heikinheimo and Shute (1986) found that social interaction with Canadians was one of the principle areas that students identified as requiring adjustment. Some African students in the study remarked that Canadians were cold, and argued that forming friendships with Canadians was difficult because they avoided closeness. The perceived lack of knowledge of the student's cultural background on the Canadian's part also presented a barrier for some African students. Furthermore, racial discrimination, imagined or actual, was a "perceived reality for most African and Asian students" in the study (Heikinheimo & Shute, 1986, p. 403). Reported incidents of discrimination, however, were neither violent nor particularly serious, but instead tended to be either subtle or silent. For example, international students perceived teachers as less helpful toward them and less favorably disposed toward

them in terms of grading than they were toward Canadian students. International students also reported that sometimes their teachers used examples in class derogatory to specific races or ethnic groups. The investigators indicated that a sense of being discriminated against caused some students to feel unwelcome and insecure.

Further, Heikinheimo and Shute (1986) proposed a “balance model” (p. 403) to describe both barriers and incentives to international students’ social interaction with host nationals. Identified barriers or inhibiting factors were: (a) English language difficulties; (b) cultural differences; (c) the students’ personal characteristics (e.g., shyness); (d) academic pressure; and (e) perceived discrimination. Factors identified as stimulators included: (a) willingness to learn about another culture, (b) motivation to learn and practice English, and (c) common interests. From this model, it was suggested that all international students encounter these potential inhibitors and stimulators that affect their interactions with the host nationals. Individual student’s perceptions concerning specific issues were conceived to largely determine whether a given issue becomes an inhibitor or a stimulator in interactions with Canadians. Certain students may perceive difficulties as challenges to overcome and continue to interact with local people, whereas others may be completely discouraged when encountering similar difficulties and remain isolated from the local community. For some students, cultural differences may present a serious barrier to interaction with Canadians, whereas other students may perceive their stay in Canada as a good opportunity for cross-cultural learning. Consequently, the balance between inhibitors and stimulators

may tend to shift, in relation to the individual student's own perceptions of these factors.

Church (1982) provided a summary of sociocultural problems most commonly encountered by international students. The problems were: (a) different social customs and norms, (b) contrasting or conflicting values and assumptions, (c) maintenance of simultaneous multiple culture group memberships, (d) ignorance of host nationals about home culture, (e) difficulty in making social contacts, (f) problems with verbal and nonverbal communication, (g) superficial American friendships, (h) racial discrimination, and (i) dating and sexual problems.

Social Interaction With Fellow Nationals

International students' association with fellow nationals has been discussed in the literature in terms of its implications for both the students' adjustment to U.S. college campuses in general and their social interaction with Americans in particular. It has been widely suggested that difficulties and frustrations often associated with cross-cultural interactions may lead many international students to avoid such contact altogether and to instead seek out personal relationships among students from their own country (Church, 1982; Grisbacher, 1991). Spaulding and Flack (1976) posed the question of whether international students are encouraged to seek out co-nationals because their American peers "cannot offer friendship of sufficient depth, or whether, having invested their emotional energy

in co-national group, foreign students have little left over for American friendships" (p. 35). In any case, co-national preference often resulted in the formation of enclaves of fellow nationals in which international students recapitulate the familiar interpersonal environment of the home culture (Church, 1982). The formation of such enclaves or small informal groups have been reported as most typical among Asian students, including Koreans, Chinese, Indians, and Japanese (Bae, 1972; Church, 1982; Galtung, 1965; Klein et al., 1971).

Bae (1972), as mentioned here, found that Korean international students, particularly those with high levels of traditional Korean values, felt insecure in relation to Americans and turned to fellow Korean students for emotional and practical support. A similar tendency was observed among Chinese students from Hong Kong and Taiwan in the study conducted by Klein et al. (1971), as previously cited. While remaining socially isolated from the host community, these students maintained a rather exclusive or closed relationship with fellow Chinese. Most students tended to reserve close personal contacts for co-nationals, while restricting social interactions with Americans to casual exchanges and encounters. Hsu (1983) also found that the Chinese students in her study ($N = 131$) tended to establish small informal groups with co-national students. The majority of Indian students studying in the United States and the United Kingdom were also found to associate primarily with other Indians during their foreign sojourn (Galtung, 1965). The pattern of closely associating with co-nationals was also found among the international students studying in England in the earlier cited study by Furnham

and Bochner (1982). These two investigators reported that data on the quality of these students' social relations indicated that the students preferred to engage in intimate contacts with co-nationals and fellow internationals, while tending to seek out host nationals only for utilitarian purposes, such as help for academic and language problems.

Empirical studies have generally shown that the level of social contact with co-nationals was inversely related to effective social and overall adjustment to American culture (Antler, 1970; Kagan & Cohen, 1990; Pruitt, 1978; Sewell & Davidsen, 1956). It has been reported that international students whose primary social interaction was with co-nationals had poorer adjustment to the host culture and were less satisfied with their sojourn experiences in the United States when compared to international students who associated more frequently with Americans (Grisbacher, 1991). Such findings have led some writers to conclude that international students' social contact with co-nationals, particularly if it is exclusive, deleteriously affect their adjustment while in the United States (Pruitt, 1978). Interacting wholly with fellow nationals may inhibit developing meaningful relations with Americans, thus reinforcing both the stereotypical view of the host nationals and a sense of social alienation from the host community (Alexander et al., 1976). Furthermore, as Grisbacher (1991) maintained, those students who surround themselves exclusively with co-nationals may have less opportunity to acquire and enhance adaptive skills which could facilitate their adjustment in the new culture.

Other writers, however, explicitly recognized co-national subgroups as constituting viable support systems, acknowledging that they carried out emotionally and instrumentally supportive functions for international students, particularly those who were experiencing great adjustment difficulties (Dillard & Chisolm, 1983; Hendricks & Skinner, 1977; Spaulding & Flack, 1976). Stewart and Hartt (1987) noted that the formation of co-national groups could help alleviate cross-cultural adjustment stress and that such groups “serve as anchors for students whose sense of appropriate behavior, self-worth, and identity are continually being challenged” (p. 5). In their qualitative study of adaptive social patterns of international students using interviews and participant observation, Hendricks and Skinner (1977) found that international students tended to cultivate close friendships with co-nationals or fellow internationals that were emotionally and instrumentally supportive. The investigators noted that as outsiders in a culturally and socially different environment, international students tended to “operate within a limited social field, which primarily includes people who play instrumental roles in [their] strategy for coping” (p. 125).

Church (1982) offered the following summary of the variety of reasons which have been advanced in the literature for why such co-national enclaves are formed:

Such enclaves allow the sojourner to reestablish primary group relations and maintain familiar, traditional values and belief systems while minimizing psychological and behavioral adjustment. A protective function is served whereby psychological security, self-esteem, and a sense of belonging are provided, and anxiety, feelings of powerlessness, and social stresses

are reduced. Such enclaves also serve as reference groups with whom the new environment can be discussed, compared, and interpreted. (p. 551-552)

Klein et al. (1971) described the functions that the co-national subgroup served for the Chinese students in their study:

It provides structure in a world where manners and morals are discrepant from patterns valued at home. It provides mutual esteem and approval in a familiar frame of reference when academic stresses are at an all-time peak. It provides suitable marriage partners and substitutes peers for parents in complex ways of courting. It provides relief from stresses of coping with new ways in a strange tongue where ignorance is equal to inferiority and embarrassment and loss of face are powerful negative experiences. (p. 84)

Most of these writers, however, cautioned that international students' tendencies to immerse themselves in co-national subculture and to limit social relations with Americans to superficial encounters could prove "self-defeating in the long run" (Church, 1982, p. 552). Such cultural isolation could hinder learning the language, customs, and values of the new culture.

Barriers to Cross-Cultural Social Interaction

Research findings of social adjustment difficulties facing international students have prompted some researchers to explore in greater depth factors inhibiting or complicating social interactions between international students and Americans. Church (1982) specified a number of factors inhibiting positive social interaction between international students and Americans. These factors were:

(a) language problems, (b) cultural differences in both verbal and nonverbal

communicative patterns, (c) ethnocentric attitudes and stereotypes, (d) evaluative or judgmental perceptions, (e) cultural ignorance, (f) different definitions and norms for friendships, (g) fear of rejection from fellow nationals, and (h) the high level of anxiety and threat to self-esteem associated with cross-cultural encounters.

Among various dimensions of such barriers as listed above, the cultural dimension has received increased research attention (Jensen & Jensen, 1983; Paige, 1990; Thomas & Althen, 1989). Thomas and Althen (1989) indicated that cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication patterns, as well as in conceptions and norms for interpersonal relationships, are potent barriers to effective cross-cultural communication and interactions. Paige (1990) also pointed out that cultural differences in values, beliefs, behavioral patterns, and ways of learning and thinking could lead to serious problems in communication and interaction between international students and Americans. He further noted that certain aspects of the new culture are subtle and difficult to recognize, which can be a source of ambiguity and uncertainty for a foreign sojourner. Jensen and Jensen (1983) delineated a number of cross-cultural considerations that need to be appreciated for effective social interactions between Asian students and Americans. They include: (a) idiomatic expressions, (b) various gestures and facial expressions, (c) touching habits, (d) planning, (e) modes of problem-solving, (f) desire for harmony, (g) group-centeredness, (h) third-party mediators, (i) dating habits, and (j) respect for age.

From a nation-wide survey ($N = 163$), Parr, Bradley, and Bingi (1992) found that cultural differences were the area of greatest concern for international students. International students in this study reported that their greatest concerns in terms of adapting to cultural differences were: (a) learning how to interpret and respond to aspects of American culture such as individualism, assertiveness, and competitiveness; (b) understanding how Americans think; and (c) adapting to American norms without compromising their own cultural norms.

Based on interviews with Chinese students, Klein et al. (1971) delineated two factors significant for understanding the nature of the barriers that exist between Chinese students and Americans. The first factor concerns “superficial differences in social behavior” (p. 85) that require cultural learning. The second factor involves the “implicit emotional risks inherent in adaptation to these new ways that stem from basic functional differences in social roles” (p. 85). Klein et al. further suggested:

Briefly what is feared most is the loss of familiar structure and social anchorage, and the absence of a familiar supportive social peer network to fill dependency needs. These fears emerge as a direct function of the contrast between Chinese and American cultures. The Chinese culture is traditional and authoritarian—one in which young people receive a great deal of structure and support both from family and from peers. American culture stresses quite opposite values for young people including self-expression, challenge to the system, independent behavior, informality, and constant change of peer associations. When faced with these conflicting pressures it is easy, especially for the somewhat insecure Chinese student, to fall back into the security provided by the Chinese subculture. (p. 85)

Some indication of the cultural variations complicating social interactions between international students and host nationals will be explored in depth in the

following section.

The Cross-Cultural Perspective

As noted previously, cross-cultural phenomena, including examples of cross-cultural relationships and communication, have been important to international student sojourn experiences. And thus, concepts and theories discussed in cross-cultural psychology would seem to contain some potential benefit for understanding international students' experiences. The literature of cross-cultural psychology is reviewed below as it was found to relate to the cultural dimension of international students' interpersonal experiences and perceptions.

In the cultural sciences tradition, conceived of by Wundt as one of the two identifiable traditions in psychology (van Hoorn & Verhave, 1980, as cited in U. Kim & Berry, 1993), sociocultural contexts and environmental forces have been recognized as important variables influencing psychological phenomena and thus may be incorporated into research designs (U. Kim & Berry, 1993). On the other hand, in the second identified tradition, the natural sciences paradigm, the aim is to find explanations for psychological phenomena by eliminating the context within which the phenomena occur. Thus, sociocultural contexts are treated as extraneous or "nuisance" variables. Although limited in terms of investigating psychological phenomena that are shaped by language and culture, the natural sciences paradigm has, nevertheless, remained the dominant framework in mainstream psychology (U. Kim & Berry, 1993).

Cross-cultural psychology and indigenous psychology are two examples of the cultural sciences tradition. Cross-cultural psychology refers to the “scientific study of the ways in which social and cultural forces shape human behavior” (Segall, Dasen, Berry, & Poortinga, 1990, p. 3). Indigenous psychology is defined as the “scientific study of human behavior (or the mind) that is native, that is not transported from other regions, and that is designed for its people” (U. Kim & Berry, 1993, p. 2). Scientific investigation of indigenous knowledge systems is still in its infancy. The literature reviewed below derives from a variety of sources but primarily from these two fields of psychology, cross-cultural and indigenous, as they relate to cultural variations in terms of interpersonal relationships and interactions.

Individualism Versus Collectivism

One of the central topics of cross-cultural research has been to identify specific dimensions according to which cultures vary. Hofstede’s 1980 book, Culture’s Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values, has been considered the classic contribution to research in this area. Hofstede identified four major dimensions of national cultures that can serve as the basis for comparing the dominant value systems among national cultures. The four dimensions were: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism (versus Collectivism), and Masculinity (versus Femininity). These dimensions were empirically derived from Hofstede’s multi-national survey of work-related values

involving more than 117,000 employees of subsidiaries of International Business Machines (IBM) in 66 countries. The data for the study were collected from 1967 through 1973. Hofstede (1983) defined the four dimensions as follows:

- (1) *Power Distance*, that is the extent to which members of a society accept that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally. A society's Power Distance norm is present in the values of *both* the leaders and the led, and reflected in the structure and functioning of the society's institutions.
- (2) *Uncertainty Avoidance*, that is the level of anxiety within the members of a society in the face of unstructured or ambiguous situations. This anxiety expresses itself in aggressivity and emotionality, in a preference for institutions promoting conformity, and in beliefs promising certainty.
- (3) *Individualism*, which stands for a preference for a loosely knit social framework in which individuals are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families only; as opposed to *Collectivism*, which stands for a preference for a tightly knit social framework in which individuals are emotionally integrated into an extended family, clan, or other in-group which will protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. The word Collectivism in this sense carries no political connotations and does not assume any positions as to the role of the state; it operates at a much smaller scale of social integration.
- (4) *Masculinity*, which stands for a society in which social sex roles are sharply differentiated and the masculine role is characterized by need for achievement, assertiveness, sympathy for the strong, and importance attached to material success; as opposed to *Femininity*, which stands for a society in which social sex roles show considerable overlap and both the masculine and feminine role are characterized by a need for warm relationships, modesty, caring for the weak, and importance attached to the non-material quality of life. (p. 295-296)

According to the country mean scores, Korea and the United States were moderately to highly divergent in all four dimensions. Korean culture showed stronger endorsement toward Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance than did the United States culture. Korean culture was characterized as Collectivistic and Feminine, whereas the United States was highly Individualistic and Masculine

(Hofstede & Bond, 1988).

Among the four dimensions, the Individualism and Collectivism dimension in particular has captured much interest from cross-cultural psychologists in recent research (Hofstede, 1994; Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989). It has been generally accepted that cultures vary in the extent to which they affirm and encourage collectivist or individualist values and behavior in their members. Individualist societies emphasize:

“I” consciousness, autonomy, emotional independence, individual initiative, right to privacy, pleasure seeking, financial security, need for specific friendship, and universalism. Collectivist societies, on the other hand, stress “we” consciousness, collective identity, emotional dependence, group solidarity, sharing, duties and obligations, need for stable and predetermined friendship, group decision, and particularism. (U. Kim, Triandis, Kagitcibasi, S-C Choi, & Yoon, 1994, p. 2)

Bontempo, Lobel, and Triandis (1990) similarly argued that individualist societies place high value on “individual regulation of behavior, self-sufficiency, and separation of personal from ingroup goals,” whereas collectivist societies endorse “ingroup regulation of behavior, interdependence, and the subordination of personal goals to the goals of the ingroup” (p. 200-201). These authors further noted that in individualist societies, the individual is the “center of the psychological field and the self is experienced as distinct from the group” (p. 201). In contrast, in collectivist societies, the “ingroup is the center of the psychological field and the self is viewed as an extension of the ingroup” (p. 201).

The above discussion is based on the dimension of variation at the level of cultural units. The cultural level of analysis is conceptually different from that of

individual-level analysis (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987). Hofstede (1994) himself stressed that the Individualism and Collectivism dimension is “sociological and not at all psychological” and it “does not compare different personalities, but different social contexts within which children grow up and develop their personalities” (p. x). Likewise, Kagitcibasi (1994) pointed out that the constructs of Individualism and Collectivism do not refer to psychological processes at the individual level. Nonetheless, there has been some conceptual confusion surrounding these constructs. In the absence of explanation in terms of specific mediating variables, these cultural-level indices have often been used for describing and explaining psychological phenomena at the individual level (Kagitcibasi, 1994).

U. Kim et al. (1994) also articulated the importance of distinguishing cultures and individuals as separate units of analysis constituting two different levels of analysis. While stressing the need for separating the cultural and the individual level for conceptual and empirical purposes, however, the same authors also pointed out that they are “functionally interrelated” (p. 5). Describing cultures and individuals as “interactive entities” (p. 6), the authors noted that although cultures do not determine the psychological disposition of individuals, they do help shape, through socialization and enculturation, individuals’ attitudes, beliefs, emotions, and behaviors. Individuals, on the other hand, “contribute to the process of maintaining, synthesizing, and changing existing culture” (p. 5). Empirical findings from comparative studies generally show that individuals from

individualistic cultures tend to ascribe to individualistic orientations, and vice versa for individuals from collectivistic cultures (Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989).

Triandis, Leung, Villareal, and Clack (1985) have proposed Idiocentrism and Allocentrism as constituting the psychological or personality dimension in parallel to the Individualism and Collectivism dimension at the cultural or ecological level. Arguing that individuals from a given culture appear to emphasize Idiocentric or Allocentric tendencies in different settings and with different target persons, the authors suggested that a useful approach to the study of this dimension might be to develop “profiles” which would indicate whether the predominant tendency of the individuals was Allocentric or Idiocentric. They also suggested that in the case of a culture with a modal profile that was Idiocentric, the use of the label individualist culture would then be justified. Various measurements designed to tap collectivistic and individualistic tendencies at the individual level have been developed, including the Individualism-Collectivism (INDCOL) Scale (Hui, 1988) and the Cultural Orientation Scale (COS) (Bierbrauer, Meyer, & Wolfradt, 1994).

Another conceptual issue concerning the individualism and collectivism dimension has to do with its dichotomous, unidimensional conceptualization. An examination of the literature reveals that there is a pervasive tendency to treat individualism and collectivism as polar opposites of a single dimension along which cultures or individuals are differentiated. As Ho and Chiu (1994) observed, “Typically, the investigation takes the form of convenient oversimplification:

individualist versus collectivist cultures, or ‘individualists’ versus ‘collectivists’” (p. 137). There is evidence supporting the view that multidimensional models are more appropriate for describing these constructs at both the cultural and individual levels (U. Kim et al, 1994; Triandis et al., 1986). Moreover, it has been suggested that these constructs do not necessarily constitute polar opposites and that there are varying degrees of both individualistic and collectivistic tendencies coexisting in both cultures and individuals (Kagitcibasi, 1994; Triandis, 1995). Studies have documented the coexistence or dialectical synthesis of individualism and collectivism in China (Ho & Chiu, 1994), India (Sinha & Tripathi, 1994), Japan (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1993), Sweden (Daun, 1991), and the United States (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1993).

Further complicating the issue are research findings showing that individuals from the collectivistic cultures tend to exhibit differing behavioral patterns depending on who the other or target person is (Kagitcibasi & Berry, 1989). With these individuals, their behavior revealed collectivistic orientations when in-group members were concerned, but with out-group members their behavior resembled that of individuals from the individualistic cultures (Triandis, Bontempo, et al., 1988). These findings require further clarification and elaboration of the constructs of individualism and collectivism.

Conceptual Models of Views of Self and Relationships

Cross-cultural analysis has challenged the universality of concepts of self and self-other relationship implicitly and explicitly used by theories and models in mainstream psychology. As with psychological concepts in general, these concepts are in important ways socially defined; they are a “cultural product that shows cross-cultural variation” (Kagitcibasi, 1990, p. 144). Many of the assumptions underlying psychological concepts are considered to be bound to Western cultural systems of values and meanings. S-C Choi, U. Kim, and S-H Choi (1993) argued: “Psychology became naturalized in the land of individualism. Its basic foundations became intertwined with the basic assumptions of individualism” (p. 193). The following section provides conceptual models of self and self-other relationship examined from a cross-cultural perspective.

Contrasting Facets of Individualism and Collectivism: Self-Group Relationships

U. Kim (1994; see also U. Kim & S-H Choi, 1994) put forth an alternative model of individualism and collectivism, aimed at integrating individual and group level analysis. He outlined three facets of individualism and three of collectivism. The three types of individualism identified as separate modes are: *aggregate*, *distributive*, and *static*. The three modes of collectivism are: *undifferentiated*, *relational*, and *co-existence*. U. Kim observed that individualism is predicated on the notion that individuals are distinct, autonomous, and independent entities. In

the first mode of individualism, the aggregate mode, the individual is the basic unit of analysis and other individuals serve as cues or stimuli for the focal person. This mode is defined by three important features. First, it stresses distinct and independent individuals with clearly-drawn, firm boundaries between self and other. Second, separation from ascribed relationships, such as family, relatives, clans, and community, is viewed as necessary for the development of the individuated self. Individuals are encouraged to move away from ascribed relationships and to form achieved relationships based on common interests and goals. Third, abstract principles, rules, and norms provide a basis for governing individuals. In this mode, individuals interact with others on the basis of principles such as "equality, competition, equity, noninterference, and exchanges based on contracts" (U. Kim, 1994, p. 29). The aggregate mode is considered to be prevalent in the United States and Canada.

When a group is explicitly defined by common interests and attributes, it adheres to the distributive mode. In this mode, the boundaries of a group are defined by commonality and fluidity. Voluntary organizations, interest groups, and recreational clubs are examples of this type of association. Because the form and degree of participation is voluntary, permanent loyalty is not expected of group members. The group persists if it satisfies the needs and interests of group members. It dissolves when it fails to do so. Another form of distributive mode is defined by contract as in contracts which define a relationship between professionals and clients.

The third type of individualism is the static mode. Whereas individuals in the aggregate mode are bound by normative and ethical principles, individuals in the static mode are bound by laws. Laws are established so that no one person can step beyond the agreed-upon boundaries. The legal system, correctional system, and military are examples of institutions found in the static mode. Everyone in the culture is bound by the same laws and, theoretically, no one enjoys special privileges.

Collectivism is defined by “explicit and firm group boundaries” (U. Kim, 1994, p. 32). Collectivism emphasizes a *we* versus *they* distinction, as opposed to the *I* versus *you* distinction stressed in individualism. In collectivist societies, one of the most important distinctions made about individuals is whether a person belongs to an in-group or an out-group. The emphasis on collective welfare, harmony, and duties typically applies only to the in-group and usually does not extend to out-groups. The first facet of collectivism, undifferentiated mode, is defined by firm and distinct group boundaries, with undifferentiated boundaries between individuals within the group. U. Kim argued that current research on collectivism is representative of this mode. He further argued that in reality, the undifferentiated mode is rare, and that it is often confused with the relational and coexistence mode.

The relational mode is characterized by “porous boundaries between in-group members that allow thoughts, ideas, and emotions to flow freely” (U. Kim, 1994, p. 34). This mode emphasizes a sense of relatedness and bonding among

the members of a group. Three essential elements of this mode are: “the willingness and ability to feel and think what others are feeling and thinking, to absorb this information without being told, and to help others satisfy their wishes and realize their goals” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 229, as cited in U. Kim, 1994). U. Kim suggested that for societies in which the relational mode predominates, including Korea, China, and Japan, socialization for interdependence starts early in life and continues throughout the individual’s life span.

In the coexistence mode the private self is distinctly separated from the public self. The public self is identified with collectivist values, such as interdependence, family loyalty, and in-group solidarity. It coexists with the private self, which espouses individualist values such as self-cultivation and personal ambitions.

Both the undifferentiated and the coexistence modes emphasize “‘sameness,’” whereas the relational mode stresses “‘oneness”” (U. Kim, 1994, p. 39). The undifferentiated and coexistence modes “prescribe behaviors, through existing norms and expectations, that demand role fulfillment at the expense of individuals’ desires, opinions, and ideas” (p. 39). The relational mode, however, “does not necessarily mean sacrificing one’s wishes and goals for the in-group. It implies that working together, collectively and harmoniously, is a way of expressing and enhancing oneself” (p. 39).

Culture of Relatedness Versus Culture of Separateness

Kagitcibasi (1994) claimed that the psychology of relatedness, encompassing relational patterns of dependence/independence and personal boundaries, is a promising domain for cross-cultural psychological analysis of the individualism and collectivism dimension. She explained:

This is because whether the self is defined as separate from others or as partially overlapping with them (i.e., the degree to which self-perception is relational, dependent-independent) or individuated (independent) is conceptually more basic than any other aspects of [individualism/collectivism]. (p. 65)

The constructs of culture of relatedness and culture of separateness Kagitcibasi proposed serve to highlight the cross-cultural dimension of basic human relatedness or relational behavior. The culture of relatedness is defined as consisting of the “family culture and interpersonal relational patterns characterized by dependent-interdependent relations with overlapping personal boundaries,” whereas the culture of separateness is understood as the “opposite pattern of independent interpersonal relations, with separated and well-defined personal boundaries” (p. 62). The cultures of relatedness and separateness are presumed to be mediated through socialization and child-rearing and to constitute the antecedents of some basic cultural variations in essential intra- and interpersonal characteristics.

The model of family proposed by Kagitcibasi explicitly recognizes the coexistence of the two basic competing human needs for agency (autonomy) and

communion (relatedness) (1990, 1994). These needs are viewed as universal across cultures. The behavioral expression of these needs relative to one another, however, is considered to vary across contexts. Kagitcibasi (1994) contended:

Individualism may be conceived as the expression of the need for autonomy and collectivism as that for relatedness. When viewed this way, the psychology of relatedness would again throw light on [individualism/collectivism] at a basic psychological level. Such study would need to assume a dialectic orientation, given the conflicting nature of the two needs involved. Thus an individualism that does not recognize the need for relatedness and a collectivism that does not recognize the need for autonomy would not do justice to the two basic human needs. A dialectical synthesis of the two would appear to be a more optimizing solution. (p. 63)

Independent Versus Interdependent Construals of Self

Markus and Kitayama (1991) contended that people of different cultures hold differing conceptions of self, other, and self-other relationships and that these differing conceptions influence the nature of both intra- and interpersonal phenomena. The authors suggested that independent and interdependent view of the self characterizes the Western and Eastern concepts of self, respectively. In contrasting culturally different views of the self in relationship to others, however, the authors acknowledged substantial within-culture variations. According to Kagitcibasi (1994), these constructs of independent and interdependent self-views could also be interpreted as the psychological conceptualizations of individualism and collectivism, respectively.

In the independent view of the self, the emphasis is on the individual's separateness and independence. The self-knowledge that is most significant in regulating behavior concerns the "decontextualized self" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 21): It is located within the self, encompassing personal desires, preferences, attributes, or abilities. This view of the self "derives from a belief in the wholeness and uniqueness of each individual's configuration of internal attributes" (p. 22). According to the authors, an independent self-system is:

not unresponsive to the social environment, but its responsiveness is dominated by a self-presentational orientation. The independent self-system thus seeks to display or assert attributes or features of the self. The others in a social situation are important, but they are important primarily as standards of social comparison or for feedback that can validate the inner attributes of the self.
(p. 22)

In the interdependent view of the self, the emphasis is on the individual's connectedness and interdependence to others. The self-knowledge that guides behavior concerns the contextualized self, that is "self-in-relation to specific others in particular contexts" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 22). For interdependent selves, self-knowledge of personal attributes and abilities is less important than knowledge of self in specific social relationships. Interdependent selves are characteristically defined by their social relationships, not by their unique, personal attributes. It is suggested that:

[w]ithin cultures that view the self as an interdependent entity, people must find a way to fit in, to belong, to fulfill and create obligation, and in general, to become part of various social units. Constructing a self means connecting one's self to others, not separating out one's self. (p. 22)

In an interdependent formulation of self, others “literally participate in the definition of the self in an ongoing and dynamic way” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 23), playing a role beyond serving as social comparison and validating the self. And therefore, an interdependent self is “not properly characterized as a bounded whole, because it changes structure with the nature of the particular social context” and “what is focal and objectified in an interdependent self is not the individual but the relationships between the individual and other actors” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 23).

The authors hypothesized that whether one holds an independent or interdependent view of self and other has important implications for cognitive, emotional, and motivational processes and their outcomes. Although they did not address contributing factors of culturally different views of self, they pointed to differences in socialization at home and in the schools as the most important determinants of these differences. In concluding their paper, the authors argued for the need of a systematic analysis of the nature and dynamics of interdependence. They pointed to some similarity between the psychology of women and certain Eastern views in that both emphasize and value interpersonal awareness and sensitivity, an essential feature of being interdependent. The authors noted that being interdependent “signifies a conviction that one is able to have an effect on others and is willing to be sensitive and responsive to others and to become engaged with them” (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, p. 42).

Confucianism and Its Influence on Relationships in East Asia

It is widely recognized that Confucianism has exerted a persisting influence on patterns of interpersonal relationships and communication in East Asia (Ishii, 1984; K. Kang & Pearce, 1983; U. Kim, 1994; Yum, 1991). Confucianism is the system of ethics, education, and statesmanship preached by a Chinese philosopher and teacher, Confucius (551-479 B.C.) and his disciples. For over 1000 years Confucianism has endured as the dominant moral and political philosophy in East Asian countries, providing the structural principles and fundamental values for social institutions ranging from the family to the state (K. Kang & Pearce, 1983; Yum, 1987a).

Yum (1991) offered two important reasons why Confucianism has exerted stronger influence than the other religious or philosophical systems of East Asia, such as Buddhism and Taoism. One reason is that Confucianism was adopted as the official political philosophy of the Yi dynasty for 500 years in Korea, of the Tokugawa shogunate in Japan for 250 years, and of many dynasties in China. In these countries, Confucianism was “institutionalized and propagated both through the formal curricula of the educational system and through the selection process of government officials” (Yum, 1991, p. 68). Another reason is that Confucianism is more “pragmatic and present-oriented” in its emphasis than the other philosophical or religious systems (p. 68).

In his comparative analysis of Confucianism and liberalism as the ideological foundation of collectivism and individualism, respectively, U. Kim (1994) described salient features of Confucianism as follows:

Confucianism promotes the collective welfare and harmony as its ultimate goal. Individuals must eradicate within themselves any individualist, hedonistic, and selfish desires in order to be considered persons of virtue. Individuals are conceived of as embedded and situated in particular roles and statuses. They are bound by ascribed relationships that emphasize their common fate. Individuals are encouraged to put other people's and the group's interests before their own. From a societal point of view, individuals are considered to be interrelated through their ascribed roles. Duties and obligations are prescribed by their roles, and they lose "face" if they fail to fulfill their obligations as prescribed. Concession and compromise are essential ingredients in promoting a role- and virtue-based conception of justice. Social order is maintained when everyone fulfills his or her roles and duties. Institutions are seen as an extension of the family, and paternalism and legal moralism reign supreme. A ruler is considered to be a father figure who is paternalistic, moralistic, and welfaristic. (pp. 26-27)

In Confucianism, proper human relationships are considered as the basis of society, and therefore, Confucianism is "most elaborate in explicating proper human relationships and providing proper ways to handle the rituals that function to maintain social order" (Yum, 1987a, p. 75). Confucian ethics include five moral principles intended to regulate the five basic types of human relationships: "*loyalty* between king and subject, *closeness* between father and son, *distinction* between husband and wife, *orders* between elders and youngers, and *faith* between friends" (p. 75). These moral principles stipulate mutual obligations which all parties concerned must honor and fulfill. It should be noted that the relationship between friend to friend was the only relationship based on equality

(Won-Doornink, 1991). The faith or loyalty of male friends was of great importance (Won-Doornink, 1991). The relationships espoused in Confucianism were primarily based upon males relating to males, with the only relationship between males and females of importance being that of husband and wife.

East Asian and North American Orientations to Relationships

In the article titled "The Impact of Confucianism on Interpersonal Relationships and Communication Patterns in East Asia," Yum (1991) explored the ideological roots of differences in cultural perspectives on interpersonal relationship and communication between North America and East Asia. She noted that individualism is central to the American culture, serving as a dominant system of principles regulating interpersonal relationships. The North American emphasis on individualism sharply contrasts with the East Asian's primary concern with social relationships, which is attributed to the Confucian legacy in this region. Yum differentiated the emphasis on social relationships from collectivism on the basis of the view that in East Asia, the "emphasis is on proper social relationships and their maintenance rather than any abstract concern for a general collective body": Therefore, "in a sense, it is a collectivism only among those bound by social networks" (p. 67).

Yum (1991) delineated the following five major cultural differences between East Asia and North America in terms of interpersonal relationship patterns: (1) particularistic versus universalistic relationships, (2) long-term

asymmetrical reciprocity versus short-term symmetrical or contractual reciprocity, (3) in-group/out-group distinction, (4) informal intermediaries versus contractual intermediaries, and (5) overlap of personal and public relationships.

Particularistic Versus Universalistic Relationships

In North America, interpersonal relationships are more universalistic to the extent that people treat each person as an integral individual and apply general rules across interpersonal situations. In contrast, interpersonal relationships under Confucianism are more particularistic. East Asians “differentially grade and regulate relationships according to the level of intimacy, the status of the persons involved, and the particular context” (Yum, 1991, p. 69). Norms and rules for social behavior are predicated on the specific relational context in which interacting parties find themselves. For instance, people are expected to engage in superordinate and subordinate behaviors depending on the others’ status levels relative to their own.

In East Asian countries, an elaborate set of norms and rules for social behavior is developed and prescribed for those whose social position and relationship to oneself are known. However, there is no universal social pattern that can be applied to people who are not known. Triandis (1984) similarly mentioned that whereas the Chinese are socialized to have highly developed interpersonal skills for dealing with in-group members, they have few skills for dealing with people who are unfamiliar. Chang (1977) made a similar observation pertaining to

Koreans that whereas the rules governing the relationship patterns characterized by mutual obligation or indebtedness are elaborate and well-established, those governing relations between strangers in the urban context are notably lacking.

Long-Term Asymmetrical Reciprocity Versus Short-Term Symmetrical or Contractual Reciprocity

In North America, people voluntarily join together for specific purposes and may withdraw from the group they joined without any serious sanctions. People often perceive commitments and obligations as threats to their autonomy or freedom of action. Interpersonal relations are “symmetrical-obligatory--that is as nearly ‘paid off’ as possible at any given moment--or else contractual--the obligation is to an institution or to a professional with whom one has established some contractual base” (Yum, 1991, p. 69).

In contrast, interpersonal relations in East Asia are complementary or asymmetrical and “reciprocally obligatory” (Yum, 1991, p. 69). Under this system of reciprocity, people relate to one another in a web of interlocking obligations. The individual does not calculate what he or she gives and receives, for to calculate would be to “think about immediate personal profits, which is the opposite of the principle of mutual faithfulness” (p. 69). The practice of forming relationships based on complementary obligations leads to warm, lasting human relationships but also to the necessity to accept the obligations accompanying such relationships.

In-Group/Out-Group Distinction

North Americans do distinguish between in-group and out-group members but not as strongly as East Asians do. Affiliation with a group is more voluntary and limited in length. Among East Asians, however, people are affiliated with relatively small and closely knit groups of people over long periods of time and maintain a strong identification with those groups. With strong, long-term identification with in-groups, people make clear distinctions between in-group and out-group members.

Linguistic codes for in-group members are often markedly different from those for out-group members. Triandis, Bontempo, et al. (1988) similarly noted that there tends to be a sharp difference in behavior toward in-groups and out-groups in collectivistic cultures. They also noted that collectivistic tendencies such as conformity are very specific to the in-group.

Within in-groups, relationships rest on mutual dependence among the members (Yum, 1991). It was suggested that:

[t]he individuals enmeshed in such a human network are likely to react to their world in a complacent and compartmentalized way, complacent because they have a [sic] secure and inalienable places in their human group and compartmentalized because they are conditioned to perceive the external world in terms of what is within their group and what is outside it. (Hsu, 1963, as cited in Yum, 1987b, p. 94)

Further, U. Kim (1994) articulated some deleterious consequences of adhering to cohesive, closed in-groups in collectivistic cultures or cultures of relatedness:

In-group loyalty often leads to out-group derogation, and in-group cooperation is often coupled with fierce out-group competition. In-group solidarity often hampers the development and promotion of more encompassing principles, rules, and laws that would protect every individual regardless of his or her group affiliation. These problems arise because of emphasis on particularism rather than universalism. (p. 23)

Informal Intermediaries Versus Contractual Intermediaries

In the United States, intermediaries designated to handle interpersonal relations and tasks are very often such professionals as lawyers, negotiators, therapists, and brokers. And the process of mediation is typically contractual in nature. Intermediaries act as objective third persons who focus on the tasks and negotiate with each party as a separate, independent individual on a professional level (Yum, 1991).

In East Asian countries, the clear distinction between in-group and out-group members necessitates an intermediary to help one initiate a new relationship. Intermediaries tend to be those who have an in-group relationship with both parties and so can link them together. The following are strategies commonly used for creating connection:

One strategy is for the intermediary to bring up an existing relationship that links the two parties, for example, explaining that “you are both graduates of so-and-so college” or “you are both from province A.” Alternatively, the intermediary can use his or her own connections with them to create an “indirect sense of in-groupness,” for example, explaining that one is “my junior from high school” and the other “works in the same department as I do.” (Yum, 1991, p. 71)

Overlap of Personal and Public Relationships

In the United States there is a tendency to draw a rather strict boundary between private and public relationship and life. In order to assure that public life does not impinge on autonomy and self-reliance, people generally strive to distinguish between relationships in public and private spheres as much as possible. In East Asian countries, however, there is a tendency to personalize public relationships. Under the Confucian concept of *i* or faithfulness, a “purely business transaction, carried out on a calculated and contractual basis” is strongly devalued (Yum, 1991, p. 71). People attempt to base interactions with others, including business transactions, on a more personal, human level. It is assumed that “if one develops a warm personal relationship, a good public relationship will follow, because it is based on trust and mutual reciprocity” (p. 71). Consequently, the distinction drawn between personal and public relationship tends to be less clear than in the United States.

The above discussion of the cross-cultural perspective concerning relationships was intended to convey some understanding of difference in interpersonal relationship orientation between the East Asian and North American cultures. In the following section, the specifically Korean cultural perspective concerning interpersonal relationships will be presented. Included also will be sociocultural background factors important to the understanding of Korean international students. In this connection, a brief description of Korea’s history and educational

system is provided.

Korea

Sociocultural Background of Korean International Students

Korea is considered an exceptionally homogeneous society, sharing common blood, history, territory, language, cultural background, and the like (Y. Lee, 1978). Over 99% of Koreans are of a single racial/ethnic group (J. Y. Park & Johnson, 1984). The only significant minority residing in Korea has been the Chinese (Y. Lee, 1978). Traditionally, Korean society remained relatively static culturally and structurally throughout most of its 5,000 year history in spite of recurrent foreign invasions (Yi, 1979). While actively interchanging in terms of culture and trade with its neighboring countries, most notably China and Japan, the traditional Korea retained its unique cultural patterns.

Previously a stable, self-sufficient, agrarian society, Korea has witnessed major political upheavals and rapid socio-economic changes since the turn of this century. The annexation by Japan in 1910 marked the end of the last Korean dynasty (Yi or *Cho-Sun* dynasty), which had endured for some 500 years. During the colonial rule by Japan (1910-1945), Korean society was exposed on a larger scale than previously had been the case to Japanese culture and to Western culture, as filtered through the Japanese (S. Kang, 1976). After Liberation in 1945, the influx of Western culture into Korea grew rapidly to unprecedented

proportions. The Korean War (1950-1953) exposed the nation to direct contact with the Western world. The process of modernization, which began after Liberation, has been accelerated by rapid industrialization since the early 1960s. Along with industrialization, urbanization has been greatly advanced. As late as 1930, the urban population, according to censuses of that time, accounted for only slightly more than 5% of the total population (Chang, 1977). In 1985, however, more than two thirds of the total population lived in urban areas, and nearly one fourth in the capital city, Seoul (Lew, 1988; Song, Smetana, & S. Y. Kim, 1987). Industrialization brought with it tremendous economic growth and resultant increased standards of living: Per capita GNP increased from \$ 87 in 1960, to \$1,508 in 1981, (S-J Choi, 1984) and to over \$10,000 in 1995.

Korean scholars have avidly studied the specific nature and extent of the impact of rapid modernization on Korean society and people. Impact has been considered in terms of family structure, inter-generational relationships, value orientations, morality, social mores, psychopathology, and the like. In contemporary Korean society, various heterogeneous elements coexist, including traditionality and modernity, as well as a plurality of religious creeds and social ideologies. It is generally acknowledged, however, that despite both substantial changes in the socio-economic environment and contact with Western culture and ideologies, the Confucian legacy is pervasively upheld in cultural ideals and precepts of human relationships. This legacy persists in spite of the influence of Buddhism and, more recently, Christianity on Korean culture (Foley & Fuqua, 1988). There has been

continued societal emphasis on social status differentiation and appropriate role behavior. Thus, Korean society has been characterized as “more traditional, conforming, authoritarian, and status-oriented than Western culture” (Song et al., p. 577).

Another area reflecting the legacy of traditional Confucian influences is education. Contemporary Korea is intensely education-oriented and places a high premium on formal education. In traditional formulation of Confucianism a high value was given to book learning and resultant moral insights, as the basis for sustaining the ruling class (Moon, 1991). The sovereign ruler was regarded as a “teacher to the ruled” and as one who was expected to “enlighten and control people by virtues as well as by laws” (Moon, 1991, pp. 6-7). Furthermore, wisdom or liberal education (*chih*) was considered one of the four cardinal principles governing right conduct (Yum, 1991). Confucian scholars, viewed as cultured generalists, were held in the highest esteem (E. M. Park, 1979). In the Yi dynasty, king, teacher, and father “formed one body,” enacting the Confucian model of the society (S. Kang, 1976, p. 59). According to Kang, the residual image of king-teacher-father still lingers in the minds of the Korean people manifested as a tendency to view the leader as “father figure” (p. 59). The traditional esteem for the educated person, combined with the possibility of upward social mobility through educational achievement, has led to what is described as an “abnormally high educational fever” (K. Kim, 1974, p. 6) in contemporary Korea. Korean families invest a great deal in their children’s schooling in terms of financial and

emotional support (Lew, 1988; U. Kim & S-H Choi, 1994).

The modern educational system in Korea has essentially evolved over the course of the past 50 years. In 1947, the School Education Law, based on the principle of equality of educational opportunity, was enacted (Moon, 1991). In the present form, the educational system is divided into six years of elementary school, followed by three years each of middle and high school, and four years of college or university. For the past few decades, Korea has successfully expanded enrollments at both primary and intermediate levels to percentages comparable to those of leading Western countries. Consequently, the Korean population now enjoys almost total literacy (Lew, 1988). Despite adoption of most facets of the modern Western educational system, however, the traditional, autocratic type of relationship between students and teachers still predominates (Moon, 1991). In Korea, teachers “talk and the students do no more than listen” (Moon, 1991, p. 33). As Moon maintained, teachers are to be obeyed rather than questioned and debated, as in contemporary American society.

Korean students must go through a rather regimented and highly competitive educational system until they enter institutions of higher education. At each level of the educational ladder, Korean students are subject to national examination systems used to screen academic advancement. Only about 90% of sixth-grade graduates are permitted to enter middle school; 80% of middle school graduates are admitted to high school; and about 30% of high school graduates (fewer than 10% of Korean students) are permitted to attend a college or a

university (E. M. Park & Johnson, 1984). It is noted that the entrance examination system, which deals exclusively with testing achievement, and the ever-intense competition to enter universities and colleges, have acted to distort the lower levels of education (Moon, 1991). Intermediate education has come to emphasize highly structured cognitive learning at the expense of affective needs and socialization concerns of students. College-bound high school students are under constant pressure from their teachers and parents to invest all of their energy in academic achievement, and as a result many of them suffer from detrimental effects of the "examination inferno" (Moon, 1991, p. 24).

The increasingly severe competition to enter Korean colleges and universities, coupled with economic growth, has apparently led to a remarkable increase in the number of Korean students who opt for colleges and universities overseas. Since the 1980s many students who failed to enter a Korean college or university opted to enroll in U.S. colleges and universities with the number of Korean students enrolled in U.S. undergraduate programs soaring dramatically in recent years (The Korean Students in the U.S., 1991, as cited in Moon, 1991). According to U.S. Bureau of the Census (1992, as cited in S. Kim, 1993), students from Korea comprised approximately 23,000 matriculants, thus making up 5.6% of the total international student population at U.S. institutions of higher education. If compared with the total number of Korean students studying in the United States in 1980, which was approximately 5,000, the 1992 figure represents an overall increase of 460% (S. Kim, 1993).

Prevailing Patterns of Interpersonal Relationships and Interactions

Like many other Asian cultures, Korea has been described as a family-centered and relationship-oriented culture. As discussed earlier, Korean cultural patterns of interpersonal relationships have been greatly influenced by traditional Confucian ideals and precepts. Many specific, basic, and readily identifiable features of such patterns have been preserved among Koreans. The cultural ideals of family cohesion, harmony, and interdependence retain their influence, although contemporary urban family and social life exhibits significant trends away from traditional structures. Most notably, the trend of the nuclear family system has increased in popularity, becoming predominant over the extended family structure (Lew, 1988). Nonetheless, the family continues to be seen as the basic component of society, with the society in turn viewed as an expanded form of the family (J. Choi, 1977). J. Choi observed that Koreans tend to “carry their patterns of conduct in family life to social life in expanded and extended form” (p. 4). He further stated:

The social life of the Korean people is based on home or on human relations at home. All social groups are regarded as large homes. The rule of seniority is applied outside home in its entirety. The obligation to pay respect to superiors and treat elders politely is nothing but an extension or an enlargement of the rule of seniority between father and son and among brothers at home. (p. 9)

Ko (1987) similarly noted that an atmosphere of familism lingers on in the public domain. For instance, a business company is regarded as an “enlarged

family, its president acting as the patriarch and its workers as members of a family” (p. 42). Such familism extends also to student-teacher relationships in which teachers are expected to act as surrogate parents and relate to students in an authoritative and yet nurturing manner. Students in turn are expected to show respect and loyalty to their teachers.

In a paper titled “The Urban Korean as Individual,” Chang (1977) provided a conceptual analysis of traditional patterns of collectivism as well as emerging new trends of individualism in the realm of interpersonal relationships and interactions in the urban setting of contemporary Korea. Chang indicated that although traditional patterns of interpersonal relationships and interactions embedded in the village setting are continually being modified in the contemporary urban context, many traditional elements have, nevertheless, been carried on within the context of urban social life. Traditional elements persist in such forms as collectivism, personalism, authoritarianism, and ritualism. Throughout the period of traditional Korea, which was predominantly agricultural, the rural village constituted the residential unit and a practically self-sufficient subunit of the society. The village was characterized by its geographical isolation and dense housing settlement. And the size of the village was such that everyone knew everyone else. Frequent, intimate interaction among a limited number of village members and widespread cooperation among households for farming led to the development of a strong sense of loyalty or identification of the individual with his village. This pattern of social interaction as derived from the village socio-

economic structure led in turn to the establishment of a closely regulated social system with elaborate, universally agreed-upon rules and standards of proper conduct. Any individual violating the standards within the village was liable for various forms of sanction, importantly including a withdrawal of cooperative aid and imposition of social exclusion by neighbors. In this sense, “the entire village, as much as it was a normative entity, acted as an agency of social control” (Chang, 1977, p. 51).

Chang (1977) contended that the traditional, collectivistic model of relationships between the group and individual--i.e., the group over individual--seems to linger on in urban life. He noted that the typical urban formal organization, whether school, administrative organization, or private company, regulates its members' behaviors not only in the organizational context but also in the extra-organizational context. Hierarchical relationships established among members of a group tend to be carried over into areas outside the official domain. What one does personally and not as a group member is perceived to affect the reputation of the group. Chang maintained:

Such a close merging of the individual with the group in present-day cities is not so much due to the lack of alternate courses of action within the group or organization or of freedom to act outside of the group as to sanctions for departing from the group norm. (p. 51)

The author further commented on the group pressure toward uniformity. Expression of minority opinion is likely to be met with intolerance or disapproval, as it is viewed as breaking the “group solidarity by opposing the majority opinion” (p.

51).

Another prevailing pattern of social interaction is personalism, defined as acting “out of a sense of obligation toward a specific person or group of persons” (Chang, 1977, p. 52). Chang maintained that although in the urban setting people do not always interact with personal acquaintances or with those on whom they depend for a living, as in the traditional village setting, personalism is still widespread. Conscious efforts are made among urban Koreans to expand their network of relationships through becoming well acquainted with many persons on a personal level. According to Chang, personalism is widely practiced not merely for continuity of the traditional pattern but in appreciation of the “utilitarian consequences of maintaining relations based on mutual obligation or indebtedness” (p.

52). He further explained:

To know someone well, i.e., to have him obligated to you, is becoming the means to the end of economic advantage. Personalism in this utilitarian context is characterized by the elaborate principle of reciprocity. Any business done in the personal context is regarded as a favor done by one party to the others, and this favor has to be reciprocated or appreciated properly. (p. 52)

The reciprocity principle inherent in this form of relationship promotes the pattern of preserving the same relationship over an extended period of time, by generating a new obligation through reciprocation of the old one. Another aspect of personalism is that one is not free to withdraw from relations bound by personalism, for the withdrawal implies the violation of the implicit yet potent rule of mutual support. And, therefore, “as long as personalism prevails in the city, the

urban Korean is neither free from personal ties nor is he completely alienated from the community. In other words, he is not lonely” (Chang, 1977, p. 52). The author further noted that whereas the rules governing relationships characterized by personalism are well established, those governing relations between strangers are notably lacking. As such, personalism prevalent in city life “stands in the way of establishing a system of regulations, or law, for governing the system of interaction involving a plurality of individuals, any one of whom does not know everybody else” (Chang, 1977, p. 52).

A third interpersonal pattern discussed is authoritarianism, which reflects the Confucian conception of the social order. In the traditional formulation of Confucianism, the social order was predicated primarily on hierarchical human relations and emphasis of unilateral obedience on the part of the subordinate to the superior. In traditional Korea, each hierarchical relation was structured by minutely elaborated guidelines, encompassing language, gesture, and manner, whereas guidelines associated with egalitarian relations were predominantly absent. Chang (1977) argued that with still no egalitarian model of interpersonal relations in the offing, the traditional pattern of interaction based on authoritarianism continues to permeate both private and public sectors. He further argued that although the new constitution adopted by modern Korea represents the formal principle of egalitarianism, this principle still remains merely an ideal.

Ritualism is another anciently standing, traditional pattern which continues to prevail in the urban setting. Chang (1977) noted that such a persistent pattern

of close interpersonal relations within an authoritarian context inevitably fosters a high degree of sensitivity to other people's evaluation of oneself. In traditional society, in which proper conduct for the person of a certain position with regard to others was narrowly defined for the purpose of preserving status differentiation, ritualism consisted primarily in observing prescribed patterns of action while in the presence of others. In contemporary society, in which the ascribed status differentiation is lacking, ritualism continues to exist as manifested in urban Koreans' efforts to "create a new system of status differentiation ... by inventing various forms of ritual such as buying a more expensive foreign car ... sending children to a wellknown high school or playing golf" (Chang, 1977, p. 54).

Thus, in Chang's analysis, despite urbanization and a move toward individualism in Korean society, collectivism, personalism, authoritarianism, and ritualism remain influential and pervasive. In terms of individualism rising within the urban context in which the above described traditional patterns linger on, Chang (1977) argued:

[T]he city as community not only provides alternate courses of action but also reduces organized pressure on the individual due to the lack of moral integration, thereby rendering an increased degree of freedom to the urban individual to take the initiative in making decisions which affect himself and others with whom he interacts. (p. 55)

The form of individualism emerging in the urban context in Korea, however, stands in contrast to that in the West in that individualism is not yet fully and explicitly institutionalized as part of the social structure as in the West (Chang, 1977). Consequently, urban Koreans still find themselves in a situation within

which alternative socially expected or institutionalized criteria and standards of conduct are either unavailable or nonexistent. This form of individualism is thus called “individualism by default,” as differentiated from “individualism by ideal” (Levy, 1952, p. 258, as cited in Chang, 1977) and it is “developing neither as a faith nor as an ideology” (p. 56). The author concluded that the urban Korean has yet to develop necessary internal mechanisms which make it possible that “the self-seeking of one individual...still give scope to the self-seeking of the other” (Dore, 1958, p. 390, as cited in Chang, 1977).

Child-Rearing and Socialization

The following conceptual and empirical analyses of child-rearing and early socialization process in Korea reflect the strong cultural emphasis on relational mode (U. Kim, 1994) in Korean society (S-H Choi, 1991; U. Kim, 1994; U. Kim & S-H Choi, 1994). Kagitcibasi (1994) suggested that culture’s relational orientations are mediated through socialization and child-rearing, and that research into these areas could help illuminate differences and similarities in the psychology of relatedness across cultures.

T’aekyo and Mother-Child Relationship

U. Kim (1994) observed that in traditional Korea, “socialization for interdependence starts in the prenatal period and continues throughout the individual’s life” (p. 34). Two important concepts emphasizing a mother’s

relatedness to her child are *t'aekyo* and maternal dew (Yu, 1984, as cited in U. Kim & S-H Choi, 1994). *T'aekyo* refers to the traditional form of prenatal care and maternal dew is defined as an indigenous Korean concept denoting a mother's intrinsic love for her child. *T'aekyo* provided specific prescriptive guidelines for prospective mothers to observe during their pregnancy. For instance, pregnant women were encouraged to entertain positive thoughts and feelings and experience pleasant events, while avoiding unpleasant and ominous objects and events. These prescriptions stemmed from the belief that every aspect of a mother's experience during her pregnancy would directly affect and leave lasting imprints on both the physical character and psychological makeup of the fetus. These prescriptions were intended to cultivate and heighten awareness of the psychological and biological connection between mother and child. U. Kim and S-H Choi (1994) observed:

The rigors of *t'aekyo* lead a mother to become keenly aware of the unique psychological and biological bonds she has with her unborn child. A mother observing *t'aekyo* is constantly reminded of her role as surrogate *umwelt* for her child. As the unborn child grows in her womb, so does the relational bond between her and the child. By the time the baby is actually in her arms, she has already developed a potent sense of relatedness of her child. (p. 240)

Korean mothers were also taught to believe that after the child is born, he or she must have symbolic "dew" coming from the mother, an essential psychological nutrient (U. Kim, 1994, p. 34). The child's psychological well-being and physical health are considered the principal responsibilities of the mother. The mother must remain close to the child to indulge the child with this emotional

nourishment. The belief is that “maternal dew propagates the existence of an unseen but powerful bond between mother and child” (U. Kim, 1994, p. 34).

Communicative Socialization Processes: Korea and Canada

S-H Choi's comparative study (1990; see also S-H Choi, 1992) of communicative socialization processes among Korean and Canadian mother-child dyads demonstrated patterns of mother-child interactions among the Korean group that were distinctly different from those found among the Canadian group. Korean mother-child interactions were characterized by a communicative pattern wherein mother and child were “relationally attuned to one another in a fused state” (S-H Choi, 1992, p. 120): Korean mothers merge themselves with the children, freely enter the children's reality, and speak for them. In contrast, Canadian mother-child interactions were characterized by an “individually-attuned” (S-H Choi, 1992, p. 120) communicative pattern. Canadian mothers “withdraw themselves from the children's reality, so that the children's reality can remain autonomous,” and instead of working within the children's reality, they “stay in their own reality and invite the children to come out to the shared social context” (S-H Choi, 1990, p. 142). S-H Choi (1990) suggested that Canadian mothers' communicative management style introduces the children to a specific conceptual framework of how to view a social context.

[T]he Canadian mothers' “independent-partner-management” style provides the Canadian children with a view of individually-attuned social relationships. Unlike the Korean mothers, a larger portion of the Canadian

mothers' social faces consists of their individual properties. Even when situated in a position of the caregiver of the children, the individual portion of their faces remains predominant. The individuated force of the Canadian mothers' face in turn leads to an individuated perspective of the children. ... The children are dealt with more or less in the same way that the mothers would deal with adult partners. The children are assumed to grow with a sharper awareness of the individual properties of their social faces. (S-H Choi, 1990, p. 150)

Korean mothers' introduction of the children to the intricacies of social relationship is based on principles quite different from those of the Canadian context, thus similarly eliciting different results:

The Korean mothers' "assistant-management" style introduces the children to a relationally-attuned social relationship. Neither the mothers nor the children are recognized as independent individuals. Their interaction distinctly remains as one between the caregivers and the care-receivers. Socialized in this pattern of a psychosocial relationship, the Korean children may come to understand the meaning of social or social context as a composition of many relationally defined selves. The concept of *social* would be understood as necessarily accompanying a certain relational map. ... the Korean children can be said to learn that their social face presented in a social context must be pictured with relational properties, but not with individually defined idiosyncratic characters. (S-H Choi, 1990, p. 149-150)

S-H Choi (1990) pointed out that individually-attuned psychosocial relationship, described above, does not connote "individualistic, self-interested tendency" (p. 150). She noted that the fundamental difference between relationally-attuned and individually-attuned relationship is that in the former, the communicative context between mother and child is constructed on the basis of their relationally defined roles and positions, whereas in the latter, the individual properties of mother and child take on greater prominence.

Indigenous Relational Concepts: *Woori*, *Cheong*, and *Uye-ri*

Woori and *Cheong*

S-C Choi, U. Kim, and S-H Choi (1993) provided theoretical and empirical analyses of the concepts of *woori* (alternately spelled *uri*) and *cheong* (or *chong*), concepts they viewed as representative of the relational orientation or mode in Korean culture. These terms are used in everyday Korean language, thus representing Korean people's understanding of a shared social reality. *Woori*, a pronoun meaning "we," "us," "our" in Korean, represents an inclusive group of people. This word is used to denote not only a group of people, but also an entity (such as our nation) and possessions (such as our house). In an open-ended survey comparing Korean and Canadian university students' responses to the concept, *woori* or we, the authors found that the most salient psychological connotation of *woori* in the Korean sample was the affective bond shared by the members of a group. The Korean students studied viewed the affective bond as essential for uniting group members into a coherent whole. It was reported that more than half of the responses to the word, *woori*, clustered around affective words such as "affection (or *cheong*)," "intimacy," "comfort," and "acceptance." The second most dominant theme was viewing the group as a unit or an entity. Expressions such as "oneness," "sameness," "bonding," and "of the same kind" were used to represent the group. Other themes identified were "commonality," "cooperation," and the notion of a group as an aggregate of individuals, "me and

others.” Both cultural groups tended to identify the same groups as primary-- family, friends, and classmates: The contrasting feature between groups in Korean and Canadian cultures tended not to be “in external criteria such as the type of a group, but in internal characteristics such as affective bonds that help to consolidate the group as an entity” (S-C Choi et al., 1993, p. 204).

Cheong is another important concept that, along with the concept *woori*, captures the essence of human relatedness in Korean culture. *Cheong* is considered the “fundamental basis of Korean emotionality” (S-C Choi et al., 1993, p. 206). Narrowly translated as human sentiments or feelings, *cheong* is a complex concept, encompassing compassion, care, sympathy, warmth, and human-heartedness. It arises from close attachment to persons, places, or objects. *Cheong* “does not develop in a contractual, commercial, and rational relationship” (U. Kim, 1994, p. 35). *Cheong* is the “emotional glue” by which members of an ingroup are bound (S-C Choi et al., 1993, p. 198). Family in Korean culture is a prototype of a primary group relationship in which members learn to share with, to care for, and to trust in one another. The family serves as a model for future relationships. Children are encouraged to establish similar relationships based on *cheong* in other contexts, in school and later in life in the workplace.

S-C Choi et al. (1993) discussed findings from an open-ended survey designed to explore notions and experiences of *cheong* among a group of Korean university students in Korea. From responses to the survey question asking for personal associations with how a person develops *cheong*, the following four

major features were identified: (1) spending a long time together with that person, especially in one's childhood; (2) living together or close to one another, and sharing both good and bad times together; (3) "human-heartedness," including elements such as warmth, comfort, and caring; and (4) accepting the other person unconditionally, with complete understanding and trust, and overlooking even the weaknesses and defects of the other person. Another survey question asking for identification of personal experiences in which *cheong* had developed elicited similar responses. Time, co-residence, long-term *woori* experience, and sharing both positive and troubled experiences and emotions together were listed as important factors in developing *cheong*. Three important features emerged to describe a person full of *cheong*. The most important feature mentioned was willingness to help others. The second feature was readiness to show empathy, sympathy, and considerable concern for other people's feelings, problems, and situations. The last feature emphasized the "overly simple, honest, sincere, unsophisticated, and uncalculating nature of *cheong*, to the extent that it might be viewed as foolish by others" (S-C Choi et al., 1993, p. 206). In describing a person for whom it would be difficult to develop *cheong*, the following various characteristics were mentioned: hypocritical, arrogant, selfish, calculating, indifferent, cool-headed, self-centered, independent, and perfectionist. Similar descriptions were made to describe a person without *cheong*: a person who has no sympathy for other people's pain and problems, a selfish person, a cool-headed person, and an apathetic person.

In synthesizing results from the two studies exploring concepts of *woori* and *cheong*, respectively, S-C Choi et al. (1993) concluded:

Woori represents collective consciousness and *cheong* is the affective bond that consolidates *woori* members together. Both *woori* and *cheong* require that the people involved spend a long time together. Spending time together and coresidence allow group members to develop a trusting, sharing, and caring relationship. Time, coresidence, and shared experiences are preconditions for individual members to become consolidated into a collective unit. Individual members learn to be altruistic, sacrificing, and caring. This promotes relationship centeredness and group solidarity over individual interests. Individual members are encouraged to open their *ma-eum* (translated as mind, spirit, heart, or idea) to other members of the group. This allows *cheong* to flow and bind members together. Individuals judged as hypocritical, selfish, apathetic, or rational are considered as unwilling to or incapable of opening their *ma-eum* to others. They are labeled as lacking in *cheong* and may experience difficulty becoming part of the *woori* group. (p. 207)

Uye-ri

Another culture-bound concept, *uye-ri*, has been analyzed by Yum (1987b) in terms of its particular role in and prevailing effect on Korean interpersonal relationship and communication patterns. Like *woori* and *cheong*, this concept is part of everyday Korean language. In discussing the Confucian origin and meaning of this concept, Yum noted that the original meaning of *uye-ri* is close to justice or a just cause, and that it was used as an antithesis to personal or individual interest and profit called *ri*. In the current use of the term, the meaning of *uye-ri* is closer to faithfulness. *Uye-ri* places value on the internal conscience of human nature as opposed to personal interest or profit. *Uye* (alternately spelled *i*) is one of the elements required of a *gun-ja*, a learned, well-rounded scholar,

viewed as the model man in Confucianism. The *gun-ja* seeks *uye* whereas the *so-in*, or small-minded man perceived to be opposite of the *gun-ja*, pursues *ri*, self-interest or material profit. To Korean Confucianists, the focus of *uye-ri* ideology was to enhance the original human nature and true conscience and to suppress the worldly desires and aspirations.

Uye-ri as a social rule guarantees reciprocity and mutual dependence. Through *uye-ri*, people find social, economical, and political support. One can “find a close confidant, a money lender, and even a matchmaker in one’s closely knit group bound by *uye-ri*” (Yum, 1987b, p. 98). To be viewed as a man of “good *uye-ri*” is to secure a “good standing” among one’s peers. In the early conception of *uye-ri* the notion of reciprocity was weak even though it existed implicitly. In the current form, reciprocity plays an important role in maintaining *uye-ri* as a social rule governing interpersonal interaction. *Uye-ri* involves complementary and obligatory form of reciprocity, where a person is forever bound by indebtedness to others, who are in turn indebted to some other people. Under *uye-ri*, reciprocity is not necessarily immediate and kept symmetrical, “nor does it have to be promised, for both parties understand that they are bound by *uye-ri*” (Yum, 1987b, p. 91).

The three main sources that incur *uye-ri* in Korea are blood relations, regional relations, and school relations (classmates and teachers). School ties are second in importance only to family ties. The concept, *uye-ri*, however, is not used to describe one’s loyalty to family, which is demonstrated by filial piety.

School ties, especially high school ties, are considered the strongest *uye-ri* incurring relationships. In the university, people are already concerned about *ri* (personal gain) even in selecting friends, whereas friendships formed in high school are based solely on *uye-ri*. The practice of *uye-ri* can “create warm, lasting human relationships in Korea because, under *uye-ri*, one does not calculate what one gives and receives” (Yum, 1987b, p. 93).

It is suggested that *uye-ri* can function as a social rule only in a society which emphasizes and reinforces mutual dependence or interdependence that requires one to be affiliated with relatively small and tightly knit groups of people over a long period of time. *Uye-ri* can work in such a society as “one expects the reciprocation of what one does to the other and that one anticipates that he or she will have to depend on others some other times” (Yum, 1987b, p. 94).

Uye-ri generates and is maintained by a strong sense of cohesion within a group, but it can create serious problems of divisiveness between groups. *Uye-ri* is contingent on a “specific group principle or group spirit,” as opposed to a code of ethics that can be applied universally. It is called for only among those belonging to the same *uye-ri* incurring group. The in-group members are “completely involved with each other but very indifferent toward outsiders” (Yum, 1987b, p. 93). It is suggested that *uye-ri*, “in its secularized, current form and meaning, has been criticized as the main cause of the serious factionalism in Korea” (Yum, 1987b, p. 93).

Linguistic Codes and Communication Patterns

Linguistic codes and patterns of communication in Korean society reflect a distinct cultural emphasis on status differentiation, a predominant tendency to define self and others in social role terms, and a sharp distinction between in-groups and out-groups. As discussed before, Korean language is highly differentiated according to age, sex, social ranking, the degree of intimacy, and the level of formality (Yum, 1991). An elaborate honorific linguistic system exists along with extensive differentiation of linguistic codes in reference terms, nouns, pronouns, and verb forms. Depending on status difference and intimacy between those who are interacting, differing codes are used in communication with great care. The following description of Japanese communication pattern applies equally as well to Korean language:

Early in any conversation, the Japanese person is compelled to ask the age of the person to whom he is speaking, especially if the other person is of the same sex and approximately equal class. For it is incredible to the Japanese that any two people could be exactly equal, and age is the prime discriminator. In fact, the Japanese language almost demands a deference in the use of words toward anyone as little as a year older than oneself, and one cannot feel comfortable speaking in Japanese unless he knows that the politeness level of his language is suited to the age of the person he is addressing. (Becker, 1983, p. 141)

Similarly, when two Koreans are first introduced, they typically engage in a sequence of small talk in order to acquire basic socio-demographic information, including age, schools they graduated from, and the regional connection (province, city, or village). As Yum (1987b) observed, "this process of obtaining personal

information from each other may seem extremely nosy and an intrusion of privacy to many Westerners, but to Koreans it is a necessary initial procedure in order to determine each other's social position and the potential for invoking an *uye-ri* relationship" (p. 96).

Further, an elaborate set of titles and terms of address are used in everyday communication. Family and kin members use kin terms which mark difference in seniority among the members such as generation and age. And one should not call one's kin member of higher ranking by his or her personal name but by an appropriate kin term (J. Choi, 1977). These highly stratified linguistic codes are considered to have developed in order to accommodate the hierarchical social relations in traditional Confucian society.

Another salient characteristic of Korean linguistic codes is that titles, role terms, and kin terms, rather than personal names, are typically used as terms of address. Teknonymy (e.g., addressing people as "mother of X" or "grandfather of Y") is also widespread (Fiske, 1993). Moreover, kin terms are commonly used as terms of address even toward non-family members. For instance, a man near one's father's age, whether a family friend or a casual acquaintance, might be called "*a-jo-ssi*," meaning uncle (David, 1971). In senior-junior social relationship, the junior person might call the senior one *on-ni* (older sister) or *hyung* (older brother) although they are not blood-related. Further, even in communication involving two persons, actual titles or role terms, such as professor, father, and older sister, are commonly used in place of personal

pronouns, “you” and “I.” Personal or possessive pronouns are often omitted in utterance and when they are used it is often “we,” “us,” or “our” (Paek, 1990). A boy might refer to “our mother” or “our father” in speaking with others even if he is an only child in his family. In accordance with the centrality of social relationships in Korean culture, these reference systems serve to accentuate the relationally defined roles and positions as opposed to identifying the addressee as a unique individual.

Still another salient characteristic is a sharp distinction between communication behavior toward in-group versus out-group members. Yum (1987b) noted that some communication patterns function to strengthen the cohesiveness and solidarity of one’s in-group whereas others act to differentiate one’s group from others. Confiding in one another functions as the former, whereas “*humdam* (gossip and backbiting)” (Yum, 1987b, p. 97) functions as the latter. Among in-group members bound by such principle as *uye-ri*, people are expected to self-disclose and withhold no secrets from one another. Such high level of self-disclosure is done with the “expectation that one is not going to be found at fault by the in-group for whatever one says” (Yum, 1987b, p. 97). On the other hand, when dealing with out-group members, Koreans tend to be cautious about what to say and how to talk, which makes such interactions rather formal. As such, communication among Koreans is often confined to one’s in-groups.

Against out-groups, it is not uncommon that a large amount of *humdam* is used. *Humdam* literally means conversation about the faults of others (Yum,

1987b). Whereas a fault or mistake by an in-group member is accepted or even justified, the same fault or mistake would be subject to *humdam* if found in an out-group member. Yum (1987b) pointed out that although *humdam* can hinder intergroup cooperation, sometimes leading to slander, it is “not a separate, defective communication act by itself but an act embedded in the social interaction patterns of group centeredness, social relatedness, and *uye-ri*” (p. 98).

Summary

The above review of sojourner research has indicated various issues and difficulties attendant to social adjustment of international students studying in the United States. Constructs and theoretical formulations selected from the literature of cross-cultural psychology, as reviewed in this chapter, have suggested culturally-varying conceptions and patterns of interpersonal relationships. The cross-cultural perspectives suggested may serve to enhance understanding of the cultural dimension of identified barriers to social interaction between international students and U. S. host nationals. Examination of patterns of interpersonal relationships and communication prevailing in Korean society has revealed a distinct cultural emphasis on the relational mode. Understanding of the Korean perspective concerning relationships may help to inform the process of identifying Korean international students’ culturally-influenced conceptions and orientations toward interpersonal relationships.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Researcher as Research Instrument

Researchers are no longer presumed to be value-free and objective in their process of inquiry (Hoshmand, 1989; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Researchers' beliefs, assumptions, and values, often implicit and unstated, influence what they find and how they find it (Unger, 1983). In the qualitative research paradigm, which relies more explicitly on a human instrument for data collection and analysis than do traditional approaches, subjectivity is openly acknowledged as part of the research process. Researchers are thus urged to make explicit how their world-views, beliefs, and the "meaning context available" (Hoshmand, 1989, p. 7) affect what they observe and how they interpret their observations. I recognize that my experiences and my personal and cultural background influence my view of any given reality. My view of reality, in turn, influences what and how I strive to understand in relation to reality. With these things in mind, I offer some of my own life experiences that have influenced my worldview and personal beliefs, which in turn have helped to shape and guide my decisions regarding development of the present study.

I was born and raised in a big city in South Korea. I completed all of my

formal education in the same city. I earned a bachelor's degree in English language and literature, along with a high school English teaching certificate from a national university. Upon graduation, I began to work for a girls' senior high school in the same city, teaching English and guiding senior high school students as a supervisory teacher. After having taught for several years, I came to the United States to study counseling psychology.

Before coming to the United States, my exposure to American and other foreign cultures was mainly through the mass media, such as television and foreign films, as well as through the foreign literature I was exposed to during and after my formal education. My interpersonal contact with Americans was largely limited to those teaching conversational English to college students in classroom or group settings. During my college years, however, I met with a small group of Catholic priests from Austria and Germany who had been living in or near my hometown for a number of years. With these European sojourners I came to develop my first, long-term cross-cultural relationships, which remain meaningful to this day.

During the past several years in the United States, I have had an overall enriching and rewarding sojourn experience, both academic and personal, with minimal difficulties in cross-cultural adjustment. I have been fortunate to meet American friends, classmates, and faculty members who are open-minded and appreciative of who I am and what I bring to our interpersonal interactions and relationships. Personal relationships with some American friends and faculty

members have evolved into deep and authentic relationships over the years.

My professional training in counseling psychology and interpersonal experiences in the United States, however, have heightened my awareness of cultural variance in modes of human relating, as well as individual differences within a given culture. Studying and working in a foreign land, along with my visits back home, have provided me with ample opportunity to wonder about and reflect on the complex interrelationship between individuals and the cultures which sustain them as their psychosocial environment or “holding environment” (Winnicott, 1965, as quoted in Kegan, 1982, p. 115). As an Asian international student studying American psychology, I could not help but remain attentive to culture-bound values and assumptions underlying psychological models and theories that are taught in the United States. Therefore, it is only natural that I have been engaged in an on-going process of critically examining how these models and theories do or do not accurately reflect my own personal experiences, as well as my own understanding of Korean psychology. Thus, my own sojourn experience, far from my home culture and lasting for an extended period of time, has provided me with the intellectual scope with which to take a new look at my own culture and to begin to “re-cognize” its strengths and limitations from my own emergent cross-cultural perspective. In a sense, my whole sojourn experience in the United States could be regarded as an informal participatory cross-cultural study spanning several years, for which I have been functioning not only as the investigator, but also as an important, most readily available “subject” for the study. During this

time, I have been “observing” and “studying” myself, others of differing nationalities (U.S. nationals, Koreans, and other internationals), and the modes of relating between myself and these others. In this regard, the present investigation might be viewed as merely a formalized version of a more personal on-going study, which allows me to look into experiences and views of other Korean international students in the United States.

Along with these life experiences, I bring certain assumptions, beliefs, and values to the present study. First, I assume that there are fundamental yearnings in all of us irrespective of our cultural backgrounds, most importantly yearning for inclusion and affiliation and yearning for distinctness and autonomy (Kagitcibasi, 1994; Kegan, 1982). I see greater potential for cross-cultural applicability in psychological developmental models which recognize the ever-present dynamic tension between the fundamental human yearnings or needs than in traditional models in which psychological development has been conceived of as a uni-directional movement from dependence to independence. I believe that development proceeds through an on-going process of differentiation and integration within relational contexts, rather than through disengagement and separation (Jordan, Kaplan, J. B. Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991).

Second, I recognize that cultures tend toward favoring one over the other, either autonomy or inclusion, and that the given culture, as the holding environment, exerts influence in significant ways as to how its members negotiate the tension between inclusion and independence, a tension which resides both within

the individual members themselves and within their relationships with others. However, I reject the notion of human beings as mere products of their native cultures, with value orientations and worldviews totally determined by internalized cultural ideologies and prescriptions. I assume that there is a mutual shaping and influence between the culture and the individuals who are its constituents: We interactively shape the cultural milieu within which we are embedded, even as we are shaped by it.

Third, on the basis of my personal and clinical experiences with persons of diverse cultural heritages and nationalities, I believe that meaningful personal and working relationships can blossom across cultures, transcending differences in language and sociocultural background. I also believe that at their best, cross-cultural interpersonal encounters can be enriching and informing experiences, wherein interactants come to look at their own culture as mirrored in the other's eyes and thus become more aware of their own cultural embeddedness.

It is with these life experiences, beliefs, and assumptions that I have approached the present study, an undertaking which has served as the first formal step in my quest to understand the complex interrelationship between individual and culture, specifically in the area of conceptions of self and relationships.

Methodological Conceptualizations

Unger (1983), Hoshmand (1989), and M. Q. Patton (1990) have suggested the importance of selecting methodologies appropriate to research questions

proposed. M. J. Patton (1991) contended that the nature of research questions is a fundamental consideration when deciding upon methods of inquiry. Primary consideration of central research questions for this study was directed toward investigating how participants experience, perceive, and make sense of their interpersonal experiences with others, both American and Korean. Given its “emphasis on understanding or the illumination of meanings” (Hoshmand, 1989, p. 13), qualitative methodology seemed most appropriate for the purpose of the present study.

Qualitative interviewing has been widely and effectively employed as a technique for discovering and describing phenomena as understood from the perspectives of participants. The fundamental principle of qualitative interviewing is for the researcher to “provide a framework within which respondents can express their own understandings in their own terms” (M. Q. Patton, 1990, p. 290), as opposed to having the researcher supply predetermined phrases and categories that must be used by respondents to express themselves. Among the varying approaches to qualitative interviewing delineated by M. Q. Patton, I decided that the interview guide approach, or formal semi-structured interview, would be the most appropriate method for the present study. The interview guide approach provides necessary focus for the interview while at the same time allowing for flexibility in sequencing and wording questions.

Participants

Research Population

The research population for this study consisted of international students from the Republic of Korea who were enrolled for undergraduate or graduate programs at a large Midwestern university. According to the listing of international students provided by the university's office of international student services, a total of 72 Korean students were enrolled at the university for the fall semester of 1993. Slightly less than one third of the Korean students were female ($n = 23$). Only 8 members of the total were married and information concerning student age was not available.

However, it should be noted that the above listing did not represent the entire Korean student population at the university. A separate group of Korean students were attending an English language institute affiliated with the university. Students enrolled at the English language institute were all international students. Therefore, for this group of Korean students, all interactions with both peers and faculty, at least within the classroom setting, transpired as part of a context wherein all students were non-Americans. Thus, the interpersonal experiences of these students with peers, as well as with faculty, may not have accurately reflected the experiences of other international students enrolled in regular degree programs. For this reason, Korean students enrolled in the English language institute ($N = 20$) were excluded from the present study.

The intention was also to exclude from the study Korean students who, even though current in enrollment in university classes, had not spent at least one semester in attendance at the university in which the study took place, or at another American institution of higher education, or some combination of the two, prior to the time of interview. This decision was based on the recognition that limited exposure to American people and culture, due to the students' relatively short duration of stay, might make it difficult for them to respond to some of the study's interview questions concerning participants' interpersonal relationships with Americans. The listing provided by international student services used for sample selection had been compiled during Fall semester of 1993. At the time of the study, this was the only such official record available to the researcher. The selection of participants for the study in March of 1994 using the Fall list included only individuals with at least two consecutive semesters of enrollment, thus meeting in all possible cases participation requirement. And thus, it was not necessary to reject any of the participants chosen. Details of the purposeful sampling method used for making these selections is delineated in the following section.

Selection of Participants

Participants were recruited by purposeful sampling (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; M. Q. Patton, 1990) as opposed to random sampling, in order "to select information-rich cases whose study will illuminate the questions under study" (M.

Q. Patton, 1990, p. 169). M. Q. Patton (1990) defines information-rich cases as "those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling" (p. 169). Among various purposeful sampling methods delineated by M. Q. Patton, intensity sampling seemed most appropriate for the present study in that an intensity sample comprises excellent or rich examples of the phenomenon of interest, but not unusual, extreme, or deviant cases.

The research sample consisted of 24 Korean international students. This sample was small enough to permit in-depth interviewing and large enough for individual variations to emerge. In addition, to maximize opportunities for uncovering similarities and variations in participants' experiences and views, an effort was made to secure a cross-sectional sample of participants. The research population was divided into four groups according to sex and undergraduate/graduate academic level. Six participants were selected from each for the study. Selection of participants from each of these four groups was based on consideration of the additional variables of age, academic major, living arrangements, marital status, and lengths of stay in the United States. These variables as well as the primary grouping factors of sex and academic level have been discussed in the literature in terms of their correlation with international students' social interactions with Americans (M. Y. Lee, Abd-Ella, & Burks, 1981). A central consideration to selection of the study sample was to provide equal representation according to sex, even though the identified population contained fewer female members than

male members. The female subgroup in the sample (12 of 23) may thus have a higher level of representativeness of population females than does the male sample (12 of 49) of population males.

Names of potential participants were obtained through two sources: the office of international student services and the Korean student association at the university where the study took place. From the mailing lists obtained from these sources, a sample of 22 students was selected. An additional 4 participants were chosen from the same population pool for pilot interviews. Two from the 4 pilot interviews, those which followed the revised final interview format, were incorporated into the larger study.

Potential participants were contacted by telephone. At the time of contact the researcher presented in some detail the purpose of the study, interview procedures, and issues of confidentiality. Upon agreement to participate, an individual interview was scheduled, mutually agreeable to both parties. A letter confirming the interview arrangements was sent to those who agreed to participate in the study (see Appendix A). The phone number of the researcher was made available to prospective participants in case they had any concerns or questions pertaining to the nature and procedure of the study. All but one student contacted agreed to participate.

Research Instruments

Demographic Information Form

A questionnaire was used to obtain demographic data (see Appendix B). The questionnaire was intended to seek information in several areas, including sex, age, marital status, academic level, college major, family and educational background, religion, living arrangement, self-evaluation of English proficiency, length of stay in the United States, and length of stay both at the current university and any other U.S. higher educational institution(s) the individual participant had previously attended.

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

The semi-structured interview guide consisted of researcher-generated questions, serving to initiate as well as to guide the interviews (see Appendix C). Interview questions were open-ended and heuristic in nature, and were designed to encourage the participants to reflect on and articulate their experiences and views of human relationships. These questions served as a base from which the interviewer could ask follow-up questions to probe and clarify the reasoning of the interviewee, as well as to gain understanding of the subjective and uniquely personal meanings of constructs used in the course of discussion.

The interview guide, then, consists of four parts. Part one explores the interviewee's experiences and views concerning relationships with Korean friends,

peers, and faculty. Part two focuses on the interviewee's experiences and views concerning relationships with American friends, peers, and faculty. Part three asks the interviewee's overall views of similarities and differences in interpersonal relationships between Koreans and Americans. Finally, in part four, the interviewee is invited to share his or her experience of the interview and to offer any comments or suggestions concerning the interview questions and process. In actual interviews, the interviewer covered the above questions or topics in whatever order seemed most natural, instead of in strict adherence to the order in which the questions or topics were listed in the interview guide.

Interview questions were first formulated in English and later translated into Korean by myself. Two Korean native speakers, both college-educated in Korea, assisted me in the translation and the wording of the Korean version of the interview guide. To test the language and substance of the interview questions and overall length of the interview (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992), pilot interviews were first conducted with two students, one male and one female, selected from the research population. Upon completion of each pilot interview, the participant was asked to share personal reactions to both the interview content and process. Data from the pilot interviews with these two participants, together with feedback obtained from them, were used to refine and modify the original interview questions as well as the interview procedures. Most helpful among the responses and feedback from these two participants was their shared perception that some of the interview questions were too abstract for them to respond to and that some

questions or topics were redundant. After modification, interview questions were again tested with two other participants, one male and one female. Responses from these two participants were included in the data for this study, since little change in the interview questions and procedures resulted from interviews with them.

All interviews were conducted in Korean. However, interviews were not categorically restricted to Korean, since participants sometimes wished, as occasion demanded, to use English words or phrases to more accurately convey their experiences while in the United States. The majority of the students interviewed indeed chose to use a few English words, phrases, or in some cases whole sentences during the interview. Examples of such English language expressions were “care,” “communication,” and “office hours.”

Data Collection Procedure

For this study, the major source of data was face-to-face, semi-structured interviews with participants. The interviewer arranged to meet with each participant at a mutually convenient time and place to conduct the interview. For nearly all participants, individual interviews were conducted in a single session in the interviewer’s office. The exceptions were 2 participants who experienced unexpected scheduling problems necessitating their having to leave before completion of the sessions. Additional meeting times were provided later in the same day. One of these additional meetings took place in the interviewer’s home.

Each interview began with personal introductions followed by a brief orientation to the interviewer's research interest in the area of Korean international students' interpersonal experiences both at home and in the United States. The participants were told that the interview questions or topics were intended to assist the researcher in learning something concerning their personal views of relationships, including friendships and student-faculty relationships with Koreans and Americans. Researcher interest in both the participants' personal experiences and their own views and ideas was emphasized. Participants were assured that from the perspective of the interviewer, and for purposes which were part of both interview context and implications, no right or wrong answers existed and that interviewees were not expected to respond according to any particular fashion or preconceived notions. Participants were also told that because some of the questions or topics were somewhat abstract, they should feel free to take time to gather their thoughts before responding. Participants were given assurance that their identity would be kept confidential.

Participants signed informed consent forms (see Appendix D) and provided demographic information prior to the in-depth interviews. The interviews ended with debriefing during which respondents were asked how the experience had been in general and if they had any reactions or suggestions. Interviews averaged one and a half hours in length, varying from approximately one hour to three and a half hours. Interviews took place from mid March through the end of April, 1994.

Each interview was tape-recorded with the interviewee's written permission. All interview tapes were first transcribed in Korean language directly onto the computer disc by the researcher. The goal was to transcribe the tapes verbatim. Each transcript was then reviewed by one of the two native Koreans employed by the researcher for this specific purpose. Both assistants were college graduates, with one having majored in the Korean language and literature. Their job was to read transcripts, while listening to the corresponding tapes, to check for accuracy in the transcription. Interview transcripts totaled 792 pages and averaged 33 single-spaced pages per respondent. Individual interviews ranged from 16 pages to 62 pages. In order to protect personal identities, participants were coded as follows: individual's initials in Korean language/ sex/ academic level/ the date of the interview. This code was used to identify interview tapes and transcripts. Pseudonyms were used in the interview transcripts whenever respondents mentioned any particular names or places in their accounts. The transcripts themselves are not included in the dissertation in order to protect confidentiality; however, significant quotations have been incorporated into the data presentation section.

Data Analysis

Whitt (1991) observed that analysis of qualitative data is "intended to build understanding inductively, from the data, rather than deductively, from a priori hypotheses or categories" (p. 408). Analysis of the interview-based data for the

present study was informed according to the principles delineated by Glazer and Strauss (1967) and Strauss and Corbin (1990). Emergent themes and concepts were identified from the interview material and were tested against themselves as the analysis proceeded. The analysis was guided by the study's conceptual framework (cross-cultural and culture-learning perspectives), the research questions, participants' interpersonal experiences and perceptions concerning both Koreans and Americans, and my own understanding and life experiences.

In order to arrive at major themes and concepts, each interview transcript was first examined separately for the purpose of identifying key terms, phrases, and categories the participant used to represent his or her views and experiences of friendship and student-faculty relationship. More specifically, key terms, phrases, and statements were identified under the following major headings as listed in the interview guide: friendship with Koreans, friendship or peer relationship with Americans, student-faculty relationship involving Korean faculty, student-faculty relationship involving American faculty, and finally cross-cultural view of interpersonal relationships. These terms, phrases, and statements were indexed according to the page and the specific section of the page in the original transcript in which they were located. The indexed terms, phrases, and statements were then compiled into a separate listing. This listing was created by locating the corresponding parts and copying and pasting them from the original document coded into the computer. Upon completion of the listing, a printed copy was produced. The indexed listing was useful for quickly locating what individual

participants said about specific topics or issues. It was also useful for identifying recurrent themes, patterns, and variants existing within the statements made by each participant.

The next step in data analysis was to cross-examine the listings in order to identify recurrent topics or issues as discussed by the participants. Key terms, phrases, and statements pertaining to similar phenomena or concepts were labeled and grouped together under major categories. As anticipated, this process of comparative analysis required numerous, on-going modifications and refinements of categories, as the analysis proceeded. Through comparative analysis, a second set of listings of the identified categories was made under the following major headings: friendship/peer relationships with Koreans, friendship/peer relationship with Americans, student-faculty relationship involving Korean faculty, student-faculty relationship involving American faculty, and finally cross-cultural views of interpersonal relationships. These listings are composites containing each participant's responses to particular categories. The final refinement of coding continued through the initial stages of writing, since the process of writing necessitated further examination and clarification of identified themes, concepts, and categories, while at the same time it helped to point out interconnections among all of the constituent parts. The final categories and subcategories that emerged from the data analysis are listed in Appendix E.

Characteristics of Participants

The participants in this study were men and women in their early twenties to early thirties. A majority of the participants were single. The participants were from middle to upper social class backgrounds. For all participants, parents or relatives were their primary source of financial support. The participants were pursuing degrees in a wide range of academic majors, with a predominant number in business and management. Participants' lengths of stay in North America ranged from several months to several years with a mean average of 33 months. More than half of the participants reported having lived with an American. Two thirds of the participants identified Christianity as their religion: Only two of the participants listed Buddhism and the rest claimed no religious affiliation. The participants' self-ratings of English speaking skills, using a scale of 1 to 7, ranged from a low of 2, or Very Poor, to a high of 7, or Very Good, with a mean average of 4.25. A majority of the participants indicated that it was unlikely that they would remain permanently in the United States. More detailed demographic information is provided below.

Age and Marital Status

The participants for this study were primarily in their early to late twenties. Only 4 participants, 3 graduate males and 1 graduate female, were in their early thirties. The average age of the participants as a group was 26.05 years.

Graduate males as a group averaged 29.67 years in age, graduate females 29.19, undergraduate males 25.17, and undergraduate females 22.17. Five participants, 3 males and 2 females, were married and the rest single.

Academic Major

Participant major fields of study were grouped into the following six general categories: (1) Business and Management, (2) Engineering and Applied Sciences, (3) Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education, (4) Health and Human Services, (5) Science, and (6) Other. More than one third of the participants ($n = 9$), including 6 males and 3 females, were pursuing a degree in the field of Business and Management. Among the rest, 5 participants, 3 males and 2 females, were enrolled for degree programs in Engineering and Applied Sciences; another 5 participants, 3 females and 2 males, were in Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education; 2 participants, both female, were in Health and Human Services; one participant, a male, was in Science; and 2 participants, both female, were in Other.

Length of Stay in North America and Length of Stay at the University

Both length of stay in North America and length of stay at the university where the present study took place varied greatly among participants, ranging from several months to several years. All participants, however, had spent at least two semesters at the current university at the time of interview. With regard to length of stay in North America, participants as a group had spent approximately

33 months on the average. About one third of the participants ($n = 9$), including 5 females and 4 males had spent from 25 to 36 months. Seven participants, 4 males and 3 females, had spent over 3 years. Six participants, 3 males and 3 females, had spent from 12 to 24 months. The remaining 3, 2 females and 1 male, had spent less than one year. Graduate males as a group had stayed for the longest length of time (group mean = 39 months), followed by undergraduate females (36 months) and undergraduate males (32 months). Graduate females as a group had stayed for the shortest length of time (24 months).

With regard to the length of stay at the university participants were currently attending, the group mean was approximately 28 months. Over one third of the participants ($n = 10$), including 6 females and 4 males, had spent from 25 to 36 months. Six participants, 3 males and 3 females, had spent less than 12 months. Four participants, 2 males and 2 females, had spent from 12 to 24 months; and another four, 3 males and 1 female, had each spent over 3 years. Graduate males as a group had stayed for the longest length of time (group mean = 33 months), followed by undergraduate males (31 months) and undergraduate females (28 months). Graduate females as a group had stayed for the shortest length of time (23 months).

Eight participants reported having attended other North American universities or colleges, while either working on a degree program or participating in an English language course, before coming to their current university. Among the 8 were 4 graduate males, 3 undergraduate females, and 1 undergraduate male.

Among the 12 undergraduate participants for this study, nearly half ($n = 5$), including 3 males and 2 females, indicated that before coming to the United States they had attended higher educational institutions in Korea for varying lengths of time ranging from several months to a few years.

Type of Residence and Living Arrangement

All but two participants were currently living either in an apartment or house. The two exceptions, both male, were staying in residence halls. Ten of the 24 participants, including 7 males and 3 females, reported living by themselves. Seven participants, 4 females and 3 males, were living with one or more members of their immediate families. Only 4 participants, 2 males and 2 females, were living with one or more American roommates or housemates. Each of the remaining 3, all female, was each living with a fellow international student.

More than half of the participants ($n = 14$), 7 males and 7 females, reported having roomed with an American for at least one academic term. Nine of these 14 indicated that they had lived with one or more American roommates on more than one occasion. Nearly two-thirds of the participants ($n = 15$), including 8 males and 7 females, reported having lived with at least one international roommate. Six participants, 4 females and 2 males, indicated that they had never lived in a residence hall during their stay in the United States. Four participants, 3 females and 1 male, had neither roomed with an American nor stayed in a residence hall while in the United States.

Religious Background

Two thirds of the participants ($n = 16$) identified Christianity as their religion. Two out of the 16 indicated that they had adopted Christianity while in the United States. Ten among these 16 participants, 6 males and 4 females, listed a Protestant Christian denomination. The remaining 6 participants identifying themselves as Christians, 4 females and 2 males, designated Catholicism as their religion. Only two participants, both female, listed Buddhism as their religion. The remaining 6 claimed no religious affiliation.

Social Class Background and Primary and Secondary Financial Support

More than half of the participants ($n = 13$), including 7 females and 6 males, chose upper-middle class as representing their family's social class background. Nine participants, 5 males and 4 females, chose middle class and the remaining 2, one male and one female, chose upper class. With regard to primary and secondary financial support, all participants indicated that parents or relatives were their primary source of financial support. Only 7 participants, all graduate students, including 4 females and 3 males, identified a secondary source of financial support, inclusive of university assistantship, savings, student employment, and scholarship.

Perceived Proficiency of Spoken English

On a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 representing Very Poor and 7 representing Very Good, the participant self-rating of English speaking skills averaged 4.25, close to the precise middle of the range, Neither Poor Nor Good. The mean self-rating of female participants as a group (4.33) was somewhat higher than that of their male counterparts (4.17). With regard to individual self-rating, 9 participants, 5 females and 4 males, gave themselves the rating of 4; 6 participants, 4 males and 2 females, the rating of 5; 5 participants, 3 females and 2 males, the rating of 3; 2 participants, one male and one female, the rating of 6. One female participant chose the highest rating, 7, as representative of her English speaking skills. The remaining one, a male student, chose 2, the next to the lowest rating.

Intent of Permanent Stay in the United States

As to the participant expressed intent, at the time of interview, to stay permanently in the United States, more than two-thirds of the participants ($n = 18$) indicated that it was somewhat to very unlikely that they would remain in the United States: Somewhat Unlikely ($n = 9$), Definitely Not ($n = 6$), or Very Unlikely ($n = 3$). Among these 18 were 11 males and 7 females. Three participants, all female, checked Undecided. The remaining 3, including 2 females and 1 male, checked Somewhat Likely.

Presentation of the Analysis

In the following three chapters, salient common themes and patterns of variation that emerged from the interview materials are examined. Chapter IV focuses on participants' experiences and perceptions concerning friendships and peer relationships involving both Koreans and Americans. Chapter V covers participants' experiences and views pertaining to student-faculty relationships involving both Korean and American professors. Chapter VI presents patterns of cultural and individual variations organized around two identified major dimensions: the dimension of interpersonal boundaries and the dimension of personal autonomy.

CHAPTER IV

FRIENDSHIPS AND PEER RELATIONSHIPS

Overview

Discussion of friendships and peer relationships begins with descriptions of participant narratives concerning relationships with closest Korean friends back home. Also presented in this chapter are participants' experiences, perceptions, and interpretations concerning peer relationships with both Americans and co-nationals. Comparisons are offered between participants' peer relationships with Americans and those established with co-nationals. Each of these, in turn, is examined in comparison with participants' relationships with close Korean friends.

The original interview guide did not contain specific questions designed to tap into participants' interpersonal experiences with co-national peers. In the course of actual interviews, however, a number of participants spontaneously recounted such experiences, contrasting them to their experiences either with American peers or with their old Korean friends. Participants' accounts of peer relationships with co-nationals yielded valuable information that helped to illuminate participants' modes of relating with peers across varying interpersonal and environmental contexts: the close, long-term friendship context involving Koreans at home; the cross-cultural interpersonal context in the United States involving

Americans; and the interpersonal context involving co-nationals in the United States.

Closest Korean Friendships

Several common themes predominated in the participants' accounts of their experiences with closest Korean friends at home. These themes were clustered into the following key aspects of closest friendships: longevity, mutuality, affectivity, and confrontation and conflict management. The aspect of longevity includes two features: dailiness and continuing contact. The aspect of mutuality contains four features: (1) trust, (2) tending, (3) sharing and intimate knowledge of one another, and (4) mutual understanding and acceptance. Finally the aspect of affectivity has two features: (1) feelings of *cheong* and closeness, and (2) feelings of ease and comfort. These main aspects will be described briefly and illustrated with examples from the interview narratives.

Longevity

A defining characteristic of closest friendship experiences, as described by participants, is the long-term nature of the relationship. For a majority of participants, closest friendships had been sustained over a relatively long period of time, ranging from several years to more than two decades. Individuals identified as closest friends were same sex, same age cohorts, and former classmates. Only 2 of the 24 participants, both undergraduate males, reported having maintained

closest friendships with individuals they had first met outside of the school context. In one case, the participant did encounter one of his closest friends in school, but he met the other closest friend in church. For the other participant, one closest friend was, again, encountered in church and the other closest friend was encountered in his neighborhood prior to attending school.

The pattern of enduring close friendship was evident regardless of when participants first met their closest friends, whether it be during preschool years, middle school, or the freshmen year in college. For instance, one undergraduate male reported having maintained two closest friendships with male classmates dating back to elementary school. On the other hand, a graduate female spoke of a woman she had first met more than ten years ago in college as her closest friend.

Although durability of relationship was evident in close friendships reported by both male and female participants, the pattern seemed more pronounced among the males. All of the four participants who reported closest friendships dating back to elementary school years were male, including three undergraduates and one graduate. Additionally, male participants in some cases explicitly underscored the long-term aspect of friendship in describing their personal experiences. A graduate male spoke of his personal belief in the unbreakable bond among his closest friends from childhood:

We all lived in the same neighborhood in XX. And we are old classmates from elementary school, middle school, and high school. We also went to the same church. So we've been friends for at least 15 years. The ties of our friendship can't possibly be undone.

Another graduate male also stressed the long-term nature of his close friendships:

I rarely become friends with someone within a couple of months. I've known almost all my friends for more than 10 years. Generally, I don't use the word, friend, for someone I've known for only one or two years. I tend to use that word rather selectively.

Dailiness

Closely intertwined with the long-term aspect of close friendship is dailiness. Dailiness refers to two or more friends being together and doing activities together on a regular, frequent basis, typically everyday. The term itself derives from Beukema (1990), who, in her study of American women, identified dailiness as a salient theme among women's recountings of best friendships with other women. In the present study, this concept of dailiness emerged as a recurrent theme for most participants.

Two-thirds of the participants directly stated that they had spent a great deal of time with their closest friends on a day-to-day basis, thus the choice of terms, dailiness, as signified in "being together all the time," "always hanging around together," "studying together," "going to church together," and "having meals together."

As a defining characteristic of close friendship, the concept recurred irrespective of whether the friendship began in elementary school, high school, or college. A graduate male indicated that he and a group of his closest friends from

high school used to spend a great deal of time together. This practice continued throughout his college years. “[We] stuck together with one another a lot, perhaps too much,” he remembered. Another graduate male also stated that throughout college in Korea he “went around almost all the time” with a group of three male classmates, including his closest friend, all of whom he first met at the very beginning of his freshman year.

Some participants specifically linked dailiness to the development and deepening of emotional bond and intimacy among close friends. Speaking of her closest friends from middle school, an undergraduate female stated, “My friends in Korea and I were together for so long while going to the same school. Having spent so many hours, I’ve developed so much *cheong* [toward them].” A graduate male explicitly mentioned that he had become closer to his two very best friends from elementary school as he “went around with them” much more frequently than with other friends. He further stated, “We saw one another everyday throughout high school. We studied together at church and ate supper together. ... And we always studied together for exams at our [meaning the participant’s parents’] place.”

Another male, an undergraduate student, also stressed the importance of dailiness in developing close friendship. He said that although all of his neighborhood closest friends and himself did have other friends at the high school they each attended, their relationships with those school friends “never developed into relationships that were deep.” After school they would “always hang around

with” the neighborhood gang, but not with the other friends from school. In order for friendship to reach this level, the participant reflected, sustaining contact must be present: “[For friendship] to become really deep, in my view, associating frequently for a long period of time, at the time I was into doing things and naturally desired to mix with others, was probably the most important factor. [participant emphasis]”

Several participants indicated that living close to their intimate friends helped in maintaining frequent and regular interpersonal contacts, which in turn facilitated the development and deepening of intimacy and bonding. Nearly one third ($n = 7$) of the participants specifically mentioned that they had lived in the same neighborhood as their closest friends throughout elementary school and high school. Among these 7 were 4 undergraduate males, 1 graduate male, 1 undergraduate female, and 1 graduate female. The graduate female indicated that she and a group of her close friends from high school, including her very best friend, all lived in the same neighborhood. She stated, “Living so close, we kept seeing one another, which led us to become closer and closer.” Similarly, an undergraduate male stated that throughout high school he and his closest friends would spend time together “almost all day long every day”:

In my case, all 11 [friends] lived in the same complex, less than 200 meters apart from one another, and, therefore, we used to go to school together and have lunch together. After school we’d meet again after staying home just a short while. We then would go to a studying room. [Studying rooms in Korea are privately-managed places with a number of booths in a rather spacious room. Such places, popular among students and others - preparing for examinations, charge a small fee for providing quiet areas for

individual study.]

Continuing Contacts

Several participants indicated that since their arrival to the United States, they had maintained contacts with their closest friends in Korea by telephone or by letters on a relatively regular basis. Some participants also reported the reunions they had experienced with their close friends when they went back to Korea for a visit. A graduate female stated that after arriving in the United States a few years ago, she came to feel even closer to her best friend and old college classmate. She commented:

She is the person [among friends in Korea] I have called up most frequently. And I have been receiving a letter from her every week regardless of whether I write back to her. ... And that has made me feel much closer to her. That's because I've realized how difficult it would be to write to someone every week. When I stop to think about being able to get a letter every week, I get deeply moved.

The undergraduate male who had earlier spoken of his 11 close neighborhood friends stated that while in the United States for the past few years, he had maintained contact with the two closest of these friends:

I call them up once every month. Sometimes twice a month. I tend to call rather frequently. Each time I call, I talk for close to an hour. So I put aside 200 dollars or so for my phone bill each month. ... And I also write to them about what I've seen and experienced in America and about difficulties I struggle with. I've been amazed at the great power of letters. Phone calls are no match for letters.

Two male participants, however, noted a disruption in keeping in touch with their closest friends. This disruption of contact began after their arrival in the

United States. In both instances, however, even with disrupted contact, the participants still considered these friendships as their closest. One of the two participants, a graduate student, indicated that he and his closest friend had now been out of contact for the past few years. The other participant, an undergraduate, admitted to feeling at times a bit closer to one of his two closest childhood friends who had made efforts to keep in touch with him, and a bit less close to the other childhood friend who "has been neglectful of me since he got married."

The aspect of longevity which participants focused upon concerning closest friendships seems to have been influenced by cultural background factors important to Korean society. Closest friends were in all cases of the same gender, as well as of the same age, and typically they were classmates, whether encountered very early in school, or later during the college years. The schools themselves may have reinforced such closeness, in that in Korea, educational institutions are typically divided according to gender from middle through high school; that is, during a period of development when opposite sex friendships might be expected to tend to become predominant. The same pattern is found also in Japan and has been examined, for example, by Atsumi (1980) in a study of friendship among Japanese. Socialization among male and female secondary school students in Korea tends to be limited to places outside of school and otherwise generally discouraged by both parents and teachers. Confucian ethics traditionally discourages close personal relationships between males and females prior to marriage: Such relationships between members of the same sex are encouraged

(Won-Doornink, 1991). As participant narratives tend further to reflect, in particular, historically, life-long male friendships have been held in the highest esteem.

Mutuality

The second defining characteristic of closest friendship is termed mutuality. Mutuality is the two way interaction between persons that facilitates further interaction that both persons experience as fulfilling and meaningful (Beukema, 1990). Mutuality in closest friendships can happen on many levels and take varying forms. Mutuality as evident in participants' narratives suggested four interrelated features: (1) trust, (2) tending, (3) sharing and intimate knowledge of one another, and (4) mutual understanding and acceptance.

Trust

Many participants viewed trust as the very foundation of close friendship. As some participants expressly indicated, it was a sense of trust that separated closest friends from any other friends. Trust and mutuality in close friendship were inseparably interwoven in participants' recountings of personal experiences and views of close friendships.

Although most participants seemed to agree as to the fundamental importance of trust in close friendship, they varied in terms of personal meanings they attached to trust. For some participants trust in friendship had to do with a firm

belief that their friends would always be understanding and accepting toward them, including understanding and acceptance of “whatever I say,” “what I believe in,” and “whatever I am up to,” or simply “everything about me.” Other participants, particularly male students, linked trust in friendship to being always able to count on their friends for support and availability in times of need. As one undergraduate male stated, it is a “belief that I would feel most comfortable consulting them about any problem I have, that they would always respond to me without ever saying *no*, and that I’d do the same for them [*italics here and henceforth indicating an untranslated participant’s expression*].” For still other participants, trust in their closest friends meant first and foremost trusting the friends to keep confidential whatever they shared with the friends and not to “pass it onto anyone unless I tell him to.”

One undergraduate male tied his “absolute trust” in his two closest friends from elementary school to the sense that even if these friends were to exhibit certain conduct or behaviors that are unacceptable, he would still believe that “those would not be more than mistakes or transient manifestations and that those didn’t represent all of who they truly are.” Another male, a graduate student, reflected about how a sense of trust in friendship develops and what trust means to him personally:

Well, you don’t make friends with one person at a time. Either at school or somewhere else, you would hang around with a group of people. Then without knowing it happened I would reveal myself [to other people] as these others revealed themselves to me. It’s not that I would purposely choose to meet a specific person because I consider him trustworthy. A

group of people sort of naturally happen to get together frequently. ... Trusting one another means self-disclosing to one another and knowing one another well. ... By knowing and understanding a person very well, I get to trust that person, feeling that he can't possibly deceive me.

In connection with trust in friendship, three of the participants, all graduate males, referred to the importance of maintaining "*uye-ri*" (signifying faithfulness in Korean) as something integral to friendship among men. For one of these students, *uye-ri* meant "not abandoning a friend in times of difficulty." As one "can never forget the friend one received help from, [*uye-ri*] thus continues to get reinforced." For another, a friend of *uye-ri* meant a "reliable friend, ... a friend who remains consistent regardless of changes [in life] such as marriage." And such a friend would "be willing to run to see me, putting aside [his] personal affairs no matter how pressing they might be, anytime I say, 'Come to see me. I'd like to see you.'" In this sense, according to the participant, *uye-ri* is "different from individualism," which is "putting my affairs first, thinking of myself first when there are some pressing matters." The third participant indicated that his circle of closest male friends from high school had "put a high premium on *uye-ri*" and "tried very hard to remain very genuine ... stressing the importance of not becoming tainted by the society" throughout their college years. The participant continued:

At the time, *uye-ri* meant--well, there was always something to worry about. As you know, there is a lot to worry about during freshmen and sophomore years [in college]. Then, always someone was there to help, being there beside [me] offering encouragement, or together--uh, like that--uh, sharing in sorrow and joy. There was always something like that.

The student went on to describe certain consequences facing someone who did not observe *uye-ri*:

Then, for instance, in the evening, for instance, a friend was having a hard time. Really having a hard time, he suggests that we have a drink together. So the two of us get together. Then the problem [the friend was struggling with] involves, could involve another friend. So we made a call to that friend. Then he'd better come to us, better come to us no matter what time of the day it was, eleven o'clock or not. If he didn't, he would get told, "How could you do that with a human face on," and all sorts of things. ... At the time, such an atmosphere was created, by one friend in particular.

Participant narratives substantiate the importance of trust in their friendships. This importance reflects the traditionally up-held ideal of faith and loyalty between friends established as part of the five moral principles stipulated in Confucianism. Moreover, the deep sense of trust in closest friendships seems to underlie and sustain intimate interpersonal exchanges that are mutuality-based, such as confiding, sharing, and depending on each other for support and understanding, practices which in turn act to strengthen the sense of trust among close friends.

Tending

Tending to or taking care of one another emerged as another feature of mutuality as manifest in the closest friendship context. Many participants described their closest friends as deeply caring about them and always willing to extend support and help in times of need. These participants seemed to share the notion that friends should remain attentive and responsive to the needs of one

another. It is noteworthy that male participants as well as female participants explicitly talked about their actual experiences of and yearning for being taken care of in the context of friendship. In fact, among all participants, it was specifically three males who made direct comments acknowledging that they would like or wanted to “lean on” their male friends for support and understanding in times of personal difficulties. Along with several others, these same males also indicated that they would be more than willing to offer themselves to their friends when in need.

Tending in close friendship came in many forms. Close friends cared for one another by offering moral and practical support, by confiding and advising one another, by always looking after one another, or by simply “being there” for one another. Participants described ways in which they and their close friends offered and received support and help. Close friends offered monetary aid to one another when in need; friends helped one another with studies; and friends provided moral support and encouragement when the other was struggling with personal problems.

The following account by an undergraduate male richly illustrates the particular context and the manner in which he offered help to one of his close male friends. The student had met this friend of his while attending a private academy which prepares high school graduates or others for the yearly nation-wide college entrance examination. The friend had unsuccessfully attempted to enter a highly competitive university and was about to be forced to give up in his third attempt

due to family financial difficulties. The participant recalled:

[This friend] was very smart and he really wanted to prepare one more year. However, being from a poor family, he knew that would be overtaxing his family. I had been saving up some money from the monthly allowance I got from my parents back in my hometown. As I recall, it was a considerable amount of money for me at that time in 19XX. ... One day as we were sharing with each other our recent failures with college entrance, he came along with me to my place. While we continued to talk about this and that ... I gave him the money. He was very reluctant to take the money. He had a lot of pride in himself. Then I said to him, "I'm not just giving away this money to you. Pay me back later several times more when you get to make money. It's not free at all." He was persuaded probably because he wanted so badly to try one more time.

What is reflected in the above story is the speaker's "motivation and ability to be aware of and to respond to another's state of need," which is considered to be required of tending in the sense of the term used by Josselson (1992) in her study of dimensions of human relatedness. The speaker's awareness of the friend's needs and wishes translated into the act of extending help to his friend without having been asked to do so. Further, in offering help, the speaker demonstrated sensitivity to his friend's feelings in making remarks that he did not truly mean in order to save the friend's face or not to hurt the friend's sense of pride. This kind of interpersonal sensitivity that seems to have come to the participant so naturally and readily is indeed a highly valued social skill for both men and women in Korean society.

Participants also talked about how they found it helpful to confide in and talk things over with close friends when struggling with personal concerns or when making difficult decisions. It was suggested that among two or more close friends

one listens attentively to any concerns voiced by the other and offers advice or feedback when necessary. One undergraduate male commented that although “talking things over with reliable friends” does not necessarily lead to problem solving, talking in itself nevertheless “relieves” his mind. A “true friend” for him is someone who can “ease my mind and cleanse my mind because I can confide in him and feel understood.” He then added, “They say it’s not easy to make three such friends in your entire life.”

Similarly, when asked what distinguishes close friends from other friends, one graduate female responded:

I tend to talk a lot about myself to close friends. I also talk about what’s going on in my family. But with friends who are not as close, I get the feeling that they are not really listening and it goes in one ear and right out the other. So I don’t usually talk as much about myself to them. ... [My close friends] really listen and also talk about themselves to me. In this way we advise each other.

The speaker described how her closest friend and former high school classmate had assisted her in making the right choice at the time she was struggling with one of the most difficult decisions in her life. And she was still grateful to her friend for the sound advice given.

Another form of tending among close friends was for friends to always remain concerned about or attentive to one another’s welfare. This form of tending was most often mentioned by female participants. In describing such caring and attentive posture demonstrated by their closest friends toward them, some participants used Korean terms or phrases meaning being considerate,

thoughtful, concerned, deeply caring, or looking after. Whatever word or phrase used, these participants seemed to refer to the view that among close friends what happens to one remains a matter of constant concern and interest for the other and that friends remain willing to extend themselves to one another without necessarily being asked to do so. Asked to define a good friend, an undergraduate female promptly replied, “a friend who’s always concerned about me.” Another undergraduate female spoke of how her close friends demonstrated their concern and care for her:

My close friends in Korea have a great deal of *cheong*. They would be supportive when I am worried about something I did wrong. ... They are always concerned about even the smallest matters in my life. ... They’d go out of their way to take care of my personal affairs as if they were their own.

Further, a graduate female articulated how what goes on in a friend’s life versus a distant acquaintance’s life takes on different meanings for her:

In a sense, with someone who’s in friendship with me, because I believe that I would have some influence on that person as that person too would have some impact on me and that we are certain to influence each other, I would have a lot of expectations concerning self-growth or changes in that person. Or rather self-growth or changes of that person become the object of my observation or constant concern or interest for me. In contrast, with someone who’s not a friend, these things don’t exist at all. What happens to that person is not my business whatsoever, and it’s something passing by me and no more than a bit of *gossip*, just like reading in some women’s magazine things such as who got married and who got divorced.

Finally, some participants described a form of tending between friends that seemed related to being there for the other in order to hold or contain what the other finds difficult to deal with alone. This form of tending appears to be based

on the perception that some other person is psychologically present and emotionally attuned with whatever psychological state one is experiencing at the moment. Close friends help one another by not only attentively listening to each other but by also, as expressed in the comments of one undergraduate male, “feeling upset together with me when I was feeling upset over something.” A graduate male recalled how his closest friend from college used to “just sit with” him when he was in difficulty. He stated, “[This friend] would sit there with me, with our heads put together. He’d just sit there with me [wondering out loud to himself] ‘What should we do about this?’ He’d sit there together [with me] in times of need.” Similarly, a graduate female reflected on how she found support in her best friend when she was going through some difficult times in college:

I was quite unsure and indecisive about things during my college years, that is, more so than I am now. So, well, how should I put it, it wasn’t because of some particular events in my life. I was just feeling restless for no specific reason. On many occasions when I was feeling that way, that friend of mine helped me a lot. I don’t mean she helped me by trying to talk me out of feeling the way I did. She helped me by just being there with me and that eased my mind.

The noticeable and dominant tendency among the participants to subscribe to the notion and practice of mutual tending in friendship is consistent with Korean culture’s emphasis on interdependence in human relationships. As discussed previously, in Korea, interdependence is highly valued and actively promoted not only in family but also in all other social settings. The Korean term, *sang-bu-sang-jo*, meaning mutual help, represents a spirit and practice of interdependence. At school, children are taught to practice *sang-bu-sang-jo* in relation to their

peers. Within this larger sociocultural context of endorsing and promoting interdependence, individuals, male or female, are more likely to be socialized to be aware of and responsive to others' needs for dependence and support.

Sharing and Intimate Knowledge of One Another

Sharing and knowing one another on an intimate level represents a third major feature of mutuality in closest friendship. Participants, both male and female, indicated that they shared themselves intimately with their close friends, "getting deeply into private matters" and disclosing their innermost experiences. In contrast, when with acquaintances and with nonintimate friends, participants generally avoided talking about personal matters and tended to be highly selective in terms of what to share with the other. A graduate male described the extent to which he shared his personal experiences with his closest friends from high school: "I've revealed everything about myself to those friends of mine and shared myself with them, sharing in joy, pleasure, and sorrow." Similarly, a graduate female stated: "There is nothing about me I'd be hesitant to talk about with these close friends of mine. I'd talk about almost *everything*. In contrast, with those who are merely my acquaintances, I have nothing to talk about." This participant went on to emphasize the importance of a mutually honest self-disclosure between herself and the other person in terms of forming and maintaining close friendship. She stated, "Being honest with each other throughout is very important [for me] ... that is, showing oneself as one really is."

Interrelated with intimate sharing among close friends is the sense of knowing and being known to one another. Some participants, particularly males, pointedly expressed their perceptions that long-time close friends knew a great deal about them: "my past and my personal background," or "my family background and my way of thinking," or "what I want," and most inclusively, "everything about me." Others talked about the sense of "knowing one another well" that they shared with their close friends. In describing the perceived extent and depth of his closest friends' knowledge of himself, an undergraduate male remarked that these childhood friends "know all about me" and that they "may even know things about me that I'm not aware of myself."

Two other male participants, one graduate the other undergraduate, specifically mentioned that knowing about each other, including personal secrets and family background, within the friendship context is critical to developing a sense of closeness. In elaboration of this sense of contextual closeness, the graduate male suggested:

You tend to feel closer to someone when you know a lot about that person and vice versa. When you know some secrets about the person that others don't know, or when you know about the person's background, you become closer to that person. And if you were to understand a person, I think it'd be important to know something about the person's background or family circumstances, because a person's character or personal views come mostly from sibling relations or family relations.

In addition, an undergraduate male described how his closest friend's intimate knowledge of him led to further sharing, resulting in an ever growing sense of closeness in the relationship:

My friend from childhood has known me since we both were little, so he has seen both my good and bad side, right? I don't even need to talk about them, for he already knows all about me, including my family background. Now that there's nothing to hide from him, I would naturally tell him any new developments in my life. In this way, we've become closer and closer. ... He knows all about me from my toes to the top of my head. He even knows my way of thinking.

Similarly, an undergraduate female spoke of the interrelatedness of sharing and knowing as established in her close friendship:

With my closest friends I can, of course, open myself up without holding anything back from them. ... That's because they are my friends and I trust them. Moreover, I wouldn't want to keep any secrets from them. And I couldn't possibly keep secrets from them any way, because we know one another too well. They could tell just by the look on my face. If I looked worried, they wouldn't just leave me alone. "Why don't you tell us? What is it?" they would come at me.

As the above speaker pointed out, knowing one another well made it possible for close friends to be able to "tell just by the look on my face" or to intuitively sense another's inner state. Some male participants further articulated the depth of tacit understanding or mutual attunement among close friends that allowed for "intuitive, emotional" communication (Ishii, 1984, p. 53), or "anticipatory" (Lebra, 1973, p. 123, as cited in Yum, 1991) communication, a mode which does not require explicit verbal expressions. These male participants suggested that their long-time close friends do not necessarily need verbal responses from them to know what they would want to communicate to them. A graduate male stated that his closest friends from high school "could tell just from the look on my face, for they have been friends to me since we were all very young. They could tell what I want from my facial expressions." Similarly, an undergraduate male

commented that his closest friends from elementary school “would say for me what I would have wanted to say even before I would do so for myself, and they would propose for me what I would have liked to suggest even before I would do so myself. And from their position, they would feel that I am doing the same for them.”

Further, in describing his own experience of knowing what close friends were thinking or experiencing just by the looks on their faces, one of these males, a graduate student, specifically used the Korean phrase, *i-sim jun-sim*. With the character *sim* meaning mind, *i-sim jun-sim* in Korean and also in its counterparts in Chinese and Japanese, refers to “immediate communication from one mind to another” or a “form of instantaneous communication, or ‘meeting of the minds’” (Tsujimura, 1987, p. 126). As Yum (1987b) observed, it is “regarded as the highest level of communication that can bring about mutual understanding” (p. 83).

Mutual Understanding and Acceptance

Understanding and acceptance of each other is also considered an important feature of mutuality in closest friendship, as mentioned by most participants including all of the graduate female students interviewed. The experience or felt importance of being understood and accepted in the context of friendship, as many participants described, included the sense of being accepted for who one is or who one is becoming, being “received” unconditionally, and feeling personally validated and affirmed.

Several participants expressed their personal belief that their closest friends would always be understanding of “whatever I say,” or “whatever I am up to,” or “everything about me.” A graduate female expressed her “belief” that her closest friend from college “will always be willing to try to understand whatever I say and accepting of what I say.” An undergraduate male also voiced his “conviction” that his closest childhood friends “will sympathize with what I personally believe in, what I do, and also what I like,” but without necessarily always approving of them.

Several other participants expressed their perception that their closest friends were more understanding and accepting of them than were other friends or other people in general. For example, a graduate male related that while visiting some of his old friends in Korea after several years stay in the United States, he found his long-time closest friends, when compared with his other friends, to be more understanding of him and to be “more ready to accept me no matter how much I might have changed.” A graduate female commented that from her closest friends she learned about “human warmth, someone besides parents loving another ... liking that person unconditionally without ... *judgments*.”

Similarly, an undergraduate male articulated in some detail the belief that his closest friend can be “totally understanding” even when he is demanding:

I once said to that close friend of mine, “I’d like to have a friend at whose place I could feel free to stop by and knock on the door, yelling, ‘Give me something to eat!’ when I am hungry, even in the middle of the night, one or two o’clock at night. And I’d also like to have a friend who could do the same thing to me. Friends who are totally understanding of one

another.” I’ve done that to the friend I am really close to without any hesitance. ... I believe he could be understanding if I behaved that way. And so could I, if he behaved that way. Of course, being a human, I could feel irritated, especially if I happened to be very tired. I might be cranky momentarily, but I think that would be only temporary, for we are both totally understanding.

Likewise, another male, a graduate student, spoke of his own willingness to “receive all there is, to receive whatever the other person is revealing as is” in his relation with his friends. To illustrate his point, he described a situation in which a friend of his, who had been drinking heavily, threw up on his pants. Being “natural” in that case would be for the participant to think, “Uh, he’s had lots to drink, so it’s understandable that he’s throwing up,” as opposed to simply passing judgment, such as, “Why is this bum throwing up like this?”

Further, some participants expressly emphasized the importance of mutual understanding and acceptance in forming and maintaining close friendship. In particular, two male participants, one graduate the other undergraduate, elaborated on this issue. The graduate male commented:

Now that my peers and myself are all at least past twenty, our personalities are quite different from each other’s. The personal backgrounds in which we grew up are different as well. That’s why I think understanding one another would be the most effective way. ... In other words, accepting another person’s situation as it is now.

Similarly, the undergraduate male, the student who had earlier spoken of close friends as always being “totally understanding,” observed:

When you meet a friend, even someone you would consider a really good friend, he could behave at times in a way that makes you think, “This is not okay,” largely because he and I grew up in different environments. In such a situation, if I consider the person as friend, I would first of all try to be

understanding of that person's behavior, for I, too, could conduct myself the same way in relation to that person. I think it's extremely important for both myself and my friends to make efforts to assimilate [such differences] so that they become part of us.

Some female participants stressed the importance of remaining open to and accepting of whatever another person says in friendship. An undergraduate female stated, "I'd feel free to talk about anything to a friend only when I could trust that friend to be willing to think, 'Ah, I see how she can think that way,' even if what I say might sound unreasonable." A graduate female reflected on what understanding among friends personally meant to her:

Well, you try to understand the situation if at all possible. Sometimes you yourself would demand understanding or want the other to understand you. And sometimes you put yourself in the other's position. And you also give advice, when possible. ... Even if other people might not be able to understand it at all when they hear that person's story, I could understand because I am a friend. There may not be many such situations, but by maintaining such a stance, I think I could be supportive and helpful to my friends.

Affectivity

Along with longevity and mutuality, the dimension of affectivity emerged as a key aspect of close friendship experiences among participants. Affective experiences ascribed to close friendship included feelings of *cheong* and closeness, and a sense of ease and comfortableness in the presence of one's close friends.

Feelings of *Cheong* and Closeness

Many participants expressed feeling deeply close to or connected with their closest friends. In describing the depth of closeness she felt toward her closest friend from college, a graduate female stated that “we are closer than siblings” and that she felt this friend was like “another me.” She expressed her “conviction” that a friendship as deeply close as this one was not ever to be found again. An undergraduate male likened close friendships among Koreans to “blood-tied relationships, where you feel the other person is indispensable.”

Among the Korean terms used by these participants in describing feelings of intimacy and connectedness in close friendship, most commonly used is the term, *cheong*. One third of the participants, 5 males and 3 females, made references to this term. The multi-faceted meaning of *cheong*, as described in the previous chapter, was reflected in the participants’ representations of their perceptions and experiences associated with a sense of having grown attached to each other, feelings of intimacy, mutual caring, a sense of total trust, total understanding, or mutual support. Three undergraduate participants, two males and one female, suggested that in their close friendships a shared feeling of *cheong*, which is “gluey or tenacious,” took hold, as their close friends and they had grown attached to one another over time.

While speaking of feelings of intimacy and connectedness in close friendship, two undergraduate males spontaneously recounted episodes which serve to

illustrate the expression of tender feelings and emotions among Korean male friends. In both cases, close male friends burst into tears of deep emotion during encounters with one another. One such encounter took place while the participant was visiting his closest childhood friends in Korea, after having spent many months in the United States. He commented that “the driving force” behind the tears was “a longing we had for one another.” The other incident took place while the participant’s closest friend was trying to console him during a time when, as a high school student, he had been undergoing family difficulties. The participant recalled vividly how during one evening, in the seclusion of a back alley he and his friend had retreated to, the friend burst into tears feeling so much empathy for the participant, the expression of which led to mutual sobbing. In support of these depictions of emotional expression, a third undergraduate male stated that for him a “truly close friend” is “a friend who could deeply cry for me when I die.”

Feelings of Ease and Comfortableness

Several participants expressed feelings of ease and comfortableness, as distinguished from intimacy and connectedness, within the context of close friendship. The expressed feeling of ease and comfortableness had to do with staying relaxed with friends within the mutually shared psychological space characterized by a sense of familiarity, total trust, and communal history. Two female participants, one undergraduate, the other graduate, specifically indicated that such feeling was derived from the perception of a “mutually shared space” or “the

common ground” established within their close friendships. Two undergraduate participants, one male and one female, suggested that their feeling comfortable when with close friends had to do with the deep sense of trust they had toward their close friends. One undergraduate male linked his feeling of comfortableness to a sense of shared history with his long-time closest friends. He commented that it was comforting for him to be able to talk about “the old days” with his closest friends from childhood as they “shared together a great many recollections and memories.” He mentioned a lack of such feeling in his peer relationships with a group of co-national males, although he had been associating with them frequently, nearly on a daily basis, since his arrival to the United States.

Confrontation and Conflict Management

The theme of confrontation and conflict management in close friendship is the one least talked about by participants. Only one third of the participants, including 5 males and 3 females, made references specifically pertaining to this dimension of their friendships. These participants indicated that a sense of competition, interpersonal conflicts, confrontations, arguments, or fights had been part of their close friendship with old friends in Korea. Although confrontation and conflict management were less commonly mentioned than were other aspects of friendship, the participants’ accounts did seem to suggest that close friendship allowed for interpersonal conflict and confrontation to surface, and that friends could find ways to work through their problems together within the relational

context.

An undergraduate male described how he used to fight and then reconcile conflict with his closest friend:

While rooming together at a boarding house, we used to fight a lot. The following morning after we had a fight, when we got up, we would start fooling around, saying "Yah, you bastard! You, what about yesterday ..." "You bum!" And that's that. If we had something a bit more serious between us, we'd say, "Hey, let's go have a drink today." I think if we had a talk over a drink, I could really be understanding of everything, and he too could be completely understanding of me.

Further, a graduate male elaborated on the kind of confrontations he and his close friends had been engaged in:

We were quite cruel to one another when giving advice. There would be times when one was agonizing, faced with a really tough situation. But there would also be times when one keeps moping around and gets stuck, not because of the situation itself, but because of a sense of defeatism. That's when we would be very cruel. [We] would say in no uncertain terms everything [that the other needs to hear].

Most participants talked about conflict and confrontation as part of close friendship and as something which could be tolerated and resolved within the ongoing relational context. One participant, however, a graduate female, explicitly stated that truth-telling and direct-confrontation were the things she most valued in friendship. In her own words: "What's most important for me is for friends to tell me what is right, whether or not I like to hear it, telling me that I am wrong when I am, and saying, 'Are you out of your mind? You're crazy!,' like that."

To summarize, in participants' representations of their experiences with their closest Korean friends back home, what emerged as a central relational image

was enduring connections. The relationships tended to be based on affective bonding and mutuality encompassing trust, reciprocal care, intimate self-disclosure and knowledge, and mutual understanding and acceptance. Within the context of closest friendships not only spontaneous expressions of intimate and tender feelings but also direct assertions of a confrontational nature were allowed. Within the participants' accounts of their experiences and perceptions involving American and co-national peers, however, notably different images of relationships tended to emerge, as developed below.

Relationships With American and Co-national Peers

Several predominant themes were discerned within participants' accounts of relational experiences concerning American and co-national peers. These included: relationship formation and durability, issues in building mutuality, instrumentality versus affectivity, and confrontation and conflict management. The theme of issues in building mutuality comprise four subthemes: (1) dissimilarities in personal background and characteristics, (2) issues of tending, (3) communication barriers in relation with American peers, and (4) issues of trust in relation with co-national peers. These salient themes are examined in light of participants' associations with long-time close Korean friends at home. Further, participants' relational experiences with American and co-national peers are contrasted with each other in terms of divergences and overlaps.

Relationship Formation and Durability

Several participants made references to the patterns of relationship formation and also to relationship durability while reflecting on their interpersonal experiences and observations concerning American and co-national peers. With regard to the relational orientation of American peers in particular, the perception was shared that Americans in general tend to more readily form and break off relationships than do Koreans. Americans were perceived as lacking in motivation and unwilling to make the necessary effort to sustain relationships over time. According to these participants' experiences, peer relationships with Americans, particularly classmates, typically did not last beyond one semester, a pattern one graduate female termed as "one semester life."

Asserting that among Koreans, "interpersonal ties, once established, don't get broken off easily," a graduate male stated: "My strong impression of American students is that they easily connect with one another and easily part," and "That's all there is to it." Echoing these perceptions, an undergraduate female remarked: "In my view, Americans' notion of friend is different from that of Koreans. ... Americans can be friends with someone they just met the day before yesterday." She then spontaneously offered her personal explanation as to why friendships with or among Americans tended not to last:

For Americans their life itself is fast-paced. There is always a sense of a fast pace in their lives, women or men, and therefore, they connect quickly, break up quickly. And whatever they do, they do it quickly, quickly, disposing of all that's in the past. Therefore, whatever they do, it lacks a

touch of sobriety--being sober in the sense of the Korean term. It's true of their friendships and all their other relationships as well.

Another participant, a graduate male, noted that very few of the American friends he had known as an undergraduate had kept in touch with him, with all of them having moved to different states after graduation. He further pointed out that without a concerted effort on his part to maintain contact with American friends, they rarely make such an effort. Korean friends, however, "would, at least one of them, continue to contact me, even when I neglect to keep in touch." Moreover, in Korea, where he had an established friendship network, if he lost contact with some old friends, he could resume contact with them through some mutual friend. But with American friends, in case he loses contact with them, he has no such friendship network to fall back on.

Two undergraduate participants expressed their personal reactions to short-lived relationships with American peers. One of these two, a female student, expressed a strong sense of disappointment in those American classmates with whom she had hoped to establish close personal relationships. She commented:

While attending the same class, we would be really close, or become close. They would sleep over at my place. Those female classmates staying in a residence hall would sometimes stay overnight if it got too late as we were talking. And we would go out to eat together and study together, and so forth. Then when we no longer attended the same classes [the next term], they would just say "Hi" when they happened to see me. And they wouldn't call me as often as before, showing up only when they needed something such as a ride. ... Korean friends, once they became close, would continue to go around together and call and see one another every-day, even if we were no longer taking the same class.

The other undergraduate, a male student, recounted a personal experience

with a particular American male. He had thought that he and this male were “quite close,” since they had been playing sports together and getting together for a drink on occasion. This male acquaintance, then, “somehow disappeared on me without a word after the semester was over.” The student reflected:

Among Korean friends--the kind of relationship we suppose *friendship* to be-- we keep in touch with one another as we get closer and closer. Isn't it true that for us, if I were to be gone and therefore would not be able to continue a frequent contact with some close friend of mine, someone I had been in close contact with, I would, at the very least, let this friend know that? Letting that be known is the basic thing to do, isn't it? But Americans don't do that.

The participant went on to share how he felt about and made sense of the experience:

I get to feel that they don't consider me a close friend. In other words, I feel that Americans, even those I considered to be friends, don't treat me in the way Korean friends do, like keeping in touch with each other. And moreover, it's a matter of course for them. If a Korean friend had been gone without a word, I would have felt angry or disappointed. And the friend, who had been gone without a word, would have felt sorry for what happened. But that American friend didn't seem to experience such a feeling. ... Then I got to think, “Ah, in making friends with Americans, one can't expect that much from them emotionally.”

A majority of participants reported only such short-lived relationships with American peers. Some participants, however, mostly graduate students, did report having sustained friendly relationships with one or two of their American peers. The graduate male who had earlier mentioned the general tendency among American students to connect with one another and to part readily was particularly appreciative of the fact that two American males, with whom he had formed close personal relationships, made efforts to stay in touch with him. He mentioned that

after he moved out of the residence hall where he first met both of these friends, one of them continued to frequently call on him. Together, they shared personal concerns and often ate meals with one another. The other friend also maintained contact with him after having moved to another state upon graduation. The student commented that his relational experiences with these American men were similar to those with close friends in Korea, in that “once the interpersonal ties are formed, they don’t get broken off easily.” Another participant, a graduate female, spoke of her continuing relationship with a former American roommate, an African-American female. She noted that this female was the only one among her several former American roommates that she had maintained contact with after they no longer lived together. Her relationship with this American female continued to grow as they got together and called each other regularly to share personal experiences. Another graduate female similarly spoke of an ongoing relationship with her former American suitemate, also an African-American, as they continued to attend the same church.

Only a group of undergraduate male participants raised issues of relationship formation and durability involving co-national peers. In contrasting peer relations among co-nationals encountered while in the United States with relationships involving old Korean friends back home, one of these male students labeled the way in which co-national peers meet one another and form associations as “*instant* style.” In his view, co-national peer relations tended to be short-term and instrumental rather than long-term and affective. His personal belief was that

people could not develop within a “short period of time” a deep interpersonal bonding on which long-term close friendship is founded. Two other undergraduate males noted that faced with loneliness as sojourners in an alien culture, they and their co-national male peers tended to seek out one another “too frequently” and thus become intimate with one another “too quickly.” Their perception was that before a solid sense of mutual trust and understanding could take hold in the relationship, people would get to know too much about and expect too much from one another. Thus, interpersonal conflicts, problems, and sometimes breaking off of the relationships were the usual results.

What seems to be at issue here is not so much the short duration of relationships per se as in peer relations with Americans, as it is the relatively fast pace at which relationships with co-nationals progress, too fast, it is perceived, for the relational foundation such as mutual trust and understanding to be built and consolidated. One of the male students recalled that a co-national acquaintance once warned him against sharing too much about him with other co-national peers, reminding him that close personal relationships can quickly come and go. As the participant related, this acquaintance had told him that:

No matter how close we might become to one another while here, it's not truly being close. Because we see one another while feeling lonely, we do become close very quickly. But then when relationships break up--what's that saying, fire, quickly ignited, will also quickly die down--things soon turn sour. So, don't tell others much about yourself. I've heard that a lot. And as a matter of fact, I've frequently said the same thing to others myself. Because I've heard that a lot, I've said the same thing. ... That's because it's one of the ways to cope with our life here.

Issues in Building Mutuality

Mutuality emerged as an integral aspect of close friendships with old Korean friends, encompassing such key features as trust, tending, sharing and intimate knowledge of one another, and mutual understanding and accepting. Within the context of discussing their peer experiences in the United States, many participants made references to certain issues associated with building mutuality either with Americans or with fellow nationals or with both. Issues of tending, as well as those surrounding dissimilarities in personal background and characteristics, were evident in peer relations with both Americans and co-nationals. However, issues of communication and cultural barriers to sharing and mutual understanding were manifest only in relations with American peers. In contrast, issues of trust took on particular salience in peer relations involving co-nationals.

Dissimilarities in Personal Background and Characteristics

A number of participants talked about how dissimilarities between themselves and American peers in such areas as personal experiences and cultural background presented obstacles to fostering mutual understanding and other bases for close relationships. Some participants expressed their perception that because of differences in physical appearances and native languages, American peers seemed to see them as “alien” and thus keep them at a distance. Listing “racial differences” as an additional barrier, an undergraduate male suspected that white

Americans might take an aversion to his skin color and thus feel reluctant to approach him, at least initially, as he himself tended to feel that way toward darker-skinned individuals.

Describing a distant relationship between herself and a former American roommate, an undergraduate female stated that this roommate “showed no interest in the East,” and seemed to “judge people by how they talk ... perceiving me, uhm, as someone from a strange place, how should I put it, a *stranger*, treating me as such.” Other students also tended to perceive an unwillingness on the parts of American students to “try to understand” or “accept” them, both for themselves as individuals in particular, or as grouped among international students in general.

Some female students talked specifically about how their own sense of not knowing acceptable ways of relating to American peers affected their interpersonal interactions with the Americans. A graduate female revealed that having “no idea how to relate to Americans” made her feel “afraid” of interacting with American peers, especially when she first arrived in the United States. An undergraduate female spoke of having felt self-conscious and uncomfortable in relating to her former American roommate, partly because she was concerned that this roommate might mistake her idiosyncratic behaviors for typical behaviors of Koreans in general. Another undergraduate female noted that although she enjoyed a friendly relationship with her former American roommate, she felt reluctant to share with the roommate her intimately personal experiences. The student explained that this reluctance was due not only to the language barrier, but also to her apprehension

that such behavior might be unacceptable in terms of American standards. This concern was apparently reinforced by the roommate's not sharing with the participant "what was deep inside of her."

Other undergraduate participants, all of whom had reported having actively pursued social contact with American peers, expressed difficulty in creating mutual understanding and acceptance in their relationships with the Americans. Voicing a sense of frustration, an undergraduate female stated:

Because of cultural differences or different ways of thinking, oftentimes we don't quite understand each other when having conversations together. This seems to contribute to the wall building up between us, in addition to the language barrier.

Similarly, another undergraduate, a male student, commented that "having grown up in different environments" he and his American peers, including his housemates, find it difficult to understand each other. He added:

Granted that [being unable to adequately explain his cultural behavior in English] is my fault, what I see as the others' fault is that they are unwilling to understand me. "Why do you have to do that?" [the American roommates would say]. Simply put, if we eat red pepper paste, they of course couldn't understand it. Likewise, I, too, have a hard time understanding them even when they offer me explanations. I think the cultural dimension presents a major problem.

Still another undergraduate, also a male student, spontaneously shared his personal experiences with peers of various cultural backgrounds. He talked about how varying degrees of differences and similarities in sociocultural backgrounds between himself and the peers affected the course of their interpersonal interactions. More specifically, the student compared his experiences with

American peers, co-national peers, and one Chinese international student from Singapore with whom the student developed his single closest friendship while in the United States. This close friendship provided an interpersonal experience which was both enriching and meaningful. Interactions with the Chinese student achieved such significant dimensions, he reflected, because there existed, at some level, both commonalities and differences in their sociocultural backgrounds. The participant noted that conversing with the Chinese student was “always interesting” and that their conversation “could continue endlessly” because there were always some differences to be explored even though they both came from a Confucianist society. In contrast, when talking with American peers, the conversation would often fall into “awkward” moments. The Americans lacked any common frame of reference to draw upon when something unique to Korean society and culture came up during the course of the conversation. With fellow nationals, on the other hand, even though having the same sociocultural background and native language facilitated communication, interaction lacked the kind of excitement which comes from exploring and learning about differences, as found in conversation with the Chinese friend. Consequently, the participant concluded that he and co-national peers “can quickly get bored with each other.”

In comparison, among the participants who reported having fostered friendly relationships with at least one American peer, some specifically mentioned certain similarities in personal background, value orientation, or lifestyle between themselves and their American peers. In one case, a graduate female reported she

had had contrasting experiences with American peers from widely differing personal backgrounds and value orientations. The student reported continuing friendly relationships with some American female peers who were all “*Christian[s]*” like herself and who, according to the participant, “are very religious and lead a straight life.” Indicating that she held her Christian friends in high esteem, the participant compared them favorably against other American students in general, particularly those whom she perceived as indulging in partying and drinking. She then recalled how she had abruptly broken off the association with her “*conversation partner*,” an American female student assigned to help the participant practice speaking English while she was attending the English language institute, prior to enrolling in a degree program. The participant described how unsettling her visit to the American student’s place had been for her. It was this experience which prompted the participant to withdraw from contact with the American conversation partner:

I went to her place, only once. I felt extremely uncomfortable there. ... There was a skeleton hanging on the wall, and also a framed picture of a naked man. And she was suggesting we go, go to a *bar*. So, afterwards I just avoided seeing her. I could tell at a glance she’s different. I mean, when I saw her after having met [my Christian friends], I could tell they were very different, qualitatively. She kept saying “Let’s have a drink” and even though she’s a girl, she smoked, too. After [that experience], I stopped seeing her, and didn’t even bother to apply for another *conversation partner*. I dreaded seeing her again.

Another graduate, a male student, who first met two Americans he considered to be his friends while living at a residence hall, indicated that both of these friends seemed more “conservative” when he compared them with other

American students. Both of them had spent some time in the military service, just as had the participant back home. He also alluded to the perceived similarity in the socioeconomic status between himself and the American friends. He stated, "I've realized that people who have struggled themselves with hardships in their lives tend to be more understanding of difficulties others are going through."

Another graduate, however, a female student characterized her American female friend, a former neighbor, as someone who was neither "blindly bound by the culture one is born into" nor "living one's life as one is brought up to live." She added that all her close friends in Korea also share a similar orientation. This student was the only one among the participants who expressly stated that her friendship with the American female was as intimate as the relationship experienced with her closest friend in Korea.

Issues pertaining to dissimilarities in personal backgrounds also posed social difficulties for participants in relating to their co-national peers. Several participants suggested that the relatively small size of the co-national student community delimits the chances of finding individuals with who they could feel compatible. As one undergraduate male pointed out, the co-national student community "falls far short of communities in Korea," communities such as "circles and departments" in college which serve as "principle mediums for interpersonal connections" among Korean college students. This observation seems consistent with the typical situation among the graduate students in this study, in that two thirds of them first met their closest friends either through academic departments

or through extracurricular activity circles during their college years in Korea. In view of the fact that the co-national student community of which participants form a part is composed of members with diverse academic majors, interests, and personal backgrounds, it seems unlikely that it could provide for its members a comparable level of homogeneity and cohesiveness to that typically found in departments and circles on college campuses in Korea.

As in relations with American peers, many participants indicated that personal differences, or a lack of any “commonly shared ground,” between themselves and co-national peers presented barriers to forming close friendship. Personal differences mentioned by these participants included differences in: age, sex, ways of thinking, personal values, lifestyles, views of life, interests, and religious orientations. Some of the differences thus identified overlap with those earlier mentioned in regard to participants’ relations with American peers, but others, particularly differences in age, do not.

Several participants specifically indicated that due to certain personal differences between themselves and co-national peers they found it difficult to foster relationships based on mutual understanding. Referring to differences in family socioeconomic status between himself and most of his co-national male peers, a graduate male remarked that his peers’ lifestyles and outlooks on life were “just too different” from his own. His perception was that such differences made it difficult for him and his peers to mutually understand one another when they were communicating. Another graduate male spoke of how differences in ways of

thinking and personal background between himself and some co-national male peers eventually led him to become totally estranged from them:

It was rather difficult for me to understand those guys and they also seemed unable to understand me well. ... We seemed to have different ways of thinking. ... And our personal backgrounds seemed different as well. Well, backgrounds--I don't know how they were brought up. There also seemed to be some differences in our financial situations. So when doing something together, we were thinking somewhat differently. Because of that, we didn't quite hit it off. ... We were close for a while when I first came here. We used to contact one another frequently. But then as I became more and more acquainted with them, I began to strongly sense certain dissimilarities between us. So now there is almost no contact between us. We don't contact one another any longer.

A graduate female spoke strongly about perceived differences between herself and her co-national peers in value orientation and ways of thinking. She saw her co-national peers as "leading a life that is oriented toward consumption" without critical awareness of self and society and without ongoing conscious efforts to better themselves and "*humanity*" as a whole. Another female, an undergraduate student, mentioned that much to her disappointment, she had not yet met any co-national peer whom she found to be "like-minded" while in the United States for the past few years. She explained that despite her eagerness to find friends among co-national peers, differences in ways of thinking, personal values, and interests between herself and her peers presented major obstacles for her in developing such friendships. She went on to elaborate:

It's not that I've avoided making friends. I've just wanted to meet someone and develop friendship through dialogue. I just didn't want to make friends out of loneliness simply because I was all by myself in America. I've longed for someone I could communicate with. ... Someone I could develop a mutually helpful relationship with, that is, someone who

understands why I came to America or why I came to America to study. I thought [we] should agree at least in that regard.

Differences in age and sex were mentioned as barriers to forming close friendship primarily within the context of discussing peer relations with co-nationals. Several participants, mostly undergraduate, directly indicated that it was the limited number, or total lack of peers of the same age and sex in some cases, which posed a problem in developing close friendships with co-nationals. Some participants specifically noted that they found it difficult or “felt awkward” in making friends with a co-national when there was an age difference. One undergraduate female revealed that her relationships with older co-national females, “*on-ni*” or older sisters as she put it, generally have been “less than amicable.” She added that she seemed to have a “personal *jinx*” when it came to relationships with older Korean females. Another undergraduate female commented that despite her desire to “talk with other Koreans” on campus she had intentionally cut off contacts with them “because of concerns about the rules of proprieties and etiquette” inherent in Korean interpersonal relationships, particularly with older persons. An undergraduate male complained that having been one of the youngest members in the co-national community for the first few years of his stay in the United States, he had struggled with interpersonal problems with some of his older male cohorts, although he enjoyed supportive relationships with some other older males.

Overall, overt complaints about interpersonal difficulties associated with

age difference came from students at the undergraduate level. Evidently, the conventional practice among Koreans of establishing a hierarchical relationship between the older and the younger person seems to present in general greater interpersonal difficulties for undergraduate students than it does for their graduate counterparts, because the former are more likely to be younger than the latter and are therefore subject to the various constraints of expressing deference to the older members of the co-national community.

Issues of Tending

As previously described, tending to or taking care of one another, as a major feature of mutuality in friendship, emerged as an integral part of relationships with closest Korean friends back home. A number of participants related their personal experiences and perceptions of tending demonstrated by their American and co-national peers. An overall impression shared among these participants was that Americans tend to look after themselves, whereas Koreans look after one another. A graduate female generalized concerning Americans, suggesting they were quite "individualistic." In comparison, she depicted Koreans as tending to care about one another and as maintaining an on-going regard for one another's well-being. An undergraduate female echoed this sentiment by suggesting that:

Among Korean friends, friends have a lot of interest in one another, right? I mean, very much looking after the other, inquiring after the other's well-being, and so forth. But in America, people keep their own *private area*,

and do stuff only outside the bounds of that area.

Similarly, a graduate male observed:

I've learned that a close association [with or among Americans] is different from what I thought of friendship to be. And I suppose I should accept it. ... [My notion of friendship] is to *care* about each other, friends, among friends. But here, one can't do that, even if one would like to, because [Americans] would think of it as odd.

Some participants recounted their personal experiences with particular American peers, who they felt were less than adequately responsive to mutual tending in the peer relationship context. An undergraduate female described how she perceived and made sense of such experiences:

I was quite caring and giving toward foreign [meaning American] peers as I would be toward other Korean peers. Consequently, they seem to think, "Wow, she has a good *personality* and she's *nice*, and stuff" and yet they are not willing to be as caring toward me. My sense is that although they appreciate such a [caring attitude], they still find it difficult to become that way themselves, because they didn't grow up that way. And so, now I almost don't expect that from them any more, as I know now how these foreign peers are. But, still, I do feel somewhat unhappy not being able to receive as much as I give. ... It can't be helped, though, because it's not their fault. They are just different.

Another undergraduate, a male student, commented that he used to "care a lot about" American peers who came into contact with him, especially in the beginning of his stay in the United States. To illustrate his point, he related his experience with his first American roommate, with whom he had shared a single room in a residence hall:

To take a simple example, when I was first staying in [a residence hall], I cared a lot about [my roommate's] sleeping. That is, whenever he went to bed, unless I had something else to do, I would go to bed, too, so that I wouldn't make any noise. And when he, or rather, I, woke up in the

morning, usually before him, because I had morning classes, I tried to be as quiet as possible. I took my stuff with me and did everything possible outside the room. But, he wasn't that way at all; he didn't care about making noise while he was getting ready in the morning. ... I was really put off by that at the time, upset, you know. "How come he doesn't *care* about me?," I asked myself.

The speaker acknowledged that at that time, instead of "trying to understand [the roommate]" he came to "*stereotype*" Americans as "people who don't care about others." He mentioned that subsequently, further experiences with other American roommates did help to modify his stereotypical views.

A graduate male shared his experiences concerning some American classmates. His involvement with them led him to realize that extending himself toward others with the intention of being helpful was not always appreciated. The participant recalled a specific episode in which upon learning that the classmate was preparing for a major examination, the participant had volunteered to pass on what he considered to be useful information concerning the examination, the information that fellow Asian classmates had previously passed on to him. He later learned, through a third classmate, that the attempted assistance had been taken as "uncalled-for kindness." The American classmate "didn't particularly like my approaching and talking to him that way," and he "seemed to think that it was his own business that he himself should take care of." After further reflection concerning the experience and its affect on his attitudes toward American classmates, the participant remarked:

[American classmates] don't understand my intentions correctly, [wondering] why I would take an interest in them and so forth. On several

occasions, I heard about their unpleasant reactions to my behavior. Consequently, now I relate to them in the American way myself. I just say “Hi” and pass by them, putting on a smile. As we don’t need that much from one another, there is not much to be missed, either, I suppose.

On the other hand, a graduate female learned that she could “inadvertently burden [American classmates] by demanding too much.” She explained:

But I demanded because it was acceptable in Korea. There were occasions in which they didn’t take it well. What I am referring to here is that if we worked together, worked together on solving problems, and if I just couldn’t recall the answers at the moment, wouldn’t it be okay to ask [someone in the study group] to let me see them again? So, I asked to let me see them again, but the person refused--now that the person had neatly put down the answers on a piece of paper--as if he/she had solved the problems alone.

Another graduate, a male student, also learned about differences in “ways of thinking” between Koreans and Americans. He recalled an encounter with one of his American classmates in which he went to the classmate for some help in understanding the commands for the computer program required for their class project. The computer program was completely foreign to him at the time. Contrary to his anticipation that the classmate would instruct him about the commands, the classmate made him wait around and gave him a computer printout of the program manual. The student stated that a Korean classmate, in the same situation, would have either simply explained to him about the commands or typed in the commands for him then and there. While commenting half-heartedly that he was “grateful that [the American] at least offered me the manual,” the student said that the incident led him to wonder if “this is why Americans are said to be individualistic.” He further commented:

[It was as if he were saying to me,] “That’s your own task and therefore you should study consulting the manual for yourself. If you can’t study just because you don’t have access to the manual, I am willing to go so far as to helping you get a copy. But, if you expect me to do everything for you, it’s asking too much.”

He acknowledged that not having any Korean classmate to turn to for assistance with his coursework, or any other classmate for that matter, prompted him to study much harder than he might have otherwise. On the other hand, he constantly felt “quite anxious” about studying on his own as opposed to studying with others, as in a study group, which he had been accustomed to doing while in Korea.

In contrast, several participants spoke of some American peer or peers who showed caring concern and behavior toward them. The expressions of care by American peers were deeply appreciated by these students. A graduate female indicated that she felt most comfortable with a “kind-hearted” American male classmate. This male not only helped her with the coursework but encouraged her to practice speaking English even when communicating with her Korean classmates.

For some participants, the demonstration of care by American peers helped challenge their negative preconceptions and views of Americans and served as a turning point in their relationships. With a deep sense of appreciation, a graduate female told of an experience with a former African American suitemate, who took her to the hospital and attended her for one week when she became ill during her first semester in the United States. Through this and other experiences with

American friends, she came to recognize the warm and caring aspect of some Americans. Such experiences contradicted her preconceived notions of Americans, especially white Americans, as being “individualistic” and “calculating.”

Another female, an undergraduate student, remarked that her current American roommate, someone her senior by more than ten years, “cares for me like a big sister.” The participant expressed her appreciation for the way in which she and her roommate had been considerate of each other’s needs. When the roommate brought her supper to her room when she fell ill, it came to her as a great surprise. She had not expected such a caring attitude from Americans, in part due to her preconception of Americans as being “individualistic” and in part due to her negative experience with her previous American roommate. Her experience with the current roommate helped her to realize that not all Americans are totally individualistic and that there are some Americans who are “considerate of others’ needs” and “caring in the way Koreans are.”

Several participants spoke of their personal experiences and perceptions concerning tending behavior as demonstrated by co-national peers. Issues that are similar to, in some cases, and, in others, divergent from those associated with tending in relations with American peers were identified. An undergraduate male remarked that in sharing the life of a foreign sojourner, there were more occasions in which he and his co-national peers extended help and support to one another (e.g., when moving or needing a ride somewhere) than would have been the case if they were still in Korea. Some other participants related personal experiences of

being cared about by co-national peers who were older than themselves. It is noteworthy that the older co-nationals identified by these students were all males. An undergraduate male reported having maintained “good relationships” with some older fellow nationals he referred to as “*hyung*,” meaning older brother. In contrast, he had not enjoyed such relationships with his same age cohorts. The participant commented that he “cannot but have good relationships with *hyung*, for they invite me to dinner on certain occasions, help me in times of need, and being older, they tend to extend care without expecting anything in return.” Another undergraduate male said that most of the “older brothers” were “very caring” and “giving” toward him. He was particularly appreciative of one of these older co-nationals for having stood by him while he was struggling with being in a “*slump*.” He further commented:

[This older brother] kept close watch on me for an extended period of time, as opposed to asking me just once how I was doing. He could have gotten mad with me, saying to himself, “Well, he’s not studying although I urged him to.” He could have just left me alone. But he continued to offer me encouragement.

A graduate female also spoke of her association with some older co-national males, a small group of “*a-jo-ssi*,” who were understanding and supportive of her. She commented that through studying together with these older males on a daily basis, she could talk things over with them and ask them for advice in times of difficulty. Another graduate, a male student, remarked that some older males were “more human” than were others who tended to be “overachievers, smart, doing their best with their own work.” During his undergraduate years in

the United States, he had associated closely with these “more human” individuals than he did with the others. The former cared about him and gave him their “human” advice, such as “I’ve done rather poorly here myself, and don’t you do like this.”

Some participants, however, related disappointing experiences with co-national peers. A graduate male expressed feeling generally distant from co-national peers, as he felt they tended to overtly “look down” on those in need, instead of offering sound advice or at least refraining from showing their uncaring reactions. An undergraduate male voiced a sense of disappointment in most of his co-national male cohorts who failed to reciprocate toward him the caring concern he demonstrated toward them.

Finally, an undergraduate female provided an additional perspective on tending behavior among Korean students. Her sense was that tending among her co-national peers was contingent on one’s membership in “small groups” within the larger co-national student community and on the degree of interpersonal closeness established among those who ask for help and those who provide help. The student noted that her co-national peers formed cliques within which members mutually relied on one another for help and support and that it was “difficult to expect some voluntary help unless one belongs to a certain group” and “unless one does everything together with the members as a group.” She revealed that not belonging to any particular group herself, she had “no one to turn to” when she needed help, such as when moving into a new place. In contrast with the

perception of the undergraduate male who noted that living in a foreign country seemed to cause both fellow nationals and himself to be more willingly help one another, the female student noted that having to cope with life in a foreign country made her co-national peers “feel constantly pressured and so they don’t seem to enjoy helping others” and that they are rather hesitant to extend help to others when asked. In comparison, Americans, in her view, being free from such pressure, “help others voluntarily, instead of providing help with strings attached” as did her co-national peers. She recalled an incident in which she was “surprised” when an American neighbor, her roommate’s classmate and someone she did not know well, became a “big help” to her voluntarily and unconditionally. The participant then spoke strongly in favor of the need for establishing a larger support network in the co-national student community:

The reason why I think there’s something we can learn from some other [international] student associations is that in establishing a student association, a Korean student association, some formal student *association* while staying in America, we need some sort of *system* [like that found in these other associations]. That is, making available [to its members] some place or someone for them to reach, to call for help in times of need, such as in an *emergency situation*. If people were assured of such a network, they would be able to live independently and attend to their own affairs without needing to establish small groups like little societies, right?

Communication Barriers in Relation With American Peers

For many participants, the language barrier stood in the way of developing with American peers close personal relationships in which they could share personal experiences on an intimate level and build mutual understanding. It should

be noted that although the Korean educational system strongly emphasizes English language education, the primary focus of English education has traditionally been English grammar and reading comprehension skills. Moreover, since the Korean language uses sentence structure and vocabulary that are greatly different from those of English, it is extremely difficult for Koreans learning English to master spoken forms without considerable training and practice in addition to regular schooling. As such, acquiring or enhancing English language conversational skills is a challenge likely to face many Korean international students coming to the United States.

The vast majority of participants for this study indeed reported difficulties in expressing themselves in English and in accurately understanding and readily responding to the American peers with whom they interacted. For some new arrivals, conducting even basic-level communication with American peers, let alone intimate verbal engagement, presented major difficulty. An undergraduate female commented that “the biggest reason” it had been difficult to make friends with Americans was that “we can’t verbally make ourselves understood 100%, and I can’t express myself 100%” in English.” She described what it was like for her to try to communicate with her former American roommate during her first semester in the United States. She recalled:

We couldn’t communicate with each other at all. When my roommate said something to me, I had to think very hard for a long while to figure out what it meant! And she, too, had a hard time understanding whatever it was that I was trying to talk to her about.

Some other participants directly indicated that without the language barrier, they could have developed “deeper” relationships based on mutual understanding in relation with American peers. For example, one undergraduate male stated:

[the language barrier] is the biggest problem: That is, if I were able to communicate [in English] to American peers whatever I want to, like I am now in Korean, I might have had more relationships with them than I do now, have conversed with them on a regular basis, and have developed deeper relationships.

Other participants also talked about how lack of English proficiency posed problems for engaging in conversation with American peers that go beyond the merely casual or superficial, and in which inner thoughts and feelings, as well as any pressing personal concerns, could be shared. One undergraduate female noted that although she could now carry on casual conversations with American peers, she continued to find it difficult to “express what’s deep inside of me, my innermost stories” because of the “language.” Another undergraduate female, who reported associating almost exclusively with American peers while maintaining minimal social contact with co-national peers, commented on how she felt about her social life in the United States:

There isn’t anything really bad about the current social life I have here. But, still, being human, I do feel a need to talk from time to time, you know. But I have few I can talk to. Even if I sat down with American kids, speaking in English, how could they possibly understand me, and how could I express everything I would want to say?

Similarly, an undergraduate male, relatively new to the United States, commented that despite both strong motivation to make American friends and personal resolve to improve his English skills, he found it more and more difficult to invest himself

in cultivating relationships with Americans. As he began to encounter increasingly greater challenges and demands as an international student, he came to turn to a group of co-national peers rather than to American peers for support and socialization. He explained that whereas he felt unable to fully express his personal concerns in English, when speaking only with co-nationals "I could feel relieved to be able to freely express, using Korean, whatever was troubling me."

Another undergraduate male talked more specifically about how the language barrier stood in the way of developing mutual understanding between himself and his American roommates. He recounted experiences with American housemates which were frustrating due to a perceived inability to express himself in English, especially when there were interpersonal misunderstandings or conflicts operating in the situation. And in his view, these interpersonal problems or misunderstandings arose from cultural differences. He commented:

When [interpersonal problems] occur in the cultural dimension, then you need to provide some [cultural] explanations for them. But, I am afraid that [the explanations I provide] are not good enough, given the way I express them. With my current level [of English skills] I just could not make them sufficiently understandable.

An additional challenge for this speaker in attempting to resolve interpersonal problems with American roommates had to do with the difficulty he experienced in accurately reading the roommates' reactions to his verbal responses. He reflected:

Perhaps it's because I have problems with communicating with them, but even when I felt I had sufficiently explained myself, I didn't know what to make of the other's reactions. I mean, I couldn't tell whether or not he understood me. You know what that's like in friendship. With Koreans, I could make certain in words or otherwise whether or not the other person

sufficiently understood what I just said to him. But with those [Americans], I feel reluctant to do that, because I would have to ask them again [whether they understood me] after having done so already. At any rate, it seems that [Americans] are likely to remain a casual acquaintance rather than a friend, to put it in our language.

Some participants also mentioned related difficulties in “getting a feel” for each other when communicating with American peers, which acted to hinder the development of mutual understanding. A graduate male commented that when conversing with each other, he and American peers “cannot seem to feel each other’s thoughts accurately ... or get a feel from each other of the ambiance and that sort of thing.” Another participant, also a graduate male, similarly pointed out that when talking with American peers, he could not “*catch* what the real thoughts are deep inside them that have led them to say what they are saying,” although he could understand what was said on the surface. He further noted that because of the difficulty, coupled with his limited ability to express himself in English, his relationships with American peers, mostly American classmates in his case, “do not progress well, compared with the way I meet, talk, and make friends with Koreans.” Still another male, an undergraduate student, commented that “because we cannot understand and respond to those [Americans] as readily as they would to one another [among themselves], they don’t seem to expect much from us.”

In addition to specific difficulties in communicating in English, participants also described how their own feelings of anxiety, inferiority, or apprehension associated with their English skills tended to inhibit them from freely and actively

engaging in verbal communication with American peers. A graduate female revealed that she used to feel “afraid” of speaking to her former American roommates and classmates, fearful that she would “make mistakes” while speaking English. She mentioned that all of her former roommates, American or international, spoke English much more fluently than she did. Reflecting on the expressed fear of making mistakes, this student acknowledged that underlying the fear might have been the deeper concern that making mistakes could cause others to look down on her and thus hurt her self-esteem. She added that such language-related concerns contributed to her “putting up a wall” between herself and American peers, especially during the first half of the time she had been in the United States. However, she gradually learned to “care less” about making mistakes while speaking English.

Similarly, an undergraduate female mentioned that her “terrible” English skills made her feel very self-conscious when relating either to a former American roommate or to classmates. In describing difficulties in following the instructor in the laboratory class where she was the only international student, the participant commented that her American teammates, seeing her struggling with English in the class, seemed to always be “looking down on me, wondering ‘What in the world is she doing here with such a poor command of English?’” Another undergraduate female revealed that even when she had an urge to speak to some American peer she would have liked to become acquainted with, she often restrained herself from acting upon the urge, apprehensive that the American peer might get annoyed with

her and with having to respond to someone like her whose “English is so poor.”

Another participant, an undergraduate male asserted that he generally better communicates with fellow Asian international students than with American students. The reason is that the former “don’t speak English as perfectly as Americans and therefore I don’t feel inferior to them.” Further, he complained that American peers do not “help us out even when they see us struggling to express ourselves in English in the course of conversation.”

Some participants, however, specifically talked about how patient and accommodating responses of some American peers helped to overcome the language barrier between them. Looking back on her friendly relationship with her first and last American roommate, someone she met as a newcomer in the United States, an undergraduate female remembered that she and this roommate “enjoyed the fun of finding *wit* in the midst of my difficulties with the language at the time.” The student commented with a sense of appreciation that the roommate “listened attentively whenever I was trying to say something to her.” A graduate female indicated that she tended to feel more comfortable relating to those American peers who showed patience with her English language difficulties than to those who did not. She also expressed concern that despite her strong desire to associate more closely with American classmates, she found herself avoiding speaking to those American classmates who, when asked a question, responded to her in an impatient manner, “acting irritated with me.”

Issues of Trust in Relation With Co-national Peers

In contrast to the expressed deep sense of mutual trust and openness characteristic of relationships with closest Korean friends at home, a sense of guardedness seemed predominant in co-national peer relations. Such apparently pervasive guardedness tended to deter any deeper level of self-disclosure and sharing within co-national relationships. Several participants mentioned their tendency to maintain a guarded stance toward or to keep safe distance from their co-national peers, including those with whom they frequently associated. Most of these participants suggested that underlying their guardedness was the lack of deep, mutual trust in their relations with co-national peers. Some participants directly indicated that they did not trust co-national peers deeply enough to talk about themselves without reserve, as they would with old close friends. For these participants, relationships with co-nationals remained relatively “superficial” or “formal.” An undergraduate female stated: “No matter how close we might become, I don’t get to feel free to talk about what’s deep inside my mind.” An undergraduate male similarly remarked that he and his co-national peers tended not to reveal innermost thoughts and feelings to one another regardless of how closely they might associate with one another. He went on to explain:

That’s because people, even friends, wouldn’t judge me favorably if I revealed my weaknesses, would they? If a certain person among friends seemed non-judgmentally accepting of whatever I disclose about myself, I would share [what’s deep inside of me]. But, you rarely find among grown-ups a person who would be accepting of me if I bared my heart to him. Everyone puts up a barrier to some extent. ... As you get older and

older you are less likely to make close friends. Friendship remains superficial although you can still associate closely with others. [By close friends] I mean the kind of friends I can talk to about everything about myself.

A graduate male related his reluctance to show his “weaknesses” to the conceited and judgmental attitudes he viewed as prevalent among his co-national peers. He stated:

There are a lot of people who are self-assured about their family background, who think highly of themselves, and who think they want for nothing. ... Since everyone here thinks he or she is somebody, there is sort of--it's hard to show my weaknesses. ... There are few people I could feel free to talk to without any reserve.

Another graduate male related an “extremely unpleasant” discovery which apparently served to reinforce his sense of guardedness around his co-national peers. He had begun to suspect one year after his arrival in the United States a “tendency” among his peers “to do some sort of personal background checkups on one another.” He explained that an acquaintance of his had told him about “what he had investigated concerning another person” through phoning his friends in Korea. This incident alerted this student to the possibility of peers acquiring information about him from sources other than himself, leading him to become more wary of his co-national peers in general.

Some other participants explicitly stated that their guardedness or “wariness” toward co-national peers was caused by an apprehension that self-disclosure on their part might cause them to become the targets of peer gossip. A graduate female commented that it was rather difficult to remain anonymous within the

relatively small co-national student community. She pointed out that because people tended to gossip, they could “wittingly or unwittingly hurt one another, to put it baldly, and they can talk badly about me, too.” She added that for this reason, one had to “exercise caution” when talking to others about oneself and that co-nationals in general were “wary of others.” For the same reason, she felt more comfortable with sharing her intimately personal experiences with someone outside the co-national community, an older American female classmate, than her co-nationals. She commented:

The difference between my relationship with [this American classmate] and the relationships with other Koreans with whom I closely associate is that, as I mentioned before, I can talk about things with her without any reserve. Because she is a foreigner, I find myself feeling free to talk about anything I want to. In some ways, it’s ironical.

Two undergraduate participants, one male the other female, related in some detail an actual experience of having become the targets of peer gossip. The undergraduate male acknowledged remaining wary of his co-national peers, for he was worried that confiding in them might “cause harm for me in the long run although it might bring some solace to me at the moment.” With a sense of disappointment and regret, he spoke of how his trust was broken:

In fact someone did tell me, “Don’t trust. Don’t tell.” And I accepted the warning. So, not having self-disclosed for some time, I began to open up recently when a number of my age cohorts arrived here. Actually I shared some things about myself with just a couple of them, but [word] spread very easily all over. I was disappointed with that. So [I thought], “Gee, I should have stuck to the end what they had warned me about.”

Moreover, the speaker’s perception was that co-national peers generally talked

about negative consequences of interacting with co-nationals as opposed to the positive or rewarding aspects. He added that it was “probably because people don’t trust one another.”

In a much animated tone of voice, the undergraduate female also related a disappointing experience, which apparently led her to become more cautious about confiding in her co-national peers:

To put it simply, let’s say I had some problems with a certain person and I really wanted to talk things over with someone. Whom did I have here? My parents? Relatives? An older sister? Well, Koreans all look like nice people, don’t they? So I went ahead and talked to someone. Then, what do you know, word got out, and besides, it wasn’t even how I had said it. [They were saying,] “Wow! I hear so-and-so is like this!” Had that person simply heard what I had to say and left it at that, I could have found some comfort in just getting it out. But it turned out to be more harmful to me than comforting.

The speaker added that she could not “trust” such a person and could never call that person a “friend” no matter how long they might have known each other. She said that to her such a person could be “no more than a *neighbor*,” someone who is “not understanding of my situation and who would be making critical comments about me somewhere.” Both this speaker and her male counterpart mentioned above indicated, however, that their disappointing personal experiences strengthened their personal resolve to honor the trust which the confiding other placed in them and therefore would not pass onto others whatever they were told.

Instrumentality Versus Affectivity

Compared with long-term close relationships with Korean friends, relations with American peers and with co-national peers as well were perceived to be more instrumental than affective, lacking the deep sense of closeness or *cheong* that bonds friends together. In reflecting on their interpersonal experiences with American peers, several participants, both male and female, specifically mentioned that they did not feel a deep sense of intimacy or “*cheong*” toward American peers, including those with whom they had formed friendly personal relationships. An undergraduate male indicated that his fondness for American friends was not the same as “the fondness I experienced toward Korean friends while in Korea.” Although he found his American friends to be “helpful and nice” and he himself wished to be “nice” toward them also, he nevertheless did not experience in relating to them a “feeling of friendship,” or “the kind of feelings you have toward a friend.” Even though he still desired to meet an American friend with whom he could feel as close as he did with his best Korean friend, he doubted that would be possible with Americans. A graduate male, while reflecting on his experiences with two American male friends, also wondered out loud if he could ever experience a sense of “*brotherhood*” with them, the deep affective bonding which he believed was possible between men who have gone through hardships in life together. In addition, another male, an undergraduate, remarked that he did not experience a feeling of intimacy or “*cheong*” with his American friends, and thus

he did not expect much from them emotionally.

Some other participants also mentioned a perceived lack of *cheong* or other such “deep feelings” within their relationships with American peers. An undergraduate female stated that in relationships with American peers: “One can’t find at all such glutinous *cheong* as found among Korean friends, or friendship between persons. [Americans] are lacking, lacking *cheong*, or deep feelings.” Likewise, a graduate female revealed that although she had been rather closely associating with a particular American female friend, she did not have the feeling of “glutinous *cheong*” or “that which exists between people and which is so glutinous that one can’t possibly break up.” Still another female, an undergraduate student, commented:

It seems to me that Koreans, compared with Westerners [referring to Americans], have more *cheong*. And therefore, once [they] become close [to someone], [they] would, for instance, be more than willing to go through water and fire to help out [that person]. On the other hand, Americans, regardless of how close their relationship with someone might be, don’t seem to have the kind of feelings Koreans have toward someone close to them--someone who is also a Korean. In my view, for Americans, individualism is so deeply ingrained in them, without their knowledge, that they seem unable to feel such [close feelings], as we would when we do things out of *cheong*. I don’t know much, but that’s how I feel.

A graduate male also spoke of the perceived “unfeeling” quality about Americans:

American interpersonal relations do allow for privacy of individuals to some extent, and yet, how should I put it, they strike me as somewhat too unfeeling or not human enough; that is, lacking in a touch of humanity except for in relations between particularly long-time friends. ... The way [these] people come across to me makes me suspect that I would feel lonely [around them] and if I were to go through a hard time, uhm, how should I put it, if I were to stay here longer, I might fall into a depression or something, you know.

One graduate female, however, reported feeling as close to one American friend in particular as her best friend in Korea, although she did not use the term, *cheong*, in connection with the American friendship. She remarked: "The minute we met each other, we both felt, 'Hey, we must have been sisters in our past lives!'" She mentioned the deep level at which she and this friend could empathically understand each other "*emotional[ly]*." She felt that this friend was capable of deeply understanding and accepting her emotional and psychological states, including those which "I didn't dare to talk about to anyone."

Several participants characterized their relationships with or relationships among American peers to be more instrumental than affective. Their perception was that American peers or Americans in general tended to base their relationships with others on the advancement of their personal interests and needs only, rather than on interpersonal feelings such as *cheong*. An undergraduate female shared her overall impression of Americans:

[They are] lacking *cheong*. ... Human relations [among Americans] are merely shallow, not deep, and superficial; that is, based only on seeking one's personal needs, or advancing oneself--I mean--putting oneself first, or selfish. The way I see it, there are more negatives.

Another undergraduate female commented:

[Americans are] somewhat too cold in relating to other people. ... they seem to expect something from the other: If they can get something out of that person, then they approach and do something for the person. If they determine there is nothing to gain from the other person, they are not caring or giving at all toward that person.

In her view, "being nice to the other person only if one needs something from that

person” is synonymous with “being selfish.” She stated, “It seems selfish and not good. It’s not human.” In contrast, Koreans, in her view, were “more caring of others, and even in cases when they might bring upon themselves some personal disadvantages, they are more willing to extend themselves to their friends and others as well, as compared with Americans.” When asked to think of a particular incident, if any, in which she felt about Americans in the way she described, this student shared her observation of some American acquaintances, who were also classmates of her co-national peer:

[I noticed that] if they need something [from her co-national peer], for example, for their paper close to its due date, then one day, all of a sudden, they would come over [to the co-national’s place] bringing with them some food they bought, after having kept no contact at all in the meantime.

Similarly, a graduate male noted that while associating with his American classmates, “I feel this wall, wall, because it feels like these Americans seek out someone only when they need something from that person.” An undergraduate male echoed this sentiment in stating that Americans put self-interests first in friendship:

In terms of friendship, Americans are different from us; that is, for us, [friendship] centers around “we,” but for [Americans] it doesn’t center around “we.” Instead, it’s like if there’s nothing to be gained for themselves, they immediately say “No, thank you!” and turn their back, and if there’s something to be gained for themselves, they say “OK!” ... there’s only the concept of “me.”

He further reflected:

[O]f course, there are self-interests involved in the concept of “we,” too. Nonetheless, in considering personal gains for themselves ... Koreans are inclined to accept disadvantage to a certain extent unless it is as extreme as

losing one's life.

Despite the shared perception, that compared with Koreans, Americans tend toward instrumental rather than affective relationships with others, several participants also characterized interpersonal relationships among their co-national peers as "superficial," or based primarily on pursuit of self-centered interests and needs. A graduate male commented:

Well, it's something that's not quite obvious, but [people seem to think in terms of] 'Ah! I could gain something from meeting that person' or 'Ah! There's nothing I could learn from that person' and they think little of that person. Such mindset seems to exist among Korean students.

Later in the interview he returned to this theme:

The problem is that [Korean] students here would call you up one day, then you'd think, "What do they need?" "Is there anything urgent?" My point is that people contact you only when they need something. I can understand, though. I am that way, too, calling someone when I need to ask for some favor.

An undergraduate female seemed to share a similar perception:

Well, I thought otherwise at first, but now I think relationships are very superficial among Koreans studying overseas. People meet one another when they need some help [from others] or when they are lonely and want to fulfill, you know, [the need for companionship]. [Consequently, my co-national peers and myself] don't get to talk about things deep in our minds no matter how closely we hang around with one another.

She went on state:

Come to think of it, that's probably because everybody's busy here and people don't get to see each other very often. And therefore, knowingly or unknowingly, there's a wall [between people], however thin it might be. I would think that's what it is. It's not that these people are particularly bad.

Another participant, an undergraduate male, articulated what, in his view, distinguishes long-term closest friendships from peer relationships with the co-nationals he met in the United States:

There is a fundamental difference between establishing [friendship] from early childhood and developing a relationship in an *instant* manner with someone I met here. The difference is what I've built up together with my friends over the years. With those old friends of mine, we've seen everything about one another, both good and bad, and it's now all purified. But with those I've met here, when I see bad things about them I am more likely to judge them. In a word, relationships can come and go as you utilize a person when his service is needed, and keep him at a distance when he is no longer wanted [literal translation: You swallow something when it tastes sweet and spit it out when it tastes bitter--a common saying in the Korean language]. You just can't expect to have within a relatively short period of time all that which is built up from early on. [participant emphasis]

Other male participants, also undergraduate, similarly related the perceived superficiality of peer relationships to the view that moving into adulthood, people, not just others but themselves as well, tend to think more in terms of personal gains and losses in a given relationship. One of these males, who was in his late twenties, talked about the perceived changes in his attitudes toward peer relationship:

Being a grown-up myself, I've become calculating. Of course, when you are little, you don't calculate like, "What could I gain from hanging around with that kid?" You don't calculate what gains would be obtained from actively pursuing that kid, do you? You would just become very close [to someone], then if he did something wrong, you would simply say, "Don't do that," as he is your friend. Then you grow up with him. Now, when I associate with someone, I am more calculating. "This is what's good about that fellow and this is what's bad. And it looks like I don't have use for what's good about him. Well, then, I'd better leave our relationship just as an acquaintanceship or something like that." Now as a grown-up, who tends to pursue his own self-interests, I seem to think I no longer

need [to find] a truly intimate friend.

Another undergraduate male, in his mid-twenties, also articulated some of the changes he had noticed within himself in terms of how he related to others:

It'll be hard to make friends after [our] twenties, for example, even after we've met a lot of people at the company we join in our late twenties, for example. ... They say that as you grow older it gets more difficult to open your heart to someone you meet. The main reason, I think, is that people tend to use their head. ... I can see that within myself, too, some of the times. Upon meeting a new person, I may be judging him by how he looks on the outside rather than by the depth of his heart, and be thinking to myself, "Ah, could he be of any help to me?" or "Ah, if I associate with this person, it may prove to be something negative for me in this and that respect." For that reason, it seems like it's hard to give my heart to that person, and at the same time it is also hard to receive the heart [of that person].

Further, he elaborated:

In case of a person doing something for me [with all his heart], instead of believing that this person did this for me because he loves me and he likes me, I would wonder, 'What is it that he wants from me in return for doing this?' I would find such shabby thoughts running through my head, and more and more so as I am getting older now. Some of the time, I try to talk myself out of thinking that way, but at other times, I try to justify myself by thinking, 'Isn't it only a matter of course?' [Such attitude] makes it rather difficult to get acquainted with someone, I mean, to genuinely get acquainted.

Confrontation and Conflict Management

Unlike relationships experienced with close Korean friends back home, relationships involving both American and co-national peers seldom were characterized by negotiating interpersonal conflicts and problems in an open and relationally engaging manner. Typically, interpersonal problems and potential

misunderstandings were not brought up and discussed between the parties involved. Interpersonal difficulty often led to emotional distancing, open hostility, or a total shutdown of interpersonal communication, and in some cases, dissolution of relationships.

Only a few participants talked specifically about how they reacted when faced with conflicts and problems in their relations with American peers. A graduate male described an abrupt ending of his personal relationship with an African-American male, someone with whom he had rather closely associated for some time. He indicated that he had stopped associating with the American because it appeared that he had become suspicious of the participant's intent behind asking certain questions which the American had apparently regarded as too personal in nature. The participant reported that he found the American's "paranoid" reaction rather unsettling, since, in the participant's opinion, the questions did not seem overly personal, nor was it his intention to probe into the student's affairs.

Another male, an undergraduate, recounted in great detail a confrontational experience he had had with one of his American housemates. The situation initially involved a communal project of cleaning up the yard. The student participated but had to leave his share of the work unfinished because he needed to go somewhere that afternoon. Two days later, he was reminded by this particular housemate to finish up what he had left halfway done. The participant revealed:

To tell you the truth, it made me very upset. So I didn't clean up [the

fallen leaves] for about two weeks, on purpose. But the reason why I didn't clean it up for two weeks was, he didn't do his dishes regularly! The thing is that while he wasn't doing his dishes, he was telling me to clean up the fallen leaves, clean up the fallen leaves. Then I just avoided encountering him. Because, well, in fact, the fallen leaves don't inconvenience him, but dirty dishes do inconvenience me, you know.

The student also revealed that another reason why he was deeply upset with the situation was that his American housemates left his part undone, instead of finishing it up for him, although he had voluntarily helped some of them with their parts on that day. And "it wasn't much work, either," he added. As the American housemate continued to urge the student to finish up his part, the student finally left a written note to the roommate that read, "If you do your dishes, I'll do the work." Subsequently, the student noticed that the housemate "did his dishes immediately." He expressed what he learned from the experience as follows: "I felt, 'Well, I see it's convenient for me if I demand something comparable from these [Americans] when they demand something from me.' ... I really figured that out then."

A graduate female spoke of how she resolved a potentially problematic situation involving an African American suitemate, who apparently invited a man to stay overnight in her room. The student recalled how startled both she and her former roommate, a fellow Asian, were when they realized a man was taking a shower in their communal bathroom. Afterwards, the student straightforwardly asked the American suitemate not to "bring men into [our] place" any more, with which request the American apparently complied. In volunteering her personal

explanation for this American's compliance with her request, the student stated, "That's because she was younger than myself."

Another female, an undergraduate, however, managed to deal with a similar situation in a different fashion. As a new arrival, she was totally unprepared for the situation of a roommate "bringing her boyfriend" to the room. The student recalled that while feeling "alarmed" by the situation, she nevertheless tried to be "understanding of [the roommate] because she was an American girl." She felt her American roommate, too, was trying to be respectful of her either by leaving the room with the boyfriend when she was present or by letting her know in advance when the boyfriend would come over. The student further noted that she knew personally some fellow nationals who, when faced with a similar situation with an American roommate, were unable to deal with the ensuing conflicts and eventually broke off the roommate relationship. She remarked: "Now I would rather find someone who's compatible with my lifestyle. But, at that time, somehow I was understanding of her." She further reflected:

If I had set out to fight with her about her bringing over her boyfriend while ignoring how she had been helpful and understanding of me all that time, that might have brought our relationship to an end. ... I tried to be understanding where we were different. I learned that that's how I could become friends with her.

More participants talked about personal experiences of interpersonal conflicts and problems involving co-national peers. Two male participants spoke of such experiences with their former co-national roommates. One of these two, the undergraduate student who had shared the confrontational experience

involving an American housemate, had found it "inconvenient" to room with a particular co-national male who was older than himself. The participant, due to the roommate's seniority, had felt unable to confront the roommate about the continued neglect of his share of chores around the apartment. When asked to think about what the situation might have been like if the roommate had been younger than himself, the student responded that he would still have felt reluctant to place the matter within a confrontational context. The participant explained that the younger roommate, as he could well imagine, "would naturally resent being ordered around" by someone who is not even his parent. The participant concluded that for this reason, "there would be more inconveniences than conveniences in living with a Korean."

The other male participant, a graduate student, spoke of a conflictual relationship he had experienced with a younger co-national roommate. When encountering problems, such as those relating to differences in lifestyle and personal habits between himself and the roommate, the student directly requested, on several occasions, that the roommate change the behavior the participant saw as problematic. The participant stated that the roommate, then, "began to give me the silent treatment" and that "whenever I told him the truth, he would become noncommunicative and very resentful." The two failed to reconcile and broke off the roommate relationship.

The following accounts by undergraduate females also reflect an absence of open communication among Korean students when encountering actual or

perceived problems and misunderstandings in interpersonal situations. One of these students described how she reacted upon learning from her co-national female friend that another co-national female, their mutual acquaintance, had told the friend something about the student which was groundless. Feeling offended and negative toward this co-national acquaintance, the student began to distance herself from the co-national and related to her in such a manner that the co-national became aware that, as the participant expressed it, "I strongly disliked her." The relationship between the two somewhat improved after a while when the student noticed the co-national acquaintance was making an effort to be "extra nice" to her. Nonetheless, the student never directly brought up the issue with the co-national, in an attempt to clear up any misunderstanding between the two.

Another undergraduate female admitted feeling displeased when she found out that some co-national peers were talking badly about her behind her back. Although she felt upset and knew who these people were, she did not express her true feelings when encountering them: "I just kept my negative feelings to myself, and didn't change at all my attitudes toward them." She added: "Although I am the type of person who would rather tell someone upfront what I don't like about the person than badmouthing behind the person's back, I, too, find it hard to [confront co-national peers]." When asked to elaborate, she responded:

I think that I could do so with close friends. But with those people I am not so close to, well, I am worried that if I said something negative to them, it might create further distance in our relationship, when in fact we wouldn't be that close anyway even if I were to say only nice things to them.

Still another undergraduate female revealed that although she wanted to reconcile with some co-national peers, she felt unable to do so and consequently suffered from estranged relationships with them, as well as with other co-nationals in general. She described how her relationships with co-national peers went wrong from the very beginning. At a small, informal social gathering among co-nationals she attended as a new arrival, she was bombarded by a series of questions concerning her personal and family background that came from older males present at the gathering. She had never met the older male co-nationals before. Feeling strongly perturbed at the inappropriate and invasive nature of the questioning, the participant apparently responded in a “half-hearted” manner, indicating her displeasure. Her sense was that this encounter between herself and fellow co-national students resulted in a “negative preconception” of her among those present at the gathering and, subsequently, among other co-nationals as well. A negative impression solidified concerning the participant: “She’s very curt. Watch out!” Despite her desire to reconcile with the older males, she could not find the opportunity to do so. As a female, she felt awkward in taking the initiative. “If I were a guy, I would have said, ‘*A-jo-ssi* [referring to those older men], let’s have a drink together.’ One can easily settle such matters over a drink. But as a girl, you know, it’s kind of difficult to do that,” she said. Identifying herself as an “outsider” within the co-national student community, this student mentioned that she had been seriously considering a transfer to another university with the hope that she would have a fresh and better start in her relations with the co-

nationals whom she would meet at the new place.

Finally, still another undergraduate female shared some perceived changes she had made over the years in the way she dealt with interpersonal problems with co-national peers. She is the same student who earlier spoke of having managed the American roommate's "boyfriend" situation through mutual understanding and respect. Referring to a situation involving a co-national peer neglecting to keep an appointment with her without giving any prior notice whatsoever, she said that among all such disappointing experiences, she found this kind of situation to be the most upsetting. However, she was aware that among Koreans, one is expected not to make a fuss over such a matter: "You just say, 'It's okay, it's okay,' right? You often find yourself in a situation where you are expected to be understanding." She went on to say:

[Nonetheless] I've now become somewhat Americanized myself and so now I would do this. If I hadn't been [Americanized], I would have said "That's all right!" and just let it go. That was the case in the past. I would have secretly been seething with upset, though. But now I'd say, "How come you did that? You broke our appointment, you know." I'd express myself clearly, even to a friend, now, even if she's a Korean. ... You don't need to show anger, you just convey [how you feel] in words, expressing it explicitly.

Later in the interview, the student returned to the subject for further clarification:

[T]he general atmosphere [prevailing among co-nationals] is to tolerate [any upsetting interpersonal situation]. "I'd rather tolerate it than try to fight and win," most would say. These two, two ways, I think neither one is a desirable way. Neither always tolerating nor fighting is good. Somewhere in the middle, I think, people can readily find other ways...it's much better for the parties involved to talk things over with, as opposed to fighting, trying to clear up any misunderstanding between them [participant emphasis].

To summarize, enduring, intimate, and meaningful relationships established with either American or co-national peers were the exception rather than the norm among the participants in this study. Except for a few cases, even the relationships described as friendly tended to be more instrumental than affective and rarely achieved the level of deep mutual trust and understanding experienced within long-established, close friendships. For the majority of the participants, there existed many barriers and deterrents, actual or perceived, that stood in the way of fostering satisfactory interpersonal connections with either American peers or co-national peers, or, in some cases both.

CHAPTER V

STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

Participants' experiences of closest friendships back home and peer relationships in the United States revealed salient themes and issues that provide insight into their interpersonal expectations and views concerning relationships involving persons of equal status. Participants' accounts concerning their relationships with faculty, both Korean and American, revealed dominant themes and issues that help illuminate their expectations and views concerning relationships primarily based on authority and status differential. Discussion of student-faculty relationships begins with descriptions of participants' interpersonal experiences and views concerning Korean faculty. Presentation of participants' accounts of their experiences and perceptions relating to American faculty, including their overall comparisons made between American and Korean faculty, will follow.

Korean Faculty

Participants were invited to reflect on their interpersonal experiences with former professors or high school teachers in their home country. They were asked to describe both their favorite and least-liked Korean professors or teachers, and to identify these faculty members' qualities, attitudes, and behaviors in relating to

students that they admired or objected to. When participants did not identify any particular faculty members as their favorite or least-liked, they were encouraged to talk about their experiences and perceptions concerning Korean faculty members in general. Participants were also asked to share their personal views of the ideal professor and to list certain specific qualities of a professor they considered to be desirable. With the exception of the few undergraduate students who had either very minimal or no experience at all in terms of college education in Korea, participants were asked to focus on their former professors, as opposed to high school teachers.

With regard to favorite faculty members, 12 of the participants identified one or two professors who stood out most in their minds. Six other participants talked about their former middle or high school teachers. The remaining 6 participants indicated that among their former Korean professors or teachers they neither particularly liked anyone nor remembered any specific person as their favorite. Among the total of 22 professors and middle or high school teachers identified, 4 were female, including 3 female professors and 1 female middle school teacher. Only female participants identified female teachers as their favorites.

With regard to identifying their least-liked faculty members, nearly half of the participants identified specific former professors or high school teachers. The majority of those identified were professors. Only 2 undergraduate females spoke of former high school teachers. All but one of the faculty members identified were male. One participant, a graduate male, spoke of a female college instructor. The

other half of the participants did not identify any specific teacher but instead discussed certain qualities, attitudes, and behaviors of teachers which they were opposed to or considered improper.

Several dominant themes emerged from the participants' accounts of their interpersonal experiences with former Korean professors and teachers. These themes were clustered around four major aspects representative of participants' perceptions concerning Korean faculty's relational orientations, personal qualities, attitudes, and behaviors toward students. These aspects were: (1) guidance and leading, (2) tending, (3) role-modeling, and (4) being more mutual versus being authoritarian. These aspects will be described briefly and illustrated with examples from the interview narratives.

Guidance and Leading

Guiding and leading students included using one's power and authority in order to influence students in a positive direction. Participants spoke in admiration of professors or teachers whom they perceived as exercising authority on their students' behalf. On the other hand, participants strongly disapproved of those who failed to do so, or blatantly misused their power over students.

Male participants provided more elaborate responses pertaining to the guiding aspect of teachers than did their female counterparts. A graduate male compared his favorite male professor to a "trainer" who "guided students well." He was impressed with this professor, who "treated students as students" and

“was not afraid of students” at the time when professors were apt to be labeled by sociopolitically-conscious students as “sycophant professors,” or professors who seemingly acquiesced to demands and pressures from the university administration, or the oppressive Korean government regime, or both, throughout the 1980s. This professor frequently called students, particularly those actively involved in the social activist movement, to individual meetings with him, urging them to “stay within the system” and advising them against “going to extremes and dropping out of school.” The professor was someone who “can make clear to students what their duties are as students”: He would “scold” them when they neglected their studies. The participant recalled an incident in which this professor struck the president of the student council in the face for not having shown proper manners toward the president of the university.

Another male, an undergraduate student, told of his favorite male high school teacher, who actively reached out to students struggling with problems at school and had “a lot of talks with them individually” in order to guide them in the right direction. Still another male, also undergraduate, said that one male teacher from his middle school stood out most in his mind, as this teacher “strove for education for the whole person” by imparting to students “wisdom,” as opposed to mere “fragmentary knowledge.” Further, the participant elaborated:

It is of course the teachers’ duty to teach students in the most precise fashion according to the knowledge they possess, but he was someone who could teach the knowledge that might be fragmentary while at the same time making efforts to guide students to become true students. If he had taught whatever knowledge he had without such efforts, students would

only acquire the knowledge with very little left in their mind about the teacher himself.

Another undergraduate male also stressed the importance of teaching students more than knowledge. He indicated that he would like professors to “cultivate the minds of students” and to “talk, even for ten minutes during class, about things students need to learn in preparation for life in the larger society, and tell them how to lead their lives.”

In terms of failing to provide appropriate guidance for students, several participants talked about former high school teachers or professors who in their view misused, or even abused in some cases, their authority and power over students. A graduate female spoke of a male professor whom she viewed as not only incompetent but also incapable of exercising authority over students in class. She commented:

Kids would do other things in his class, you know. He taught poetry. ... If I were a teacher, I wouldn't do it that way. If my students were doing other things I would at least confront them, asking “How come you are doing that?” But he never did that. It seemed to me that students then looked down on him all the more.

Similarly, a graduate male voiced his criticism of a particular male professor whom he saw as incompetent and also incapable of taking charge in his class. He stated: “[He was] unable to *control* and lead students. Then he can't be thought of as a professor, in my view.”

Other participants spoke in disapproval of faculty members' preferential treatment of some students accompanied by a negatively biased approach to some

others. Two graduate participants, one male and one female, complained about the tendency among certain professors to be “emotionally-driven” or “partial” in grading. The issue of partial treatment seemed to be particularly significant for undergraduate students, who talked about their experiences with some former high school teachers with much animation and detail. An undergraduate male criticized what he perceived as a lack of consistency among some teachers in administering physical punishment to students and consequently “punishing certain students for things they would let others get away with.” He commented:

[T]here seemed to be preferential treatment, separating kids who did well in school from those who did poorly, and kids having prestigious family background from those who didn't. My point is that although most teachers aren't that way, there are some who are that way.

The apparent tendency among some high school teachers to overtly show favoritism to academically-inclined students was also mentioned by a few of the undergraduate females. One student recalled a prevalent sense of discord and conflict between subgroups of students in her high school senior class--between those academically-inclined and those not. She particularly focused on the behavior of her male supervisory teacher. In Korea, the supervisory teacher remains in charge of an assigned group of students, typically ranging in number from 50 to 60, throughout the school day within a designated classroom. Korean students at all grade levels do not pass to other classrooms except for certain special classes or extracurricular activities. Subject area teachers come to the supervisory room for classes. The participant claimed that instead of exercising his leadership to

work to resolve student problems, her supervisory teacher resorted to preferential treatment for academically-inclined students, thereby exacerbating classroom tension and disharmony. Another student was critical of a teacher's partial treatment of students on the basis of academic performance alone. The participant commented that although she did not expect teachers to remain at all times totally neutral toward their students, she did believe that nonetheless teachers should never "totally dismiss" less-favored students such as in the case of "openly putting them down" in class. Still another student spoke of her own personal experience with one particular male high school teacher, someone with whom she had a highly conflictual relationship. While admitting to the negative feelings and disrespectful behaviors she herself had displayed in his class, she claimed that the teacher had treated her in a particularly harsh and unfair manner. She stated, "[He] wrote me off as a trouble-maker and treated me as less than human."

Some participants expressed strong feelings about use of physical force on students in unrestrained or abusive fashion. A graduate female remembered how indignant she felt when she saw a male professor hitting several male students who had just got caught in the act of cheating during an in-class examination the last term of their senior year. In a much animated voice she stated:

He was hitting them on the back of their heads. That made me feel so strongly that I would have railed at him had he not been a professor. I very much resented the professor hitting students regardless of what they had done wrong. After this [incident], I completely erased from my mind all my ideas about that person, thinking to myself, '[He is] an association, a bad association, rather than a professor.

Another participant, an undergraduate male, also voiced strong disapproval of some high school teachers who “would get so angry that they could not *control* themselves” when inflicting physical punishment on students whose remarks or behaviors apparently “hurt [the teacher’s] sense of pride” or “authority.” In listing “the course of actions” teachers should not take, another undergraduate male expressly emphasized that the “containment of one’s temper is a must” for someone in a teaching position. He went on to articulate his personal reactions concerning teachers who apparently lost their tempers when disciplining students:

I saw a few times when a teacher, being unable to hide or control his temper, set off by just a certain comment or behavior of a student, would slap [the student] on the cheek, strike him with his fist, or commit even more severe physical violence. Honestly, even from a student’s position, [that teacher] would not look like a teacher at those times. What I mean is that [that teacher] would look more like someone hitting me or my friend rather than like a teacher. In other words, he would no longer look like a teacher, but merely a human being. I understand a teacher is also a human, but for students, he is a teacher. I also understand that there are limits in terms of how much teachers can put up with [in dealing with students.] But I still believe teachers should not go beyond the limits of their own reactions [to students].

Tending

Many participants talked about their personal experiences of and needs for being cared about by faculty members. In discussing their notions of the ideal professor, two graduate males both indicated that the ideal professor would give out the impression that students can always turn to him or her for help with their personal problems. Likewise, other participants also held in high esteem

professors or teachers who were perceived to be “kind and considerate” of and attentive to student needs. In speaking of her favorite male high school teacher, who “cared a lot about me,” an undergraduate female recalled that the teacher would single her out at times to ask her a question in his class. The teacher also would speak to her personally when she and her classmates were cleaning up their own classroom after school, as is customary in Korean elementary and secondary schools. Another undergraduate female also talked about a male high school teacher who “cared a great deal about me,” and “treated me as if I were his own child.” A female graduate student expressed the sense of maintaining a “strong emotional bond” with her favorite male professor and “mentor,” who “always showed care and thoughtful consideration of me” and who continued to offer support and encouragement to the student during her stay in the United States.

Similarly, two male participants spoke of particular male faculty members who “gave a lot of *cheong*” to their students. One of these two, an undergraduate, described a male high school teacher, an alumnus of the school himself, as “particularly attached to the school and us [students]” and always willing to make concerted efforts to tend to the students. The teacher, for example, would come to school on Sundays to play ball with the students in an effort to help relieve the students of the tension they were suffering while preparing for college entrance examinations. The other participant, a graduate student, related close personal relationships he had enjoyed with his two favorite male professors. He noted that one of these professors guided the study group he belonged to and “*push*[ed] me

to study in a way that made me feel emotionally secure.” The participant indicated that he had received considerable “*cheong*” from these professors:

These professors who gave me *cheong* helped me apply myself to studies: There were times they offered me encouragement and also times they presented a new direction [in our field of study]. And they even concerned themselves about the pattern of my daily life: That is, they might say something like, “I see you are leading your life in this way lately. I wonder how much longer you could keep on going like that.” Or, they might just say, “Well, isn’t it about time that you got serious [about your studies]?” They would say those things now and then, which stirred the sense of conscience in me. Well, why would anyone even bother to say things like that if he didn’t care at all about me?

Several participants, on the other hand, wished for professors in general to care more about their students. A graduate male expanded on this issue:

Speaking of our professors in Korea, well, they are scholars and yet as they function within the college setting, they should care about students. But, in reality, the extent of attention and care they show to students is just too narrow. That is, attending to their own studies comes first. And students are put in the back seat. That is basically why [students] can’t look up to them as mentors. My view of teachers is that teachers establish themselves as teachers only in relationship with students. Without their relationships with students, we can no longer consider them as teachers.

Another graduate, a female student, said that she would like to see “more personal relationships” between students and professors and that for the establishment of such relationships professors would need to be “warmer,” “caring,” and “willing to *share* their time and heart” with their students outside of the class. Further she indicated that she tended to feel distant from professors who are “too professor-like,” and who “think they have fulfilled their duties just by giving lectures in the classroom, unwilling to take time for students outside classroom.” Similarly, an undergraduate female wished for professors to make greater efforts to foster one-

on-one relationships with students. Her perception was that compared with high school supervisory teachers, professors “rarely reach out to students unless the students take the initiative” in forming personal relationships with them. Echoing this perception, two graduate male participants pointed out that the presence of “too many students” compared with the number of faculty members in Korean colleges makes it difficult for the professors to attend to individual students on a more personal level.

Role-Modeling

Role-modeling in the context of student-faculty relationship refers to faculty members’ demonstrations of qualities which their students recognize as desirable and may wish to identify with or emulate. The following comment by an undergraduate female effectively illustrates this dimension of what students seek in this context: “Teachers are like a light. If the light is dim, students get lost or have a hard time in navigating in the sea. ... I want teachers to demonstrate something to their students.” Most of her peers in this study seemed to agree that professors and teachers should “demonstrate something to their students” and yet they differed in terms of what the “something” was that they would like to see demonstrated. Participants also varied in terms of specific personal qualities that they most admired about their favorite teachers. Some highlighted competence and expertise in teaching, whereas others focused on faculty members’ demonstrations of dedication to education. Still others stressed the importance of teachers in

“setting an example,” not only for students but for the society as a whole, by showing attitudes and behaviors reflecting integrity and moral character. Finally, a group of females spoke highly of qualities of the female faculty members whom they admired not only as teachers but as role-models for women.

Competence

The issue of possessing competence and expertise in teaching was mentioned by both male and female students, but it seemed particularly important for male students. More male participants emphasized competence as the most important qualification of professors and teachers than did their female counterparts. For example, an undergraduate male explicitly stated, “No matter how caring and considerate, professors lacking competence can’t be recognized as professor, can they?” Competence meant, most of all, being sufficiently knowledgeable or “being second to none in terms of possessing an extensive knowledge in one’s field of study,” as one undergraduate male put it. For several participants, however, competence also meant “love for learning,” or commitment to ongoing pursuit of knowledge. In describing his favorite male professor, a graduate male recalled what stood out most about this relatively “young” professor:

Having finished his study abroad, he had just started teaching. Compared with other professors, I saw in him an extremely energetic and enthusiastic attitude in pursuing his studies. I noticed such [an attitude] in him as he was one of the new generation professors. And I thought such an attitude was much needed.

Some other graduate participants also spoke in admiration of professors who impressed them as being not only knowledgeable but also “steadily and continually engaged in academic pursuit.” Being skillful at teaching was another important aspect of competence. Faculty members who were perceived as more effective in teaching than others presented teaching materials and managed their class in a way that fully engaged students in the learning process and made learning “more enjoyable” and “easier” for students.

Perceived lack of competence of professors or teachers caused these students to lose respect for given faculty members. Several participants voiced their criticism of the incompetence they perceived in the professors or teachers they least liked. These faculty members seemed lacking in knowledge and expertise in the subject matter they were teaching, or they “neglected studies,” as a graduate male pointed out among his several other comments made concerning a particular female college instructor. “Entrenched in routine,” these faculty members taught “the same old stuff year after year” and were unable to provide “anything new” for students. They also seemed unprepared to deal with challenging questions from students. Some participants specifically mentioned that they had noticed ineffectiveness in teaching skills and methods. Revealing that she “had little respect” for a particular male professor she saw as unqualified, an undergraduate female criticized his lectures for being “poorly structured.” A graduate female commented on a male professor’s inability to engage students in learning. She remarked: “His teaching style was so *boring*, sort of rattling on as if talking

to himself. He wasn't teaching effectively at all." An undergraduate male was critical of high school teachers who did not possess "critical self-awareness," those who were "unable to look at themselves and thus continued to teach holding onto their own ineffective [teaching] methods."

"A Sense of Mission"

Distinct from being competent in teaching is the issue of putting one's heart into teaching. Some participants stressed the importance of professors and teachers engaging in education with a sense of devotion or "a sense of mission," the phrase used by some male participants. A graduate male defined "bad teachers" as those who "regard teaching simply as a job" without any sense of mission as educator: These teachers "don't care about their class and students, and are busy attending only to their own personal matters." He asserted that the reason teachers are "still considered very important in Korean society" lies in the fact that "they stand in relation with students." In his view, "70% of student character is formed by [their teachers]," and students are "influenced more by their teachers than by their parents." As such, "only teachers with a sense of mission can be called teachers." Similarly, an undergraduate male viewed teachers as "public figures entrusted with a tremendously important mission" and argued that "no other responsibility is greater than that of teaching."

A graduate female was particularly critical of the professors she saw as "having neither intention nor any philosophy of education." She argued:

I have seen many people who are not educators and yet are in the field of education. ... [These people] don't have any true desire to teach something to someone and yet I saw a lot of such people teaching for the sake of the position and prestige. There was nothing at all to learn from those people.

She articulated her vision of a "true educator":

In my view, a true educator does not simply teach *knowledge*. *Knowledge* itself, *knowledge* can be obtained from books. What only humans can do is to give water and wait patiently, as for a growing plant, until the person grows. Having faith that that person can grow. That is, to serve as what sun, water, or nature does. Providing fertilizers. Perhaps, *knowledge* is a portion of the nutrients. Rather than picking here and there, pushing for the growth, [the true educator] would create an atmosphere where growth can naturally occur. [participant emphasis]

"Setting a Good Example"

In addition to competence in teaching and devotion to education, other desirable personal qualities and attitudes were also mentioned. The undergraduate female who likened teachers to a "light" for students indicated that she would like professors to "make their own ideas clear to others, while at the same time always remaining *open*" to others' ideas. The graduate female who had spoken passionately of her vision of a true educator stressed that teachers should possess "tremendous patience, very *creative minds*, and open-mindedness" in order to serve as growth-facilitators for students.

In contrast, a group of male participants, and most notably the undergraduates, talked most explicitly about moral and respectable conduct that is, in their view, required of educators. An undergraduate male clearly expressed his view that teachers ought to "set a good example" not only for students but for the

society as a whole:

First of all, teachers should set a good example for the society, even more so than government officials. Frankly, education plays the biggest role in sustaining the moral principles of the society, doesn't it? And teachers are the providers of education and therefore, if they fail to set a good example, the society would lose the basic foundation of its moral principles, right?

For another undergraduate male, the "ideal professor" was someone who demonstrates not only scholarly competence but also moral integrity, such as "not being servile" as he put it. He envisioned someone who "can speak out concerning their own positions" without giving in to the pressure from higher authorities or going along with others, in a situation where all involved know things are not as they should be: that is, "someone who would not attach oneself to any type of authority or power for personal benefit."

A graduate male reiterated this sentiment in stressing the importance of teachers always following the ethical course of action, such as showing moral courage to publicly protest against the wrongdoings of their school administration. Still another male, an undergraduate, expressed his view that teachers "must be truthful" and "demonstrate honesty and sincerity" even when they have made mistakes or showed undesirable conduct in relation to students. Finally, another undergraduate male stated: "Professors ought to be *high class* not only in terms of intellect but in terms of cultural level. ... Only professors with culture would deserve respect, right?" His expectation was that professors "morally inspire students" not only with words but by actually demonstrating in "conduct worthy of a professor in every aspect." He offered examples of "professors lacking

culture and refinement,” such as those who, in conversing with students, “talk vulgar” or “cross the line” and talk about things they are not supposed to (e.g., their “real estate investment” or to “bragging about how rich they are”).

Role Models for Women

It was previously noted that only female participants identified women as their favorite teachers or professors. Three of the 4 female students who spoke of their favorite women teachers were all undergraduates. A common theme ran through what each of these three admired. The admired women teachers seemed to have impressed these students with being their own persons and interacting with their environments with a secure sense of self and personal choice.

One of these students indicated that she respected a particular female professor not only as teacher but as a woman. She expressed her admiration of the professor for her ability to draw a sense of satisfaction from “all areas of her life,” including family, career, and hobbies. She recalled: “I thought to myself, then, as feeling rather envious of her, ‘If I could lead such a life after graduating and getting married, I, too, would lead my life feeling content.’” For another student, a “young” female college instructor left the strong lasting impression of being a “woman with rather progressive ideas.” She remembered this instructor as someone who “knew clearly what it was that she was doing and who had rich ideas and feelings.” The third student’s favorite teacher was a young female teacher from her middle school years. The student remembered having felt that

the teacher had “her own views on things that are clearly defined.” The way the teacher expressed her ideas as well as other personal characteristics led the student to feel at the time that the teacher was “somehow different from others.” The student recalled how this teacher “would come to the school dressed in *han-bok* she herself had made.” *Han-bok* is a term for traditional Korean costume. Most contemporary Koreans, particularly those from urban areas, prefer Western style attire to *han-bok* for daily work, and wear the *han-bok* for special occasions, festivals, and ceremonies. Although in recent years there has been an increasing interest in modifying *han-bok* to better fit the modern lifestyle, a teacher, male or female, wearing *han-bok* to work was a rare sight a decade or so ago. The same student further reflected on what this teacher inspired within her at the time:

Watching her, I thought to myself, “I wish I could be, like her, assured of my own ideas and capable of expressing what I personally believe in, to the extent that when other people saw me, they would also think, ‘That person’s really assured of herself and her own ideas.’” That teacher seems to stand out most from the memories of my entire school life [in Korea].

Being More Mutual Versus Being “Authoritarian”

Many participants talked about professors and teachers who tended to be mutual in relating to students, in comparison to those who were “too authoritarian.” Professors and teachers perceived as mutual or “not authoritarian” tended to “try to understand students” from the students’ own points of view. Although both male and female participants appreciated such efforts, male participants did so more expressly than did their female counterparts. One undergraduate male

described teachers who were always “making efforts to understand kids” as “being human.” Another undergraduate male spoke of his favorite male professor, who “always when speaking took the side of the students.” Similarly, another undergraduate male said that his favorite male high school teacher “would talk [to students] with students’ positions taken into consideration.” He clearly stated his views concerning how teachers should relate to students:

I think the most desirable way teachers should relate to students is to teach while taking the students’ positions into consideration. [Teachers] should try to listen for the students’ positions and that would be the fastest way to solve problems. And moreover, such oppressive, hierarchical, and one-way directional elements must be done away with, and, in my view, only then the greatest authority or moral character of teachers would be established.

Professors and teachers characterized as being more mutual than authoritarian were also perceived as more approachable than others. These faculty members tended to relate to students in a manner that made students “feel at ease,” “feel comfortable calling on them,” or “feel like I can come closer” to them. In describing her favorite male high school teacher, an undergraduate female said that she “felt comfortable with him just like with my dad.” A graduate female indicated that her favorite male professor was someone she felt she “could have a nice talk with, drinking a cup of tea together, anytime I visit, without even the slightest burden on my mind.” Later in the interview, however, she complained about the pervasive lack of a “true dialogue” between students and professors on college campus. True dialogue, in her view, is not the same as “superficial and unengaging dialogue” but is instead that which would help professors “see

students not from their own standpoints but from those of the students.”

In addition, the professors and teachers these students felt to be more approachable than others also impressed the students as “gentle,” “kind,” “humble,” or “able to mix well with students in social settings.” In contrast, the professors and teachers these students perceived to be “difficult to get close to” were described as “rigid,” “formalistic,” “inflexible,” or “too business-like” in relating to students.

Three male participants further extended their own visions of desirable student-faculty relationship in terms of it being “more equal” than strictly hierarchical in nature. One of these participants, a graduate male, expanded on what he meant by a “more nearly equal” student-faculty relationship:

In relating to students too, well, uh, not such a hierarchical relationship but what I would call somewhat equal. Although [professors] could not be totally like friends [with students], it would be nice if they related [to students] in such a manner that would make [students] feel comfortable to approach them to ask questions. That’s because if [professors] come across as too stern, it’s extremely difficult for students to get close to them.

Similarly, another participant, an undergraduate, expressed a wish that professors would conduct themselves in such a manner that students would “feel comfortable relating to them.” The desirable student-faculty relationship for this participant, then, was one in which “students themselves recognize professors’ authority as opposed to professors themselves claiming their own authority over students.” The third male, also an undergraduate, added further rationale in support of teachers who tended to be more mutual in relating to students. However, this

participant conversely indicated that he did not “see in a favorable light teachers who are completely open with students.”

Finally, professors and teachers seen as more mutual, from the perspectives of several participants, tended to be more willing to listen to what students had to say and to be more respectful of students’ own ideas and views than were some other faculty, who were perceived as being authoritarian. A number of participants, mostly undergraduates, commented on the importance of teachers’ willingness to honor and foster students’ self-expressions and individuality. An undergraduate male expressed his view that teachers should “respect the opinions of students, however young they might be, and also actively elicit them.” He wished that teachers would be more willing to “discuss and share ideas with students.” Another undergraduate, female, in referring specifically to high school teachers, emphasized how important it was for teachers to remain receptive to students’ own ideas. This participant’s view was that in the course of individual meetings intended for offering guidance to students, it is important that students and teachers “each share their own ideas and have a dialogue, as opposed to students being made to come and listen to a lecture” from the teachers. Two other undergraduate participants, one female one male, commented that teachers should recognize students’ individual “potential for growth” or “pay more attention to students’ individual personal characteristics, aptitudes, and career exploration and planning.”

Similarly, a graduate female expressed a wish that professors would have more dialogues with students, stating that “in college, students do have some level of knowledge and their own ideas.” She also wished that teachers would work more “*group* discussion” into their classes. Likewise, an undergraduate female also would like to see professors allowing more opportunities for students to express their own views in class, rather than leading a “*lecture-oriented class*” and “cramming education” into their minds.

In comparison with professors and teachers perceived as being more mutual, those “with authoritarian mentality” were characterized as “trying to rule over students.” A graduate male made the particularly strong statement of expressing that he “hate[s]” such mentality. A graduate female depicted the male professor for whom she had come to lose respect, as clearly acting toward students from commitment to the belief that “it’s all right to disregard students just because he’s a professor.” Another graduate female claimed that she “saw a lot of times [professors] entrapped in an outrageous authoritarianism, mentally abusing students.” A few of the undergraduate male participants also voiced their disapproval of the authoritarian attitudes they found to exist among some of their former high school teachers.

A graduate male participant recounted the personal experience he had undergone in connection with a particular male professor. According to the participant’s accounts, the professor had strongly discouraged students from asking questions and freely expressing their opinions in class. Severe limitation of

student input was accomplished “by resorting to authoritarianism and an repressive atmosphere.” For example, this professor, in many instances, would single out and “severely scold” individual students in class, if they had failed to give the right answer to his question.

American Faculty

As with their experiences in relation to Korean faculty, participants were invited to share their personal experiences with and perceptions of American faculty. Participants were asked to identify both their favorite and their least-liked American professors. Participants were also asked to talk about any personal difficulties experienced in relating to American professors. Finally, participants were given opportunities to compare and contrast observations made and views held concerning American versus Korean student-faculty relationships.

Two-thirds of the participants ($n = 16$) identified the favorite professors they had met while studying in the United States. Six of these 16 each talked about 2 favorite faculty members. All but one talked about faculty members at their current U.S. university. One participant, an undergraduate male, spoke of the instructor from whom he had taken a class at a nearby community college. Of the 22 instructors identified, 5 were female and 4 were foreign-born professors from either an Asian or a European country.

Eight of the participants did not identify anyone they met while in the United States as their favorite professor. Most of these participants indicated that

there had not been any American professors as yet whom they particularly admired or with whom they had formed close personal relationships. Six participants, including 3 graduate females, 2 undergraduate males, and 1 undergraduate female, noted that although they could not single out anyone in particular as their favorite professor, they had a favorable impression of American professors in general.

With regard to least-liked professors, nearly half of the participants ($n = 11$) identified specific individual faculty members. One undergraduate male identified two professors, one male and one female. Among the 13 faculty members overall identified for the least-liked category, one was a foreign-born male, and 7 were female, including one female teaching assistant. All of the identified faculty members were those whom the students had met while studying at their current university.

Some of the participants who did not identify any least-liked professors specifically indicated that they generally liked or thought favorably of the American faculty they had encountered. Others mentioned that they had not met any specific professor who had imparted a particularly unfavorable impression on them. Stating that there had not been any American professor he particularly disliked, an undergraduate male explained:

The sense of dislike itself presupposes some level of personal contact. ... As most of the classes I took were *low-level* courses, and were lecture-style, accommodating a huge number of students, there was minimal contact [between myself and the professors]. Therefore, I don't have any sense of dislike.

Another undergraduate male noted that it was difficult for him to “evaluate” American professors, because they struck him as “all alike” and also because he did not “expect much” from them. Moreover, not having had any experience with professors in Korea, he did not have any frame of reference with which he could compare American professors.

Several common themes were culled from participant descriptions concerning their interpersonal experiences and perceptions in relation to American faculty. These themes were grouped together into the four aspects representative of participants’ views of American faculty’s relational orientations, personal qualities, attitudes, and behaviors toward students. These aspects were: (1) being more egalitarian, (2) role-modeling, (3) tending, and (4) guidance and leading. The theme of being more egalitarian includes two features: (1) being more casual; and (2) being more “respectful” of students. The theme of role modeling also includes two features: (1) teacher as “a career person” rather than as a mentor; and (2) competence in teaching.

Being More Egalitarian

Being More Casual

Participants in general described American professors as somewhat “casual” and “not authoritarian” when relating to students. The perceived lack of authoritarianism stood out in participants’ minds when comparing American and

Korean faculty members. The same perception was shared among the participants that interpersonal relationships between American professors and students were both less hierarchical and less formalistic in nature than those maintained between Korean professors and students. An undergraduate female remarked that whereas “in Korea it felt as if professors were people who are somewhere way up there,” American professors felt “closer” to her. She added: “Although we are different in our nationalities, there seems to be less of a *gap* between us ... in the sense that although the American professors and I are not personally close to each other, I feel comfortable going to talk with them.” Another student, an undergraduate male, also reported feeling more comfortable when approaching American faculty to discuss class-related matters than he had when faced with his former Korean professors. The participant found American professors to be more accessible and responsive as far as students’ academic needs were concerned. The student then elaborated on the perception that “professors are people who are difficult to get close to,” a perception which he believed was commonly held among Koreans:

Because our country places the highest value on proprieties and there is a big age difference between students and professors and professors are very, well--because we were brought up in a society where traditionally people have been taught to pay an utmost homage to teachers and parents, taught not to step on even their shadows [a Korean adage], we would just become so timid when with a professor. And we can’t even express what we want to say, right? So, [it’s difficult] to approach [professors] to inquire about things we didn’t understand during class, and also there are few professors who would welcome [such a visit from students].

An undergraduate female noted that American professors are not as “high-handed” in relating to students as Korean professors. Her sense was that

American “teachers are gesturing to students, ‘Come to me to be embraced,’ just like *a-jo-ssi* with his two arms wide open.” She further noted that language might have something to do with her perception that there was “no gap” between American professors and students. In first meeting an American professor, the student found that she could converse with the professor using “casual language,” whereas with a Korean professor, she was expected to use formal Korean language including honorifics. She revealed that she found it “very difficult” to converse with Korean professors using formal language.

Two other participants, both graduate students, also made references to cultural differences in the use of language. One of these two, a female student, pointed out that when addressing American professors one could call out, “*Bill!*” or “*Bob!*,” whereas with Korean professors, one was required to address them much more formally, using such modes of address as “*gyo-soo-nim*.” “*Gyo-soo*” is a Korean term meaning professor and “*nim*” is a honorific term commonly used when addressing those who are senior to the speaker in terms of age or social ranking. The other participant, a male student, making similar reference to matters of formality, pointed out a comparable cultural difference in the terms Korean versus American professors use in addressing their students. For example, when addressing a male student with his family name “Kim,” American professors might say “*Mr. Kim*,” but Korean professors would likely say “*Kim kun*.” The term, “*kun*” following the family name as used here, is a term customarily used among Koreans in addressing a male who is unmarried, younger, and of lower status than

the speaker.

Moreover, a graduate female remarked that Korean professors “tend to be authoritarian and hard to intimately relate to” and that “one just feels uncomfortable and intimidated when with a professor.” She recalled her first graduate class meeting in the United States during which she had been “sitting still, feeling rather timid.” Then she became aware of something “peculiar” about her posture as she began to notice that everyone else in the class appeared comfortable, “sitting with their legs crossed, and snacking” all the while throughout the class period. “Someone asked me if I was feeling ill,” she remembered. Later on she managed to allow herself the liberty of having something to snack on during classes and found this habit very much to her liking. She no longer felt “very tired” from having to wait until after the evening classes to get something to eat or to drink. She was particularly appreciative of the “free atmosphere” she sensed in her classes and also the “comfortable” and “intimate” manner in which she saw the American professor and students interacting with one another.

Indicating that American professors tended to be less “authoritarian” than Korean professors, an undergraduate male described in detail an episode which was “really shocking” to him. He explained that in one of the classes he took his first semester in the United States, as the professor and students were reviewing material related to an upcoming major test, one of the students asked the professor to tell the class what formulae would be on the test. The professor simply smiled without complying with the request, the student, however, a female, tried to press

him by saying, “*Hey, come on, guy!*” The participant looked back from where he was seated and saw, to his utter disbelief, the female student in question, in a nearly reclining position and with her legs propped up on the chair in front of her. What was equally shocking to the participant was that the professor had not seemed to have taken offense at the student’s deportment. The participant, on the other hand, was convinced that no Korean professor would have tolerated such a display of disrespect.

In the course of discussing difficulties they had experienced when attempting to relate to American professors, several participants suggested that the internalized “fixed notion” of hierarchical relationship between professors and students continued to present difficulties. Despite understanding that American professors’ relations with students were “less hierarchical” though “not entirely like peer relationship,” a graduate male revealed that he continued to feel “uneasy about readily approaching” American professors in general. He reflected:

[W]ell, I, I was thinking that I might be putting up a wall between myself and those persons [American professors], because I continue to think in terms of the teacher-student relationship in Korea. As you know, in Korea, the relations between teachers and students are very much those of people of the higher and the lower status. And therefore, it’s still difficult for me to relate to professors here. ... To some extent it seems that it is my ideas that are creating such difficulty.

An undergraduate female expressed feeling apprehensive about conversing individually with American professors, in stating that:

In class, it always feels as if [the professors] are far off and distant from me. And then, coming closer to them and conversing with them on a one-to-one basis is somewhat nerve-racking. And even more so, because [I

have to speak] in English, not in Korean.

An additional source of apprehension for her was a pervasive concern that despite her wish to express herself in a “deferential” manner and to “impress the teachers favorably,” her limited English speaking skills might cause the “sentences” she constructed in English to come out in ways that she did not intend and thus might cause her to sound discourteous.

A graduate female mentioned that she became most keenly aware of the cultural differences in student-faculty relationship while taking a class from a female American professor. And she was the only international student in the entire class. She recalled that as she was observing her American classmates and the professor “intimately” relating to one another, she felt like an “*outsider*” and “different from other people.” “It is hard for me to relate to a professor that intimately,” she remarked. Her perception was that American professors and students were “more equal” and “more like friends,” whereas there was a “sense of distance” between Korean professors and students. Further, she elaborated:

The reason why there is such a distance [between Korean professors and students] is that in our way of thinking, professors are seen as those [up there] like Heaven, and therefore, it’s like “How dare you,” *you know*. But here, well, uhm, too close a relationship? That is, close to the point where students would talk to the professors about what they did personally, what they did *last evening*, talking about trivial personal things. ... In a way it’s a closer relationship, but in another way, it’s a relationship in which the status [of American professors] is lowered when compared with that of Korean professors.

Similarly, an undergraduate male indicated that he found it difficult to relate to American professors in the manner American students did, because the

“notion” was still with him that “teachers are authority figures who are difficult to relate to.” Teachers were difficult for him to relate to in the sense that: “Teachers have an authoritarian mentality, and you feel uncomfortable relating to them, you have to conduct yourself properly and be careful, and there are, you know, all these formalities.” Nonetheless, he understood on the cognitive level that American professors were “not at all teachers I should feel uncomfortable relating to because of formalities,” for he had seen American students relating to their professors “comfortably, though not like their friends.” The participant stressed that his preconceived notions of teachers strongly affected his attitudes and behaviors toward American professors. This was especially true during the early phase of his stay in the United States, to the extent that he “didn’t go to see teachers even when I had difficulties or questions concerning the coursework.” At the time, he “thought not knowing things was all my fault.” Over the years, however, he had seen some noticeable changes in his “way of thinking.” He now believed that “it is only natural that I don’t understand everything because I am a student.” A turning point came when he realized that he had no one else but American professors to turn to for help with his classwork. A group of co-national peers he had relied on for assistance had all graduated and left the campus. When he finally “got up the courage” and began seeking American professors to ask for help, he learned that they were “extremely kind and helpful.” Expressing a sense of regret, he remarked that this experience had led him to feel that if he had sought out American professors from the beginning, he could have

cultivated more meaningful and enjoyable relationships with them over the past few years. The student also talked about an encounter he had had with a Korean professor and a group of the professor's present and former graduate students during a visit with his best friend back home. This encounter led the participant to realize "how much I've changed." The participant, his best friend, and the group of past and present graduate students accompanied the professor to a social gathering held in the professor's honor. For each of the present and former Korean students in the group, the professor had served as the major academic advisor. The special occasion was Teachers' Day. The participant recalled that, in his eyes, the manner in which the Korean professor and the Korean graduate students and former students related to one another was bound by "formalities." Many of their mannerisms seemed "very strange," "awkward," and "unnatural." The realization that he "hadn't even expected" fellow Koreans to relate to one another in the manner he had just observed brought home to him the extent of the difference between them and himself.

Being More "Respectful" of Students

A number of participants mentioned that compared with Korean professors, American professors tended to relate to students as "more like equals" in the sense that they were more "respectful" of students, their personhood, their opinions, and their feelings. An undergraduate female expressed her perception that American student-faculty relationships were not predicated on "status" and that

American professors and students “relate to one another on an equal footing as individuals who are independent of one another.” Further, the participant noted that she learned the American system is such that “teachers can get into *trouble* sometimes if they don’t fully accommodate students’ opinions.” She added that “the basic reason behind it is that American society itself does not accept the seniority mentality, as our country does, that the senior, older are necessarily right and wise.” A graduate male remarked that American professors show respect for students, “respect for the individual’s freedom” and that they are not permitted to treat students in a heavy-handed manner, “let alone strike them.” His observation was that despite its “unrestrained” appearance, American society nonetheless strictly adheres to the principle of respecting individuals. Another graduate male became aware that “there are all kinds of written rules and regulations, which act to prohibit American professors from ruling over students,” and which hold the professors accountable for their professional judgments and behaviors. He stated his view that American student-faculty relationships were based on “responsibilities and prerogatives” of both parties that were clearly spelled out, which contrasted with the corresponding relationships among Koreans. This student expressly voiced his disliking of “authoritarian mentality” and attitudes that he saw as prevailing among Korean professors, who maintain strictly hierarchical relationships with their students. An undergraduate male also remarked that American professors respect students as “humans” and that the relationships between the two are based on “freedom and respect,” as opposed to being bound by proprieties

and role expectations as in Korean student-faculty relationships.

Several participants spoke more specifically of American professors' attitudes they perceived to be more respectful and accepting of students' ideas and opinions in class. An undergraduate female mentioned that if a student made a comment in class that was clearly "off," an American professor would still react to the comment in a respectful manner. In such a case, a Korean professor would more than likely totally dismiss the comment as irrelevant and blatantly "put the student to shame." In the student's view, American faculty members respected students more than did their Korean counterparts, particularly high school teachers. It was her understanding that such respect for the individual provides the very basis of democracy, on which American society is built, and that Americans have grown up in a primarily egalitarian sociocultural milieu. A graduate male, making a similar observation, commented that American professors were "very courteous toward students" to the extent that they responded cordially to questions from students regardless of how "blatantly simplistic" the given question might seem to be. The student commented on the perceived tendency among American students to ask questions in class without any hesitation whatsoever, in sharp contrast to the attitude found among their Korean counterparts. He added:

There's no coercive atmosphere whatsoever [in class]. Consequently, consequently, [students] get to talk. Because they don't know--and here kids are not ashamed of not knowing. In Korea, [students] feel very ashamed if they don't know about something. Moreover, "How come you don't even know that?," [Korean teachers] would put them to shame, you know. "How come you don't even know that?" But here, if [students] don't understand, then [teachers] simply say, "You don't understand this?"

and explain, "Well, that is such and such." They don't say, "How come you don't even know this?"

Likewise, a graduate female commented that American professors impressed her as more receptive to student ideas and more willing to work collaboratively with students in problem-solving than had her former Korean professors. American students, in turn, appeared to her to be self-assertive and capable of presenting alternative perspectives to the professor. Her perception was that Korean professors tended to adhere to the mindset that "I am a professor ... I am teaching others, I am indeed above others, above students." Korean professors, thus, tended to think that "they are always right and would stick to their own ideas to the end" when those ideas were contradicted by students. Further, Korean professors tended to impose their own approaches to problem-solving rather than actively eliciting and incorporating input from students. Similarly, a graduate male shared his perception that American students were allowed to directly challenge professors' ideas and to assert themselves in class to a degree which would seem "presumptuous" to Koreans. On the other hand, Korean students would often find it difficult to express their own ideas in class, because within the Korean student-faculty relationships roles are prescribed so that "teachers are those who give and students are those who receive." A graduate female characterized the relationships between Korean professors and students as being those in which "one party gives orders and the other party takes them." She added that even in class, "one party offers explanations and the other party takes

notes,” instead of both parties engaging in “*discussion*.” In comparison, she perceived American professors as being in a relatively “much lower” status than their Korean counterparts, since American students would relate to their professors as “equals” and sometimes act in a manner which the participant characterized as being immodest and daring. The participant later revealed her personal reactions to the mode of relating between Korean professors and students: “I am accustomed to it, to the hierarchical aspect of the relationship, passively receiving [as student]. Yes, I am very accustomed to it, and yet, I seem to always react to it quite negatively, albeit privately.”

For another female, an undergraduate student, Korean teachers were also authority figures to whom she found it difficult to relate comfortably. Like other participants, she also characterized Korean teachers as subscribing to a rather “authoritarian mentality,” for instance when attempting to impress upon the situation that: “I am a teacher and you are a student. And therefore, whatever [I as] teacher do is unconditionally right. And whenever a teacher says, ‘You do this,’ students must follow.” In comparison, in her personal experiences, American professors were rarely authoritarian. The participant stated:

They don’t seem to be coercive. They simply explain [to students] that such is such. And they rarely demand that students unconditionally comply or do this in this way. Their style is more like, “If it suits you, do it, but if it doesn’t, then you don’t have to.”

The participant was also impressed with American students’ ability to “present their own ideas in a very coherent and articulate manner.” Her perception was

that Korean students, the products of a “cramming education,” lacked the ability to articulate their own ideas and thus hardly expressed any opinions and views of their own that were contradictory to those of their teachers.

An undergraduate male directly indicated that he felt “comfortable” when talking with American teachers individually. He noted that he had never heard American professors speaking to students in a “commanding” tone of voice. His observation had been that American professors tended to explain to students about courses of actions and their consequences, instead of commanding. In his view, such an attitude reflected American professors’ “respectful consideration of the student as an individual.”

Another undergraduate male was particularly impressed with the willingness demonstrated by American professors to readily acknowledge their own mistakes and to say, “*I am sorry. Thank you.*,” when students pointed out instructor errors in solving problems in class. Similarly, a graduate female commented that the frequent use of such expressions as “*I am sorry*” and “*Thank you*” among American professors gave her the “feeling” that American professors and students were “on equal terms.” The participant added that she had never heard her former Korean professors using such expressions in class. She also appreciated American professors for openly admitting that they did not know when that was the case.

Role-Modeling

The view of American professors as role models for students centered around two features: first, their taking the stance of a “career person” toward teaching and, second, their overall competence in offering instruction. Notably lacking, however, were comments revealing any explicit expectation among Korean students that their American professors would demonstrate high levels of personal integrity and moral character through their setting of good examples for both students and the society.

Teacher as “a Career Person” Rather Than as a Mentor

Some participants shared the perception that American professors regarded teaching merely as a “profession” or “career” rather than as a vocation. According to these participants, American professors related to students primarily through assuming the stance of professionals who “just impart knowledge.” They rarely attempted to serve as mentors, the roles maintained by some Korean professors who “assume the responsibility of looking after students,” in academic matters and in personal matters as well. These participants, along with some others, also noted that although more casual and less formalistic than Korean professors in interacting with students, American professors tended to relate to students in a manner that was “impersonal” and “business-like” in nature. Some students specifically pointed out that being casual with students is not the same as being “personally

close.” In comparison, being formalistic and hierarchical, Korean professors, nonetheless, are more likely to establish relationships with students that are at the same time more personal, in the sense of imbuing such relationships with feelings of “intimacy,” “affection,” and “*cheong*.”

A graduate female commented that she had often thought of her American professors as “professionals” and that in the United States “professors are equated with their knowledge, which has nothing to do with their personhood.” The participant added that she did acquire from American professors a great deal of “knowledge,” which she distinguished from “wisdom.” And yet she felt that American professors were “humanly blocked,” lacking “*compassion*” and “human *connection*” when interacting with students. In her view, American professors did not feel any “sense of responsibility” for individual students. Moreover, she elaborated:

In Korea, [the professor-student relationship] is still influenced by familism. No longer viewed as the same as the parent-child relationship as in the past, the mentor-student relationship, nonetheless, continues to overlap with [parent-child relationship] to some extent. The [professor-student] relationship is such that professors do assume the responsibility of looking after students although the level of intimacy may vary [from one relationship to another]. But here, such relationship is nowhere to be found.

Some other participants mentioned difficulties they had experienced in developing personal relationships with their American professors. A graduate male expressly complained about the perceived lack of opportunity for students to develop close personal relationships with American faculty. He noted that in Korean universities professors and students would often create occasions to gather

together socially, such as “having a dinner together.” His experience on the U.S. college campus had been that students would see professors during “*office hours*” concerning impersonal matters only and that students were rarely given opportunities to “meet with a teacher” and to “get to know the person personally.” Similarly, an undergraduate female mentioned that although she “would really love” to meet individually with American professors and to talk with them on a more personal level, she had shied away from doing so. It seemed to her that few American professors would “desire personal relationships” with students. The participant indicated that there had not been anyone among her American professors with whom she would feel comfortable consulting about her personal problems or just conversing on a more personal level. The student further noted that whenever she talked with American professors individually, the topics were almost always “impersonal” or “formal” in nature, such as class-related matters. With American professors, she “can’t freely talk about everything, this and that,” as she did with some of her former Korean high school teachers.

Likewise, another undergraduate female felt that American professors and students conduct themselves in such a manner that American college education is “like a private academy” and teaching becomes “merely a job.” In the Korean private academy, as referred to by the participant, educational and learning contexts differ from those of the traditional school setting. Operating on a purely contractual basis, the institute charges fees to students seeking preparation for taking high school or college entrance examinations. Unlike the traditional

school, relationships and interactions between instructors and class participants are typically impersonal and transactional in nature. Thus, American student-faculty relationships, from the participant's point of view, were based on impersonal transactions, rather than on "*cheong*." In elaboration of this point, the participant offered the following observation concerning American professors and their students: "[They] just come to the class, and then leave when class is over, and when problems arise, they work on them together. And teachers can get into trouble, and students can get into trouble. It's too much like that." The participant illustrated her point by suggesting that when referring to one of their students to a third party, American professors were likely to say, "*She was in my class*" rather than "*She was my student*." The participant argued: "*She was in my class*' represents a fact. A fact. And it says something about the past. And it seems to mean that there is no relationship [between the professor and the student] in the present." In comparison, when she heard one of her former American professors saying to her parents, who were visiting her at the time, "*She was my student. She was a good student*," she felt it was "somewhat Korean" in the sense that "it conveys a certain ongoing *relationship* with me, giving off a sense of some continuity." The student also noted that when meeting with American professors individually, she found that they would become "stiff and rigid" and respond "only to questions," being "unable to dialogue" concerning matters other than those directly pertaining to the class. "In some way, Korean teachers are more personally intimate" with students, she remarked. To her, American professors

are “too impersonal” in relating to students, and “busy only with defending themselves.” She revealed that over the course of her stay in the United States, she herself had come to relate to American professors in an “impersonal” manner:

Of course, I do go to see them to ask questions when there's a problem. But I've learned that that was all there is to it. Because they would go, “*What do you need? What can I help you [with]?*,” I too have become that way myself. “*What can I help you?*” or “*What did, what did you say? What is your name? What do you need?*,” like that, too formally. ... I would say it's being impersonal rather than cold. Uhm, that's probably what I meant by teachers *defend*[ing] themselves. Teachers always getting tensed up, and going “What can I help you with?,” in that way.

Looking back on her college education in the United States, the participant concluded that what she had learned in the American university was “*competition*,” “small knowledge,” and “always *defend*[ing] oneself and fighting.” But she had not learned “*wisdom*” and had not received the “education that touches one's *heart*.”

Finally, a graduate male remarked that whereas Korean professors and students come to develop close personal relationships that are sustained over time, American professors and students “see one another only when they need something and they don't need to see one another when there's no need for it.” Consequently, American student-professor relationships tended to be “superficial” and to remain formal. The shared personal experiences he had had with his American advisor and supervisor, for whom he had worked as a graduate assistant. He stated that although he and his advisor “have come to know each other personally,” their relationship had not developed into the “Korean-style” student-

professor relationship. What he came to realize was that “there are limitations” in terms of how personally close he could become with his American advisor. Initially, he had tried to relate to the advisor in the same manner that he would to “Korean professors,” and to treat him as his “mentor.” In the hope of fostering a personally close relationship with the advisor, he invited the advisor to his place to meet his family. He also eagerly looked for “even simple errands” that he could do for the advisor, as graduate assistants in Korea would customarily do for their professors. However, he came to notice that the advisor seemed to feel “awkward” and “uncomfortable” and to be “drawing the line.” He reflected:

When I volunteered to do things for him, he would just say, “That’s all right.” A few times when I did get to do things for him voluntarily, he did thank me, though. But still--if I were him, I’d be happy to use [the assistant] more and more--but he wasn’t like that at all. ... It got to be awkward for me alone to continue acting that way, as I sensed that he was feeling uncomfortable, finding the situation awkward. So now I, too, go with the American style, doing things only when I am asked to.

Some participants, on the other hand, depicted American faculty’s professional stance toward students in a more positive light. An undergraduate male noted that “the mentor-student relationship in Korea, the interpersonal ties, is in name only” and that college students in Korea rarely receive assistance with their studies from their professors outside the classroom. He found American professors to be much more responsive than his former Korean professors to his requests for help with his studies. Arguing that “other than that which pertains to studies, there’s not much students could expect from their professors,” the participant stressed the importance of professors’ willingness to “support students” in their

struggle with their studies.

A graduate female expressed her sense that in the United States “professors exist for students, but there [in Korea] it felt as if students were there for their professors’ sake.” She went on to say:

For instance, here when students ask questions, teachers are under an obligation to answer. In other words, students and teachers seem to think, “Because I have *pay* [sic] the tuition, you ought to respond [to my questions].’ But there, it feels like students would need to beg for learning from teachers.

The speaker, relatively new to the United States, believed that given the perceived mindset among American professors that “I am here for students” and not vice versa, if she could speak English more fluently, she could become much closer to American professors within the two years of her graduate program than she had been able to with Korean professors during the entire four years of her undergraduate study.

Competence in Teaching

Several participants directly mentioned that in their opinion, American faculty in general employed more effective and diverse teaching methods and approaches than Korean faculty. Characterizing the teaching style prevalent in Korean colleges and universities as “lecture-oriented” and “cramming style,” in which students typically remain passive and silent, these participants particularly valued some of the teaching methods American faculty used, such as classroom discussion, small group discussion, and in-class presentations by students. The

participants suggested that these methods tended to elicit active participation from students and to foster a dynamic exchange of ideas and opinions between professors and students, and among students themselves as well. An undergraduate male, for instance, depicted American faculty as “moderators” who, by “presiding” over discussions and arguments among students, allow them to “have lots of opportunities to express their own opinions and to accept others’ opinions.” In addition, two other undergraduate students, one male the other female, indicated that American faculty, when compared with Korean faculty, made greater efforts to link teaching materials to real-life experiences.

Several participants spoke more specifically concerning the perceived competence in teaching and the scholarship of the particular American professors whom they most admired. These participants were impressed with the depth and extent of certain professors’ knowledge and expertise in their fields of study. Also impressive to these students were the “teaching *technique[s]*” the professors employed or the manner in which they taught their classes. These professors led their classes in a fashion that made the classes “*exciting*” or “interesting” rather than boring. They also appeared “well prepared for their classes.” They came across as “sincere” or “very enthusiastic” about teaching. An undergraduate male described one of the things that stood out about his favorite male professor: “[He] taught in an enthusiastic and effective manner. Seemed to me that he was competent as well. Very enthusiastic, always trying to do one more thing for students, whatever it might be.” Another male, a graduate student, depicted the teaching

style of one of his two favorite male professors as “almost perfect.” In addition to being “always well prepared” for his class, this professor “would return the answer sheets [already graded] the very next day after the test. [He] wasted no time. ... He would give out the scoring keys for the test as [students] were leaving the classroom after the test.” The student further noted that this professor’s teaching style was so deeply “impressive” that he “would like to [teach] that way when I get to teach in the future” in his home country.

Another male, an undergraduate, explained why he had chosen without any hesitation a particular female adjunct professor as the “*master teacher*” on the end-of-the-semester evaluation form. He stated:

It wasn’t because she gave me an A. First of all, she *lead* [sic] the class effectively. There are many professors, in fact, who teach students nothing substantive in class and rely only on texts, those whose *style* is to leave everything up to students--“Study on your own.” ... She was not the type of professor who expects only students to invest, or who has, the “study if you want to, but don’t if you don’t want to” kind of attitude. She would give just the right amount of assignment for students to fully digest. She gave assignments, and the assignments were all helpful for preparing for later classes and learning in the process. The *format* she used in organizing the class was super. ... I had the feeling of actually looking forward to her class. Yes, there was such a professor.

As was the case when voicing complaints concerning Korean faculty, participants perceived a lack of competence in teaching among certain American faculty members. Most of the participants who mentioned ineffective teaching were undergraduates. Only one graduate student, a female, specifically complained about having had to take classes from “people poorly equipped to teach,” including some adjunct professors with no or minimal training and

experience in teaching. Most common among the issues raised by the undergraduate students was the professors' inability to effectively engage students in the learning process. These students spoke strongly about some professors who were apparently "out of touch with [their] students' levels of understanding and capabilities." An undergraduate female described a particularly frustrating experience with a class she had taken from a foreign-born male professor. She claimed that although she had been strongly motivated to "do well" and had even sought out help with the class material from a co-national peer, the class assignments were "just too difficult" not only for her but for the majority of her classmates. Her perception was that given the fashion in which the professor structured and taught his class, the class might have been appropriate for graduate-level students, but not for beginning-level undergraduate students such as herself. Despite her strong motivation and efforts to succeed, she ended up failing in the class. "It was unfair!," she exclaimed. Similarly, another undergraduate female complained about an unengaging teaching style of a particular female instructor, a teaching assistant in this case:

[Her] teaching was just terrible to the point where American students too would protest and say, "I hate [this class]." You know the *style* [of teachers] who just rattle on alone and then leave. Yes, and [she] didn't care at all about whether the students were following or not. Yes, that instructor I disliked most, I think. Such instructor, such *style* of instructors!

An undergraduate male complained about two specific professors, one male and one female, for teaching poorly. He noted that in addition to their failure

to “accurately assess the level of students,” they also “lacked enthusiasm for teaching.” Another undergraduate male described a particular male professor as “slack” in teaching his class.

Tending

Several participants indicated that in general American faculty were not so giving and caring about students as Korean faculty. A graduate male remarked that American professors differed greatly from Korean professors in terms of “loving students”: The former appeared to him to do things for students out of a “sense of job responsibility,” rather than a sense of “*cheong*,” or a sense of care and affection they felt toward students. He reported having received “a great deal of *cheong*” from his former Korean professors.

Another male, an undergraduate, reflected on his experience with American instructors of the intensive English language program designed for international students. The student commented that these instructors seemed to be “intimate with students” in the sense that they were more “active” than his former Korean high school teachers in initiating conversations with students. And yet, the American instructors seemed “less attached to students” than the Korean teachers he had known. He elaborated:

Although [the American instructors] tried to talk to each individual student ... it seemed that with regard to deeply-felt affection, the kind of affection some of the Korean teachers I liked showed to me, they were different from Korean teachers. I got the sense that they were doing their job faithfully, which is different from feeling, “Aha! As educators, they are

really caring about me.”

To further illustrate the perceived difference, the student related an encounter with one of the instructors. The student explained that when he showed up for the class after having been absent on account of sickness:

[The instructor] asks, “Why didn’t you come to the class?” [I reply], “I was sick.” “Then, you should have called. Why didn’t you call?” Then there goes the marking of absence. Then, I think, “Ah! This [teacher] is concerned more about my absence than about my being sick, that is, concerned more about my *academic progress* than about my *personal progress*.” That’s the feeling I got.

He noted that in the same situation, those among his former Korean high school teachers whom he cared for and who cared about him “would have asked me why I was sick, what was wrong, whether I had been to the hospital, whether I had taken any medication, how long I would need to rest, and so forth.”

Two graduate students, one male the other female, directly stated that their personal experiences had led them to “give up expecting” that American faculty would help them with their struggles and difficulties. The graduate male commented that at the beginning of his stay in the United States he had frequently sought his American professors to consult with them concerning his personal difficulties, as he believed that “teachers in the department are supposed to be the people who are closest to me.” To his disappointment, consultations “proved to be of little help.” Furthermore, he sensed that American professors “didn’t seem to like my talking about my problems.” The graduate female similarly remarked that “the atmosphere is never such that I could feel welcomed to talk openly about

my personal difficulties.” The student went on to describe a particularly hurtful experience with a specific female American professor. When she went to see the professor to discuss the difficulties she had been experiencing in her class, she felt that the professor was totally unsympathetic to her situation, stressing her position that she should be “*fair*” to all of her students, domestic and international. The student reflected:

I didn’t expect any favor, and instead of being consoled, I ended up feeling hurt. ... If the same situation happened to me now, it would not be the same. That is, I would not feel hurt as much as I did then. But at that time, I had some expectations. I mean there were those expectations about teachers that I brought with me from Korea.

After that incident, she had “resigned myself to the notion that I should not expect [American teachers] to share in my difficulties.” She learned that in American colleges students were expected to take care of their difficulties “on their own” and thus expecting help from professors “can only lead to getting hurt.”

When asked to express their personal wishes for American faculty, most participants indicated that they would like American faculty to be “more attentive to,” “more considerate of” and more responsive to their personal difficulties, including those pertaining to English language and adjustment to the new academic system. A graduate male indicated that he would hope American faculty could be “more giving of themselves” and “kinder” to international students like himself. An undergraduate female remarked:

[O]f course, we did choose to come to a foreign country to study, but still there are more difficulties we encounter in our studies than American students do, right? I am not asking for any favors. I am just asking

[American faculty] to be more understanding of our situation.

Another undergraduate female commented:

What *international* students need is for [American] teachers to be more willing to extend themselves ... be understanding--thinking, "These students certainly have ideas, but it looks like there's something they can't quite express because of the language problem. So, I ought to listen as attentively as I can." Unless [American] teachers demonstrate such willingness, students would find it difficult to relate to teachers. [participant emphasis]

Within the context of talking about their favorite American professors, a number of participants indicated that they felt these professors were more attentive and responsive to their needs than other professors. Several participants specifically noted that these professors took into consideration their needs and difficulties as international students and that such consideration sometimes translated to some thoughtful and helpful gestures. An undergraduate male expressed a deep sense of appreciation for a particular male professor whom he saw as "considerate of students." The student commented that having been an international student himself in an Asian country, this professor was most "understanding of difficulties facing international students." The professor called the participant and the one other international student over at the end of the first class meeting and gave each of them a copy of the notes covering that day's lecture, mentioning that he would continue to provide them with the lecture notes every week. The professor also allowed the participant and the other international student, when taking in-class examinations, to use dictionaries translating English into respective native language and vice versa. An undergraduate female was also appreciative of a

particular female professor for being “very understanding” and considerate of Asian international students, particularly their struggles with the English language. The student noted that this instructor had made “many *office hours* [available to students], encouraging them to come to discuss with her things they don’t quite understand or even about things not related to class.”

Another undergraduate, a male, was especially impressed with a male professor, who “did everything he could at his own discretion” for the participant’s classmate, a fellow international student. This student had required emergency hospitalization in the middle of the semester. Noticing the absence of the student from class, the professor asked the participant if he knew any thing about what might have become of her. After learning about the student’s situation, the professor voluntarily wrote letters to the hospitalized student’s advisors as well as to her other instructors that semester. The letters informed the faculty members of what had happened and asked for special consideration for the student. In addition, the professor paid a visit to the student in the hospital “every single day” until her parents came over. The participant remarked: “Such thoughtful and caring gestures and favors shown to us made us feel deeply grateful.”

A graduate male spoke of his favorite professor, an elderly male, who “never declined when I personally asked him for a favor.” Expressing explicitly a “sense of closeness” toward this professor, the student voiced his appreciation of the professor’s kindness in seeing him frequently in individual meetings and providing him with assistance in class assignments.

Participants were also appreciative of some American professors' caring and thoughtful gestures as manifested in a more subtle form. Describing a male professor as "very understanding" of her, a graduate female recalled that while reviewing the audiotaped lecture one day, she had noticed that the professor had spoken more slowly than usual during the class that day. She felt that the professor had done so intentionally for the sake of both herself and a fellow international student, the only two international students in his class. During the class meeting the professor had covered particularly important material related to the upcoming test. The student also remembered the assurance the professor had given her when she had been feeling "extremely nervous" about her first class presentation in English.

In speaking of a foreign-born female professor, a graduate male expressed his appreciation of the comments the professor had made on his paper. He found the comments to be both thoughtful and useful, as they included specific suggestions as to how to rearrange sentences or paragraphs to better present his ideas. The participant described what those comments had meant to him personally:

In my opinion, she did so because she herself is not an American. ... Because probably she herself had to struggle to master English and because I am an international, I would think she was particularly considerate of me, hoping that would encourage me to improve myself.

An undergraduate male also talked about a female adjunct professor, who "cared a lot about me." The professor is the same one whom he considered as the "*master teacher*." The student was impressed with this professor as she

remembered not only his name but “even where I sit in the classroom.” Furthermore, when he asked for help several times with “the first class *project*, which was disadvantageous to international students” and with which he had “no idea” what to do, the professor offered him guidelines and suggestions that were specific and helpful.

Specific attitudes and behaviors of certain faculty members perceived as inconsiderate and uncaring were also mentioned by some participants, exclusively by graduate students. Speaking of a male professor he had during his first semester in the United States, a graduate male indicated that he had asked this professor to speak more slowly during class. The professor’s speech was too fast and inarticulate for him and other international students in the class to follow. Despite the request, however, the professor continued to speak “in exactly the same speed and same manner.” The student commented: “[It was my] first semester, first semester. When I indicated to him that I couldn’t follow at all what he was saying, his response was, ‘Then just say *repeat*.’ A bitter disappointment [to me], a bitter disappointment.”

Another graduate male talked about a specific female adjunct professor he “really disliked.” The student noted that besides feeling that “I am learning very little from her class,” he felt “the woman is very uncooperative in all respects.” He further indicated that he did not “feel any sense of closeness whatsoever” toward the professor. The student described an especially upsetting encounter with the professor in which she apparently responded to him in a “cold and indifferent”

manner. He explained that he had experienced difficulty taking notes in the professor's class, since she covered the teaching material using an overhead at a pace that was too fast for him to keep up with. After one particular class meeting, the student approached the professor to ask her to let him review the notes she used for the overhead presentation for that day's lecture, "she just refused." He stated, "[she said], 'Come during my office hours,' and [she] just walked away. That made me feel so bad that I didn't feel like ever going to see her again." And that was the first and last time he did approach the professor to ask for assistance.

Expressing her disapproval of professors who "make strongly discouraging remarks to students," a graduate female shared her personal experience with one female professor. She mentioned that this professor had given her "extremely negative feedback" on her performance in class that was not only "hurtful" but "humiliating." The student noted that her deep sense of disappointment with the professor's qualities as "educator," as reflected in the manner she provided feedback to her students, was deepened by the fact that this professor had received academic training in the area of human growth and development. The student further noted that underlying the professor's totally negative and discouraging feedback was a "lack of consideration and caring toward students."

Guidance and Leading

Referring to his personal experiences, a graduate male asserted that "the concept of guidance" seems absent in American professors' relations with students

and that the advisor assigned to him was one “in name only.” He commented, “If American teachers believe providing guidance for students is not required as part of their job, I suppose they don’t have to.” Later in the interview while discussing his personal wishes for American professors, however, the student spoke passionately of why guidance is greatly needed for international students like himself:

That’s because there are language problems, problems of adjusting to this culture, and therefore, if American [students] had to deal with ten problems, international students would have to deal with them a hundred times, or rather hundred problems. In addition, [international students] would have to adapt to the culture, suffering under *stress*, not even eating properly, you know. Going like this every day, without a secure pivot in their lives, they are continually in a state of wavering. Therefore, they need some place where they could go to talk clearly about these matters--it’s necessary because--of course, I suppose they could go to a place like the counseling center, but [counselors] are people who are not in immediate relationships with me. Although I could receive counseling and [my counselor] could understand me, those who are in the most immediate relationships with me are teachers, because I came here to study. And therefore, if I could [do these things] with the teachers, [rather than with the counselors], I could have a sense of stability in my life. [participant emphasis]

Some other graduate participants also shared disappointing personal experiences with some American professors who failed to provide them with the guidance and assistance they had hoped to receive. One of these participants, a male student, complained that few American professors provided him with specific suggestions and directions when he went to see them in times of difficulty. For instance, when he went to see American professors because he did poorly on tests and wanted to discuss with them whether or not he should drop the class, they would say, “What are you going to do?,” “*Do you have any idea?*,” “*What do you*

wanna do?,” or simply “*Do your best.*” He asserted that Korean professors would have given him more specific directions, such as telling him what to focus on in order to better prepare himself for the next exams. He commented: “[A]n ideal professor ought to at least show some level of sincerity, when a student comes [to him or her] with a difficult problem, and to suggest what course of action [for the student] to take ... or at least provide a sense of direction [for the student].”

Another graduate male reported a similar difficulty: “Whenever I went to see [my American advisor] to get some *information*, I never got the *information* I was looking for. I haven’t figured out yet how to go about getting the information I need. I would think there’s got to be a way.” The student described at some length what it was like for him to consult with his American advisor concerning his academic planning. He had hoped the advisor would be able to guide him in deciding on the best way to successfully complete his current degree program while at the same time preparing for the more advanced degree program. Before the consultation, he had narrowed down his options to three. He recalled:

I laid out one by one the three options under consideration. What was funny [about the advisor’s response] was that when I described my first option, he said, “*Good!*,” and then when I described my second option, he said “*Good!*” Well, finally when I described my third option, “*Good!*” What he told me in the end was, “You have to make a choice. You have to make the decision yourself.” Well, of course, I know that, I have to make a choice, make the decision. What I had in mind was that if I told him about the first, the second, and the third option, he would point out the pros and cons of each option or sort things out for me in a way that would help analyze the options in comparison with one another. In other words, what I expected from him was not, “Please, make the decision for me.” Rather, “Yes, of course, I understand I have to make the decision, but because I don’t have a lot of experience in America, I find it extremely

difficult to predict the future. But someone like you could see much better than I do the pros and cons of each of the three options.” That’s what I really hoped to hear from him, but I ended up coming back without hearing [what I had hoped]. After that, I agonized a lot over it on my own, trying to figure out which option was good and which option was bad, and then made a choice.

Still another male recounted a similar experience, which left him with “a very negative impression” of the particular professor. The experience strongly discouraged him from further seeking assistance from the professor. The student explained that not having taken the prerequisite courses in the recommended sequence, he was concerned that the class might be too challenging for him. Subsequently, he went to see the instructor of the class to inquire about what extra work he could do in order to keep up with the class. He recalled the encounter:

Well, his response was far from earnest. What he said to me was that the best course of action for me would be to drop the class. Considering that the option [he recommended] was not something I would consider as a viable option for myself and that I just wanted to find out ways to do some extra work which could help me do okay in that class, he just completely missed the point. I felt he didn’t understand at all what I was getting at. So, he left a totally unfavorable impression on me at that time, leading me to think, “How could a professor be like this!”

Finally, an undergraduate female spoke of her experiences with two American professors, one for whom she came to develop a deep sense of respect and the other for whom she came to lose respect. These two professors stood out in this student’s mind as contrasting examples of how some professors succeed while other professors fail in exercising their authority and leadership in an effective manner. Expressing a sense of respect and appreciation for a particular female professor, the student commented that this professor “wasn’t afraid of

complimenting an international student in front of other students” and “directly showed an interest in [me] regardless of what my *race* is and stuff.” Moreover, the student was particularly impressed with how “wisely” this professor made use of the peer evaluation in grading student performance in her class. Instead of blindly reflecting peer evaluations in the grades of those evaluated, the professor apparently used the peer evaluations as a source of grading the performance of those who provided the peer evaluations, not those evaluated. The student was deeply appreciative of the professor’s approach since her personal experiences had led her to believe that American classmates tended to discriminate against their international peers in peer evaluation. In contrast, the professor in whom the student became profoundly disappointed apparently failed to exercise his leadership effectively when a serious problem arose between the student acting as a leader of her team and her American teammates. The American teammates were accusing the student of having “*communication problems*,” and attributed the team’s problems solely to her poor leadership. Her perception was that the professor “sided with the American students,” who comprised the majority. Her insight was that the professor might have helped the students assess the problematic situation from both sides’ points of view while assisting them in reaching some level of mutual understanding concerning issues of both cultural differences and collaborative problem solving.

CHAPTER VI

PATTERNS OF VARIATION ON CULTURAL AND INDIVIDUAL DIMENSIONS

Participants identified experiences and perceptions concerning overall differences between Korean and American culture and people in terms of interpersonal relationships. Their representations tended to focus on two major dimensions of cultural variation. These dimensions were interpersonal boundaries and personal autonomy. Perceptions of participants concerning these dimensions evidenced not only important patterns of commonality but also substantial individual variation. Commonality was manifested in what participants understood to be the culturally normative patterns of interpersonal relating in Korean and American societies, respectively. Variation was in evidence primarily in how participants made personal sense of the cultural patterns they perceived, how they reacted to their implications, and the manner in which they attempted to negotiate the terms of relationship with others. The above two dimensions of interpersonal boundary and personal autonomy issues are presented in detail below.

Interpersonal Boundaries

Participants' perceptions and experiences concerning the dimension of interpersonal boundaries are presented under the following six categories: (1)

“separate” versus “overlapping” boundaries, (2) in-groups and out-groups, (3) “*privacy*,” (4) sharing material resources, (5) tending and knowing, and (6) “*office hours*.”

“Separate” Versus “Overlapping” Boundaries

Among the several participants who made references to interpersonal boundaries, a general perception seemed to be held that Americans are more closed or bounded as “individual entities” than Koreans. As one undergraduate female put it, Americans have a “crust that’s thick.” Koreans, on the other hand, “don’t have their own individual shapes” and “just dissolve” into the mass. Americans were also viewed as “totally separate” or “distant” from one another, whereas Koreans were perceived as “closer” with their “boundaries almost overlapped,” especially within close personal relationships. A graduate female said that her overall impression of Americans as being “somewhat cold” had much to do with her sense that “there is distance or *gap* between one person and another.” She added that Koreans become “intermingled once they get relatively close to each other.” Similarly, another graduate, a male student, stated that among Americans “the relation between you and me is not close and instead, you and I are totally separate as equal individual entities.” Expressing his sense that for Americans “I” as an individual is “isolated” and “lonely,” he wondered if Americans’ “sex liberation isn’t an attempt to relieve the loneliness they feel.”

Some participants spoke more specifically about the perceived difference between Koreans and Americans in terms of how boundaries are drawn and maintained in interpersonal relationships, particularly in sharing oneself with the other. A graduate female stated that for Koreans, "it is taken for granted that there are almost no secrets between us if you and I are friends, but Americans maintain friendship in which individuals mutually acknowledge some level of *privacy*." Claiming that his close friends in Korea "know all about me," an undergraduate male stated that Americans "don't reveal everything about themselves." He added: "They would talk with me as long as three or four hours on end, and I know they enjoy talking on the phone. And yet, they are not sharing all about themselves. It's no more than *enjoy*[ing], just *talking*."

Referring specifically to his American male housemates, another undergraduate male stated, "I just don't understand why they don't have friends, I mean friends with whom one can have a heart-to-heart talk as we do." His observation was that these American males, when socializing with one another, "just kill time playing around" such as playing sports and watching a movie together, as opposed to "spending time together having a heart-to-heart talk" as Korean males do. The participant further commented that although "these [American] kids do love to talk," they seemed to him unable to "relieve loneliness through meeting with someone [they] can talk to" and therefore, they seemed "even lonelier than we are," the "we," here, indicating international students studying in the United States.

The same graduate female who depicted Americans as “somewhat cold” also noted that Americans maintain boundaries no matter how close they might be to each other. They are selective in terms of what they share with others, including their close friends, and tend to keep their problems to themselves. She wondered if such practice “isn’t linked to Americans’ individualism”:

Perhaps it reflects the notion that one must take full responsibility for and *control* all that happens to oneself. ... And moreover, looked at from the other way around, this notion implies that one is unwilling to get deeply involved in someone else’s personal matters, doesn’t it?

The participant observed that among Koreans, however, friends would “reveal inner-most experiences to each other” and would “get deeply involved [in the other’s private matters] as if they were their own,” although at times such involvement might be uncalled-for. The boundaries between people are “almost overlapped” and “they feel a need to know everything about the other person.” As an example, the participant noted that she and a particular co-national female, someone with whom she had been closely associating, “know everything that happened to the other within the past 24 hours and have even memorized the other’s schedule.” She stated:

One can know whether the other person has conflict with another, what emotional state the person is in, what feelings the person has, and so forth. Well, Koreans, I guess, are like fire. ... You, or the other, and I cease to exist: that is, *privacy* stops to exist. ... And any attempt to maintain *privacy* would create a sense of distance.

Two other graduate participants, one male one female, provided additional perspectives on the contrasting patterns that were manifested in “too much”

sharing demonstrated by Koreans and “too little” sharing by Americans. The graduate male pointed out that “too much” sharing accounts for much of the interpersonal conflict among Koreans. He reflected:

In my view, it [referring to interpersonal conflict] all comes from the fact that people reveal to one another their personal aspects too much, beyond what’s necessary, beyond what’s necessary. And in so doing, they always look for empathy and understanding. Of course, I am that, that way, too. That’s probably because I, too, grew up in Korea. But here, [the situation] is exactly the opposite, in my, my view, as far as this particular *case* is concerned. ... People here don’t talk about themselves at all. People don’t know at all about one another, or rather, people know only what’s on the surface, that is the outer situation a person is in, the person’s occupation, or that sort of thing. Or if the person happens to like fishing, “Oh, that person likes fishing.” That’s about it. “Shall we enjoy fishing together?” that sort of, that sort of interaction between people. But they never talk about something deep inside of me, such matters as my personal problems.

The graduate female characterized Koreans’ interpersonal relations as “much more personal” and “stickier” in the sense that “there is more of giving and receiving and that [the relations] are much more *emotional*, and much more *dependent*.” In contrast, Americans’ interpersonal relations are “much drier to the point where you have to ask whether it’s all right with the other if I talk about my *personal life* or if I ask questions about the other’s *personal life*.” The participant pointed out, however, that in disclosing personal matters to the other, Koreans “don’t seem to consider at all whether they might be burdening the other with such self-disclosure.” And therefore, for the recipient of such self-disclosure:

It’s very burdensome at times, especially when I am not particularly interested in learning about the other’s stories, that is, when I don’t want to get to know much about the other’s personal life, or when the person talks about something I can’t get involved in. ... On the other hand, it seems to be a helpful means or a way of understanding the other when I do

desire to deeply understand the person.

In-Groups and Out-Groups

The graduate female who depicted Americans as “somewhat cold” also pointed out that although interpersonal boundaries in close relationships among Koreans are blurred or nonexistent, the boundaries in nonintimate relationships are much firmer than those in corresponding relationships among Americans. She remarked that when it comes to relating to people whom one does not know personally or one is not particularly close to, Americans are “not so cold as Koreans.” She explained:

[Koreans], if they are not close, regard one another as if they were total strangers. The conception of Koreans, rather Korean students, that I’ve come to develop since coming to America, is that when they are close, they become close just like fire, and yet when they are distant, they are, perhaps, way more distant from one another than Americans are. ... When I get to hear [some Korean students] talking about people they don’t know well--when they feel they are not close [to those they are talking about]--I wonder how their heart can possibly be that far removed from others. In other words, with regard to a person they don’t know well, Koreans seem to keep a great deal of distance.

The participant went on to state:

But Americans aren’t like that about being close and distant, right? Even with those they don’t know at all, they show some level of closeness, enough to say, “*Hi*.” And when they are close to others, they still maintain some level of [distance] instead of collapsing into the closeness.

The participant reflected, further, that in terms of “general” human relationships, life in the United States might be “all right” to the extent that although relationships among and with Americans are “somewhat cold,” Americans, nonetheless,

do not treat as “total *strangers*” those whom they do not know well, as Koreans do. She then acknowledged, “In fact, the word, cold, itself may be contradictory, because [Americans] are not so cold as we, Koreans, are in distant relationships.”

Some other participants also commented on the perceived tendency among Koreans to keep distance from people with whom they are not in close relationship. An undergraduate female observed:

Korean kids are on close terms with those they are close to, but they are not on close terms with those they are not close to, right? They have their own gangs, right? But [American kids]—although they, too, of course, have those gangs, they seem to converse in a natural and friendly manner with kids they are not particularly close to.

An undergraduate male made a similar observation:

If Koreans exhibited the same verbal expressions and behaviors that Americans do toward each other, it might look like the two persons are really intimate with each other, but it doesn't seem to be the case in American society. As far as I could make out what [Americans] are saying to each other, they would be talking as if they were really friendly and felt a lot of *cheong* toward each other. Then, when later on I get to see them together, they don't actually seem to be on such close terms with each other.

Nonetheless, the participant noted that what was most impressive about American students and professors was that “they are very kind when interacting with other people.” He was so deeply impressed with such kindness that he “decided to be as kind to American kids as they are kind to me, and also tried to be that way toward other international students, and even when with other Koreans, I have acted that way. [participant emphasis]”

A number of participants commented on the perceived tendency among co-national peers to form closed cliques and to be exclusive toward those outside

their own cliques, including both Americans and fellow nationals. An undergraduate female stated that although she highly valued “*cheong*” found in Korean interpersonal relationships, she was aware that if excessive, *cheong* could lead to exclusiveness:

As much as [Koreans] have a great deal of *cheong*, grouping together among themselves can become so excessive that it leads to division [within the group as a whole]. That being excessive, or thinking of themselves or “we” too much, they become exclusive toward other people who are not “we,” even among fellow Koreans.

Likewise, another undergraduate, a male student, while expressing his high regard for “banding together on the basis of *cheong*” among Koreans, revealed that a major source of personal “disappointment” for him in other Koreans in the United States has been their “inability to mix with foreigners.” Within the context of discussing barriers in forming close friendships with Americans, he commented:

Coming to America, I came to realize that Koreans’ or rather my biggest--because I am a Korean, too--the biggest problem for most [Koreans], though not an absolute majority, is that they seem to always hang around in separate groups. No matter where I go, that’s the case. ... Let’s say there are one hundred dots within a circle, one of them being Koreans. Then, within the hundred dots, Koreans hang around only with other Koreans. And, if there are hundred groups within the circle of Koreans and I enter one group, then, I would not step outside of that group. [participant emphasis]

The student noted, further, that among his co-national peers: “Everyone wants to make friends with Americans, at least privately so. [They tell me so] when I talk with them. I myself have wanted to. But we don’t seem to know how to pull away from the enclosure of Koreans.” The participant further remarked:

In order for me to make American friends, I need the time for building

friendships with Americans. It would mean I'd have to take away the time I need from those friends I always hang out with. And taking that time away is extremely difficult. Moreover, even before I do so, they would claim the time from me by calling me up and creating occasions for get-togethers. And I, too, enjoy spending time with other people and hanging out with friends.

Two other male students, one undergraduate the other graduate, pointed out that their co-national peers' apparent reluctance to socialize with a mixed group of Koreans and Americans had presented a problem for them in developing friendships with Americans. The undergraduate male stated that although he had hoped to make friends with both co-nationals and Americans, it proved to be extremely challenging. Among other things, he found himself in a position where he had to choose one group over the other to socialize with within the limited time he set aside for social activities. "Where Koreans hang around, one can't bring American guys to hang around with," he remarked. The graduate male also noticed that his co-national peers acted "awkwardly" when there was an American present at their social get-together. They were reluctant to speak English and tended to shy away from such social situations.

A graduate female had this to say concerning co-national peers' tendency to "band together" among themselves:

Another is, uhm, as relations [among Koreans] are too much family-like, in relation with those outside the family--I mean, in case Koreans stick together, uhm, that is being exclusive in a sense. In so far as what I have seen while staying in America, Koreans band together with other Koreans, which is good if they would continue to get together with the same people upon returning back home. But, in a sense, they could not accomplish certain goals because of sticking together--showing favoritism toward one another and sticking together.

The participant added:

When we speak of Americans, uhm, we say Americans are not accepting of foreigners. But from our point of view, or rather from their point of view, I suppose, the same can be said [of us, Koreans] too: Koreans associate only with other Koreans and don't accept us. In other words, [Koreans and Americans] get to be mutually exclusive.

Some participants related their own personal experiences in which they perceived their co-nationals as distant toward them in social situations. An undergraduate female described her experience at a social get-together. Having had a minimal social involvement with co-national peers, she knew very few of those present at the get-together. While watching others sitting at the tables and socializing in small, separate groups, she "just stood in the back," feeling that "there was no room for me to squeeze in." And no one invited her to join the group or approached her to strike up a conversation. She felt that co-national peers "were treating me as a stranger," and that "there was no warmth [toward me] and they were very cold." A graduate male recounted a similar experience at a different social gathering among co-nationals. As a relatively newcomer at the time, he did not know many co-nationals who were present at the gathering. He reflected:

My anticipation was that I would get to talk to a lot of people regardless of how much older or younger they were than myself, but when I got there, I found that people there were not talking much, even though they were all Koreans.

Very few extended themselves to him to start up a conversation. When he did speak to some people, the conversation ended after a brief introduction, instead of

flowing smoothly. Like the above undergraduate female, he noticed that people were socializing in separate groups of close acquaintances. "Someone who's new and doesn't know anyone could not help standing around idle," he said. The participant felt "very awkward" and "uncomfortable" while waiting for his acquaintances to show up, both of whom happened to be quite late. Another participant, a graduate female, reported contrasting experiences she had with Americans and co-nationals. She indicated that older Koreans from the church she attended a few times never took time to get to know her and to give her words of encouragement and support. On the other hand, some American elderly women whom she came to meet through church-related activities had offered her a great deal of encouragement and help. She stated that these women, or "grannies" as she put it, "understand how difficult things are for me here" and they "encourage me as if I were their own daughter."

Whereas the above students felt like outsiders, two undergraduate male participants commented on the apparent exclusiveness prevailing among Koreans toward people with whom they were not well acquainted from the standpoint of insiders. One of them commented:

Koreans love to socialize as a group and become really close once they get acquainted with one another. If some foreigner is trying to join in, when they are playing around, then initially they are exclusive. Americans are sociable at first! They appear sociable at first, so I join in. But, still, it's difficult for me to fit in right away: I've got to fit in, but I can't fit in unless they give me a pull. Struggling with difficulties, I then get out. But for Koreans, if there's someone trying to join in, we sort of hold off that person at first, but once that person is in, we help the person to fit in with us, that is we help the person to be on our side.

The student further reflected on cultural differences in social behavior between Koreans and Americans:

They say that Americans are sociable and friendly and the English are conservative, don't they? And they say Koreans are conservative, too, or difficult to get acquainted with. But in my opinion, Koreans are rather easy to make friends with, and Americans are difficult. When we first see them, it would seem Americans are easy to make friends with. To anyone, even someone whose face they see for the first time, they would say "*Hello! How are you?*" and just go right ahead with conversation! While standing next to me inside the elevator, they would just start talking to me. [Some American] I've never seen before would go on talking to me for ten minutes. If I were to say to some Korean I hadn't met before, "*Hello! How are you?*," [that person would think,] "Is he nuts?" ... When greeted with "How are you?" by someone they saw just once or twice before and yet whose face they couldn't quite remember, some Koreans would just walk away without saying anything. So, it would seem quite difficult to get acquainted with someone you are not familiar with, and frankly speaking, it is somewhat difficult. But, on the other hand, it is also Koreans whom you can get easily close to once you meet with them two or three times, true? But Americans are very difficult to get close to, even if you meet with them as many as hundred times, let alone two or three times. (pause) That's because Koreans remain friendly to the end, continue to be friendly. ... But you find that although Americans appear to be sociable and friendly on the outside, they are just the opposite, the opposite, once you get to know them deep inside.

The other male mirrored this perception in stating:

For Americans, [manners or proprieties] are not more than something that's very much habitualized. In other words, we, or rather for Americans, to say "*Excuse me*," when bumping into someone, is something that comes out just naturally. And there's no meaning beyond that. But, for us, each and every verbal expression is likely to be imbued with a certain emotion. And words, however insignificant, don't come out as readily as "*Excuse me*" but in a much more subtle way. And because of such subtlety, as far as human relationships are concerned, our country is more difficult: Difficult in the sense that it's a lot more difficult to strike up an acquaintanceship when you first meet someone, but once you get acquainted with that person, you can get in very deeply. [participant emphasis]

The participant then went on to share something that he had learned from one of his classes in the United States, which had made a great deal of sense to him:

So, in comparing Americans and Koreans, they often refer to a *shell*. With Americans, it's easy to penetrate the shell, but you can't get to the core that's inside. But, for us, a massive shell may initially block the way, but once you've penetrated it, it's easy to get deep inside.

Finally, in line with the above insight, a graduate male, when asked how his view of Americans had or had not changed over time, provided the following reflection:

It seems that there have been some changes. ... Well, I seem to have rid myself of a certain bias to some extent. ... At first, indeed, I had a very good impression of Americans. They seemed to be very kind, and for them to smile and to greet me when they saw me impressed me very favorably. So I assumed that they would be like that in friendship also. But I've come to realize that that was something habitual, and that in the actual [friendship] situation they are not the way I expected. But then, I also found that there are some [American guys] who are that way, to some degree. ... My expectation was that we would easily get closer to each other, and that we would be very understanding and help each other, but ... a wall, there seems to be a wall. They seem to put up a wall.

"Privacy"

Underlying challenges and difficulties encountered by participants in negotiating terms of relationships with American and co-national peers were issues surrounding "*privacy*" or boundary setting and maintenance. A number of participants reported interpersonal difficulties associated with differences between themselves and the other in terms of expectations and behaviors of setting and regulating interpersonal boundaries: that is, differences in setting limits to the extent to

which the other has access to what defines me and what belongs to me, including my personal experience and private affairs, my time, and my material resources. Participants, however, varied in describing what specifically constituted difficulties and problems for them. Some participants expressly took issue with others, typically Americans, in their setting of interpersonal boundaries they perceived to be too firm. For these participants, the perceived rigid boundaries acted as an obstacle to developing close personal relationships. In contrast, some participants seemed more accepting or even appreciative of boundary setting and regulation demonstrated by Americans. A major source of complaint for these participants was their co-national peers' tendency to not recognize and honor their personal boundaries.

The following account provided by an undergraduate male illustrates how in his view American peers give "too much" emphasis to preserving their "*privacy*" or setting boundaries, thus hindering any close relationship from developing:

[American] men are by and large friendly, but they are individualistic anyway, I mean, unwilling to get together frequently. For example, when I am invited to [some American's] place, we would just hang around two or three hours. Well, Koreans, when invited to someone's place, would stick around indefinitely. And until I say "I've gotta get going now," the host could not ask me to leave, right? The host is not supposed to kick the guest out like that in Korea. And even if he had to, he would do so somewhat apologetically. But here, only after one or two hours [of socializing] [Americans] would say outright it's time that I should leave, saying something like they've got something to do. ... And therefore, staying only two or three hours, it was no fun, you know. [participant emphasis]

Later in the course of interview, the student elaborated on this issue:

Among Koreans, we can always ask for help when we need to: We are

always close, I mean, we can get together at all times. If I need to, I can ask [other people] to come just to hang around together at any time, whether it's twelve o'clock midnight or one o'clock in the morning. We can do that with Koreans, right? We are that close, especially among those of us who are close to one another, to the point where there are no boundaries, and it can become almost problematic. We can do things like calling up someone, as late as two or three o'clock in the morning, to borrow liquor when we need some, or to ask for help when in need, right? But with Americans, although we can ask for help, we need to do so within the bounds of not impinging on their private life. [Koreans] do impinge on one another's *privacy*, and yet we don't think our privacy is being impinged on even when it is, since we, too, can always impinge [on others' privacy]. And that is something positive, something positive and human. If you think too much about *privacy*, *privacy*, interpersonal relations, uhm, how should I put it, interpersonal relations can't become deep. Instead, they just become formal. In other words, interpersonal relations that are bound by formalities. They can't develop into deeply intimate relationships. [participant emphasis]

Another male, also an undergraduate, seemed to agree with the above speaker's notion that not always having to mind one another's privacy is an indication of interpersonal closeness. In an earlier section of this study, the participant had offered the example of a close friend at whose residence the participant felt free to drop by as he chose. The participant had understood the total openness of the relationship experienced--being able to come over and request food at "one or two o'clock in the morning," for example--as being the surest indication of utmost intimacy and friendship. The student then indicated that with friends who were not truly close, he would not be "as much carefree with what I do." He explained: "That's because I would think, 'If I acted this way, it would inconvenience this friend. And if I inconvenienced him, he might have some negative thoughts about me.' So, I'd be likely to think twice before I jump."

For another undergraduate male, however, his co-national peers' impinging on his privacy had been a source of considerable personal distress. This student found it problematic, as opposed to seeing it as an indication of interpersonal closeness, when some co-national male peers habitually invited themselves over to his place and stayed as long as they pleased with little regard for his privacy. He commented:

In Korea you'd meet with friends typically under certain constraints such as [those imposed by] parents or some other situational restrictions. But people here get too much into another person's privacy once they become a little bit acquainted with that person. Well, they would almost turn my place into their living quarters, as soon as they become somewhat familiar with me. [They seem to think], "Anything goes between friends, right?" And they don't show basic courtesy ... you know, something as basic as leaving my place when it's about time to, which is what we used to do while were living [with parents] in Korea.

The student continued: "[In addition], when someone wants to come over to my place I would expect that person at least to inform me [in advance] that he is coming over, even if he is a close friend of mine. But they would just barge into my place at all hours, at dawn or at night." The speaker seemed to be keenly aware of personal differences between himself and some of his co-national male peers in pointing out that part of the problem might be due to what he termed as "differences in lifestyles." His perception was that most of co-national male peers, regardless of age, "are "accustomed to" and "take for granted" the practice of coming in and out of the other's place as one pleases. His peers thus "don't seem to have any complaints about it," whereas he gets "bothered by it." The student added that one of his long-time closest friends, also studying in a U.S. university,

likewise complained about experiencing similar problems with his co-national peers.

Sharing Material Resources

Several participants related personal views and experiences concerning sharing material resources with their peers which revealed individual differences among them in terms of how they conceived of and negotiated boundaries in this realm. Some of these participants directly objected to the other drawing rigid boundaries around whatever belonged to them. The others, however, saw it desirable to recognize and maintain some level of respect for boundaries.

An undergraduate female spoke of an episode involving her former American roommates which brought home to her how “individualistic” Americans were, a notion which she had entertained “just vaguely at first”:

Yes, [I was living with] three Americans. Uh, even in the kitchen, things were separated according to what belongs to whom. They did not communally share things at all. Didn't share things like dishes, not even a *cup*, and in the bathroom, too, there were three separate soaps! In that respect--at first I had no clue, so being rather indifferent to that, even though I did have my own soap, soap there, I somehow got to use one of the *roommates'*. I got out of the bathroom, and then my *roommate* went in there, right after. Soon she came out and asked if I had used her soap. That's because the soap was wet! I was just flabbergasted! That--then I was really shock--shocked. It was just the first time [I did that], you know. Wondering how they could mind even such a matter and try to guard what's theirs, I was just flabbergasted at first. [participant emphasis]

The speaker noted that she “strongly detested” the practice among the American roommates' of maintaining firm boundaries around what belonged to them, for

such practice seemed “sort of lacking a human touch.” When she later roomed with a fellow Korean, she found that arrangement more convenient as they “shared everything” with each other.

A graduate male seemed to hold a similar view concerning this issue. Recalling his experience with a former American roommate and the roommate’s childhood friend, he described how astonishing it was for him to see the roommate’s friend bringing his own cola with him whenever he came over to visit. The student commented: “So, I said, ‘Please don’t do that, and just use ours.’ Then, [he] said he would use [ours], but he didn’t.” Like the above undergraduate female, this student also found such practice to be “just too individualistic.” Expressing his strong dislike for the practice of demarcating what is mine and what is not, the student described how he managed to “civilize” the former American roommate:

I really hated it. So, we fought a lot, [and I told him] I hated it. Because--then, because he understood Korean people to some degree, he paid for half of our grocery bills: That is, for any groceries, although I ate Korean food, and he ate American food. We would put up the [grocery] receipts at the end of the month and each would pay half of the total amount. Neither of us had complaints about it, and so we did--he became quite--well, I sort of civilized him, sort of. [I said], “Instead of you paying only for what you’re going to eat, let us each pay for half, for I can have American food at times, and you can have Korean food at times.” So we each paid half, [despite the fact that] when Koreans came over, they would eat up everything. ... But still, he accepted it, understanding our [Korean] friends, our society in that way.

Likewise, another male, an undergraduate, noted that based on his experience with American housemates, he learned that among Americans “one cannot

use [what belongs to another] even when one needs it right away, if the owner is absent.” In contrast, among Koreans “one first uses it when one needs but the owner doesn’t, and then tells the owner later that one used it.” The student then described how he succeeded in instructing one of his American housemates to share material resources in the way commonly practiced among Koreans:

American guys don’t do it that way. But I made him do it that way. That is, what happened was--there has been a great deal of fussing over food. I always have rice [kept warm] in the [electric] rice cooker. And he likes rice, too. So, [I said to him,] “Whenever you feel like having some rice, please help yourself. Help yourself and just tell me later that you did. And in case you used up what’s left there, then, cook some rice, because, it’s kind of, you know, a bummer not to have any rice when I get home.” So, I taught him how to [cook rice]. He does these things. So, now I don’t have any problems--rice, no problems as far as rice is concerned. Whenever he’s hungry, he eats my rice, and cooks some rice if there’s not enough left, and leaves it as is, if there’s plenty left. Then, I come home and have some, and then make some more. In that way, other things, such as milk and stuff, food stuff--they are kept separate, kept separate, but we can use [the other’s] when we need it. Now that we’re living that way, he finds it convenient, too. Wouldn’t he? Of course, it’s convenient. Now we do that way with other things. Because it’s convenient, now he realizes it’s good, now. [participant emphasis]

Some students, however, reported having adopted and doing things the “American way” at least in certain social situations, involving either American or co-national peers. An undergraduate female noted that when she ate out with some American peers and volunteered to pay for the whole group, they “found it rather odd.” She learned that American peers “rarely buy things for one another, and have a very clear concept of each paying for oneself.” Over the course of time, consequently, she had “become somewhat used to *Dutch pay*” when socializing with American peers. The graduate male who had spoken of “civilizing” his

former American roommate also came to learn that unlike Korean professors, American professors do not always pay for their students when they eat out together with students. Consequently, even when an American professor invites him to come along and have lunch at the cafeteria, he now makes sure that he has some cash with him “just in case,” and “borrows some if I don’t have any with me.” Another male, an undergraduate, reported that he and some co-national male peers now would go Dutch at a bar. He found going Dutch awkward at first, but had come to recognize the “convenient aspect” of it.

In contrast, two undergraduate participants, one female the other male, suggested that they personally regarded it as desirable to have some level of boundary recognized in sharing material resources with their peers. The female student indicated that she disagreed with her co-national female peer who “calls friends persons with whom [she] could spend money together without separating my money from your money.” The student expressed her view that “some practical *rule[s]*” are needed for maintaining friendship, even with regard to “monetary matters.” Referring to the co-national peer, the student remarked, “She seems to think differently than I do.” She added: “I don’t have my own money now. It’s mom and dad’s money, now, and so, I don’t think we are in the position of talking about stuff like that. [I think] we ought to respect each other’s situation.” This student’s assertion contrasted with that of a graduate male participant for the study for whom “being close” in a friendship context signified sharing unsparingly material resources with one another, including money.

The undergraduate male who had complained about his co-national male peers turning his place into their living quarters also commented on the tendency among the male peers not to “observe formalities,” and to “help themselves to all the food there is” whenever they came over to his place without notice. The student said: “I’d feel content if I had invited them myself and prepared the food for them, because that would reflect my hospitality. Or, it might be okay if they had dropped by only every so often.” He further took issue with the mindset he perceived as reflected in his peers’ behavior:

Sometimes, they would say things like--uh, for instance, as you know, most of us get money from our parents. If they used up the money, let’s say, a week or so before they are supposed to receive money from home. Being broke, they would have difficulty taking care of their meals. Then, although in passing, they would say, “If I run out of money, I’ll just camp out at so-and-so’s place, eating over there. Hang in there, playing a bug.” It’s a joke, but it also means there is a thought, an idea behind it. And they also actually do it, right? I might overlook it if it had happened just once or twice. But having seen it a lot while living here, I’ve begun to feel badly about it.

The student continued:

[They seem to think] it’s okay to do it, because the other is their senior. ... Taking it for granted--they don’t seem to feel sorry about [what they are doing]. In my case, if I ran out of money--first of all, running out of money is my fault, isn’t it? Because I poorly managed my money. So, I’d feel ashamed. ... [If I were broke and a senior invited me to eat over at his place for a while], feeling sorry, I would pull out some things I have at my place and bring them over. Being a junior, I would do the dishes and stuff, trying to do something about my feeling sorry.

“Playing a bug,” as used in the above narrative, is a Korean colloquial expression.

It refers to capitalizing on the hospitality of someone, typically a friend, acquaintance, or relative.

Tending and Knowing

Boundary issues concerning tending to one another are closely intertwined with those concerning knowing what goes on in one another's life to the extent that tending to another encompasses knowing what concerns the other person. Participants seemed to generally agree that looking after themselves, Americans maintain and respect clearly-drawn boundaries around "*privacy*." In comparison, Koreans look after one another, and are thus more likely to overstep the boundaries and intrude on others' privacy. Nonetheless, participants differed in terms of highlighting specific issues that were problematic for them personally. Some were highly critical of Americans for "caring too little" about what concerns another, whereas others spoke against Koreans' minding of others' personal affairs to excess. Still others expressly addressed limitations inherent in both these orientations, that is, "caring too little" and "caring too much," as a graduate male put it.

A graduate male criticized Americans for being "too busy caring about themselves to care about other people." He stated that for Americans, "there's only me, me, me." An undergraduate female asserted that in terms of interpersonal relationships Koreans are "more human" than Americans. She further commented:

Well, first of all, among Koreans, once they get close to one another, they get to feel a lot of *cheong* toward one another to the point where they reveal everything there is inside of them, although they, of course, do speak ill of others behind their backs. So, they care about even trivial matters concerning one another, and are always understanding of one another. And they would go to a great length to take care [of one

another's problems] as if they were their own. But American peers aren't like that at all.

A graduate male noted that compared with Koreans, Americans are more respectful of others' "*privacy*," and at the same time less inclined to extend themselves to others. He went on to discuss in more explicit terms how Koreans' "interest" in what goes on in others' lives could be both positive and negative:

Americans are individualistic in some respects, but Koreans tend to sort of meddle with others' business. And yet, that's both positive and negative. They gossip a lot and meddle with others' business, but at the same time it shows their personal interest [in the others].

The student provided an example: "For instance, in case of *roommate*[s], if I looked worried, a Korean [roommate] would say, 'What worries you?,' but an American wouldn't, right?" He elaborated:

In Korean interpersonal relations I'd feel less isolated. That is to say when I feel lonely or have a hard time, I am more likely--how should I put it--to have someone who would worry about the situation together with me, and to meet someone who would actively try to work out [the problems for me]. The negatives, on the other hand, is that my *privacy* can be intruded upon. (pause) That's because in Korean society there's a lot of gossiping, people talk a lot about other people, don't they, because they are very much interested [in the others]. So, that's the biggest problem in our life during study abroad, gossiping, isn't it? ... For those of us who don't get bothered by it, gossiping is not a problem. But I've seen people, particularly high-strung ones, getting deeply hurt and agonizing over that.

Such perception was echoed by another graduate male who suggested that Americans acknowledge private matters of an individual as such and yet their interpersonal relations seem to be lacking in "*cheong*." The student pointed out that the difficulty in dealing with relationships with Americans "lies in the fact that people care so little about one another." On the other hand, the difficulty with

interpersonal relationships with Koreans “lies in the fact that people get to know too much about one another, and so words get spread too much.” What he would like to see is something in-between: “I would like it to be right in the middle. Moderately self-disclosing, moderately, moderately building the common ground, while mutually acknowledging each other’s individual matters without any meddling what so ever.”

Some other students, however, more expressly took issue with the apparent tendencies among their co-national peers to “gossip” and to “meddle with others’ business.” Two undergraduate females were particularly vocal about these issues. One who had identified herself as an “*outsider*” in the co-national student community expressed feeling more “guarded” around her co-national peers than around American peers, because she felt that co-national peers were “sticky.” The student remarked: “They are nosy about others’ business and gossip, then drop the subject later. But in the meantime, while they are talking about me, I’d get really troubled by it, you know?” She added: Americans “don’t bother me. ... They don’t act like sticky rice cake concerning my private matters and stuff.” Consequently, her sense of guardedness toward Americans was “much less.” Nonetheless, her personal experiences with American peers led her to remain wary of them as she came to wonder, “Are they going to just use me?” The student further revealed that she did not have “much of a relationship with American peers.” She elaborated:

I rarely call them up. Suppose I didn’t call them for a long while, and then

I called them up one day and said, "I'm worried about something," they're not the kind of kids who would listen. They would say, "Is that so? I'm busy now. Why don't you call back later?"

The other undergraduate female strongly protested against the seemingly excessive inquisitiveness among co-national peers concerning others' personal affairs. She indicated that unlike American peers who "don't *touch* me," meaning that they would leave her alone, co-national peers would be intent on knowing and gossiping about what she was up to. As an example, the student recounted an episode in which a third person "said out of the blue, 'You did such and such, didn't you?'," indicating that the speaker knew about what the student had privately shared with "only one person." She commented: "Spreading words about others' personal business and feeling satisfied only after acquiring knowledge [about others' business], could it be that they intend to be helpful [to me]? I certainly think not." The student offered her own explanation for the underlying motive:

Koreans seem to feel some sort of relational ties [with other people] and so, (pause) to put it simply, they *control, control*. In other words, they seem to feel they need to know about everyone's *business*, and only then do they seem to feel they are safe, *safe*. [They seem to think], "This person probably knows a lot about my business, my personal matters, so I need to know about her business, too." Ah! I've felt things like that very very strongly.

Further, two male participants both of whom were highly critical of Americans for being "self-centered," nonetheless, did point out certain issues of tending or helping involving Koreans. These participants were the male students who had spoken of "civilizing" their American roommates. One of the two, an

undergraduate male, explained why “there are more inconveniences than conveniences in living with a Korean,” especially same age cohorts:

[T]hat’s because privacy disappears between friends. That is, [in relation with those with some age differences] I can maintain my privacy to some extent, because there are times we are not in contact with one another. But with agemates, we would hang around together all the time, so privacy would likely disappear. ... It’s not that I dislike it, but that there would be times when I, too, would want to be by myself, without being bothered by others, just being by myself. In the case of agemates, there would be less of such time. If they saw me being by myself, they would come and say, “What’s worrying you?” If I [wanted to tell] them what bothers me, it’d be okay. But if I wanted to think by myself, I would have to leave the house, then.

The other student, a graduate male, expressed his perception that in terms of “*give and take*,” or reciprocating favors between people, Americans tended to do so with equity kept in mind, whereas Koreans did not. While acknowledging that the American mode of “*give and take*” could be convenient, he commented that in American society,

If I received something from someone, I’d have to do something for the person in return. ... [For instance] if I bought someone a meal, that person would certainly try to buy me a meal next time. Likewise, if I gave someone a gift, certainly something would come back to me, a [thank you] *card*, at least.

He then pointed out both positives and limitations in Koreans’ way of “*give and take*”:

[E]ven though it doesn’t exactly make even like the American way--I mean, just because I gave this person ten, that doesn’t mean I should expect ten back [if that person is Korean], nor do I expect that. Consequently, it’s more convenient. People help one another to the best of their ability, and they don’t have to think in the American way, “Now that this person has helped me once, I’ve got to help this person.” [participant emphasis]

The speaker added that consequently, “Sometimes one gets obliged to the same person over and over again.” He went on to say:

Another thing is, there are a lot of [Korean] people who only take and are unwilling to give--of course there are not really that many. ... [A]nd these same people are quick to complain, “How come you ... ?” if you happened to fall a bit short of what they had expected from you. In other words, they, they, well--there are a lot of people who don’t realize that this person is really extending [himself/herself] to them.

Furthermore, another male, an undergraduate, shared his views more specifically focused on helping behavior among American versus co-national peers. Like some of his peers in this study, this student also described Americans as “individualistic,” but he made a clear distinction between being individualistic and being “selfish.” In his view, Americans are “very individualistic” in the sense that they “do what they’ve got to do on their own, and they don’t ask others for help.” His perception was that when Americans do ask for help, they are “very cautious” in doing so out of “consideration” of the other person’s time. In contrast, being selfish is being “intent only on getting one’s own work done regardless of how much of the other’s time is taken.” The student described at some length the apparent tendency among his co-national peers to readily ask others to do things for them even when they could do those things on their own but feel somewhat incompetent doing so. As an example, the student spoke of how some co-national peers would call him up to ask him to register for classes for them, something which, in his view, “they could do for themselves if they just read the directions carefully.” Nonetheless, the student concluded that Koreans

are “neither individualistic nor selfish: Instead, they have a lot of *cheong*.” He further explained: “At the same time, they are very giving. As I do things [for others], there are a lot of people who do things for me, too. What I have been given might be more than what I have given, and so I don’t have any particular complaints about that.” The student, however, later talked about how difficult it was for him to refuse any request for help from his co-national peers, even at times when he was tied up with his own work. Because he had a reputation for typing English relatively faster than others, he would frequently get asked to type for his co-national peers, which he would “always” agree to do. He reflected:

If I were individualistic and I had my own work to do, I’d say flat out, “I’ve got to do this. I’m afraid I can’t [help you].” But, it’s kind of awkward to say that. Another thing is, when I ask a favor of some other [Korean], I have the anticipation, “Ah! This person will probably do this.” In other words, I am asking for a favor with the anticipation that if I ask it like this, then the person will definitely do it. It’s not like asking a question because I don’t know whether or not this person could do it. It is rather asking with the full knowledge that this person will comply. Just because I put the request in the form of a question, it merely sounds different from, “You do this!” For instance, when someone comes to me and says, “I’m sorry, but would you please type these ten pages?,” this person is aware that it means to me the same thing as telling me, “You shall type these ten pages. You cannot refuse.”

The student added:

Being aware of what’s going on in my life, those close acquaintances of mine [among co-national peers] refrain from demanding when I have *final[s]* or some work to do. ... Those who are rather selfish among Koreans say, “Would you type these ten pages for me?” while fully aware that I will do so and cannot refuse, as I said before. [So, I say] “Yes, sure!”

Finally, a graduate female described American interpersonal relations as

“clean” but lacking a “relationship.” She explained that these relations were “clean without involving borrowing and paying back. They are clean in that regard, but that the absence of relationship is their down side ... [meaning] a Korean-style or Black-style relationship.” To further illustrate her point, she contrasted parent-child relationships between Americans and Koreans:

For instance, when we look at parent-child relationship, the relationships between American parents and children, uhm, seem to almost come to an end after [the children] graduate from high school. It's rather a relationship between one individual and another than that between parent and child. It becomes, uhm, an egalitarian relationship, uhm, mutually independent financially, independent financially. And the parents recognize [their children's] leading their own lives. In the case of Korea, children live together with their parents until they get married. And parents mind every little thing [concerning their children,] and that is ... taken for granted.

The participant added that for Americans both parents and children accept that “one lives one's life according to one's own way of thinking” and that “it appears to be positive.” On the other hand, “seeing [Americans] end up in a nursing home in old age,” she came to wonder, “What kind of relationship was there?” When asked to talk about her ideal parent-child relationship, she responded:

The relationship I would like? Uhm, I, I, well, on the surface I like American style, because there seems to be too much hassle [for both parents and adult children] while they are living together. In other words, meddling too much, feeling too much pressured, things like that--in child-parent relationship, it would be nice if parents could draw the line at some point, “We'd better stop at this point. We'll show our concerned interest up to this point.” And then on the children's part, they could accept things to a certain point, and decide things on their own to some point. But it's very difficult to have such a relationship. It's very difficult to have such a relationship while living together. ... I don't necessarily agree that parents and children must live together, or that the oldest son must live with parents [even after he is married], but from a human point of view, how could one let parents end up lonely in a *nursing home*?

She further reflected:

You mean an ideal relationship? (pause) Instead of seeing children merely as their children, recognizing them as human beings, and not abandoning parents to the end. One doesn't have to live with parents in order not to abandon them, aah, how should I say it, we [Koreans] don't use the word "love" toward parents, and yet, tending parents not only financially but with a heart. ... Just as we always care for those we love, just as we care, hold interest in those we love.

"Office Hours"

Within the context of discussing difficulties in relating to American professors, several participants spontaneously made references to issues surrounding "*office hours*" observed among American faculty, a practice exemplifying boundary setting with regard to time. An analysis of participant responses suggested variations in terms of how they made sense of and reacted to the boundary setting demonstrated by American professors.

A graduate female recalled how "terribly embarrassed" she felt when the professor whom she went to see without having scheduled an appointment in advance said to her, "Make an appointment first and come back later," and said so "cold-heartedly and flat out." The student stated: "Then, I felt, 'Ah! These professors don't welcome a person during hours outside the *appointment* hours.'" She also came to learn that American professors maintained a "*tight schedule* in addition to their class hours." In comparison, with her former professors in Korea, she "could come and go anytime outside their class hours," without having to make an appointment. "'Do you have time?,' you just say and go right [into

their office],” she remarked. To this student, “*appointment* was a terribly huge barrier” in approaching American professors. Her initial reaction to seeing professors only by appointment was that it felt “unnatural” and “very impersonal.” She further reflected:

Since I go there by *appointment*, I go there for some impersonal matter, right? Then, I get to feel obligated to come out of the office as soon as the impersonal matter is taken care of. If I walked in there without an appointment, I’d feel free to talk about merely personal matters also, and such an atmosphere would more likely be created. But, when *appointment*--when I am there for an *appointment* concerning a certain matter, what other matter could I attend to aside from the matter, you know? ... And besides, they would give me the impression that they are really busy, that there are more *appointment[s]* that follow. ... I just come out right after I’m done with my business. Sometimes, I’ve felt so rushed to come out that I took care of my business while standing there the whole time.

The student then shared certain changes in her perceptions that took place over the course of her stay in the United States:

It does give me a strong sense of aversion. But now, now when I think about it, I think it might be safe that way, going to see them after having arranged an *appointment*. I think, “Well, at least the boundaries are clear.” That is to say, that when I have made an *appointment*, have secured my time by making an *appointment*, then it is my time, so I can go see them.

She added that in relating to American professors, she seemed to “have learned how to keep my distance [from them]. ... It’s somewhat paradoxical that I’ve come to feel it’s safer to keep my distance to some degree.”

A graduate male also learned that “we have to use *office hour[s]* only” in order to see professors. His impression was: “Everyone’s busy, teachers here.” The student indicated that operating on a “*tight[ly]* arranged *schedule*” might be “convenient” for American professors themselves, but that “the negative aspect of

it is there's no room for me to squeeze in." Like the above graduate female, he revealed that while keenly aware that other students also needed access to professors' time, seeing faculty only for the prearranged, fixed amount of time and only during their office hours made him feel uncomfortable about "discussing personal matters" with them. Recalling his experiences with former Korean professors, the student stated that although these professors did have office hours, the hours were rarely observed in a strict manner. He described what it was like to go see his former professors in Korea:

I see the "In Office" sign on the door of their office? Then, as long as they are in their office, you just knock on the door and go right in. ... Then the teacher says, "What brought you here?" Then, [I say] "I wanted to talk, talk with the teacher[you], so I came." [Then the teacher says], "Have a seat."

The student further noted that unlike most of his fellow undergraduate students at the time, he frequently went to see his professors to discuss matters that concerned him, including personal problems. He recalled:

If I were to spend about an hour in their office, [the professor and I] would end up talking about other things for one hour and twenty minutes and then talking about class-related matters for about ten minutes. But still, I would leave the office feeling content. In America, one can't expect such a thing at all.

From his personal experiences, the student concluded that Korean professors are "inclined to open what is theirs," willing to take extra time for the sake of students, whereas American professors "aren't like that at all."

Another male, an undergraduate, also stated that he found it "difficult" and "awkward" to see professors only during "*office hour[s]*" that were fixed.

Moreover, to do so is “merely formal,” because “I just ask them to explain things that I don’t understand.” He recounted experiences with two of his American professors which made a sharp contrast in his mind. When the student went to see one male professor, Asian-born, he was told to come back later during the professor’s office hours. He reflected:

No matter how fixed the office hours, I still didn’t think he would turn me away—I thought he would not go so far as to say, “Go.” ... So when he did, it was disappointing, you know! Teachers, teachers are supposed to be very caring about their students—well, of course...I understood the American lifestyle and therefore was feeling sorry [about inconveniencing the professor]. But still, I did take up the courage to go see him because there was some problem. So, ah! I was rather disappointed. I didn’t know he would go so far as to say *no*.

The student then spoke of how favorably impressed he was by a different male professor, an American, not only because the professor appeared truly enthusiastic in his pursuit of learning, but because he “would keep his office door totally open, telling me to come at any time.” The professor even said, “If I am not in my office, look for me. I’ll be somewhere in the building.”

Two other undergraduate students, one female the other male, also made comments concerning office hours. The undergraduate female disclosed that when deciding to go to see an American professor, it became more or less a matter of “psyching myself up to go” because “one can’t just freely go in and out of [their office].” She continued:

In other words, as opposed to just stopping by while passing and [saying], “How are you?” I’d sort of psyche myself up, “Well, I am going now,” then go to see them. How should I put it? (pause) There’s some sort of a wall, wall? Or feeling that I have to follow certain formalities?

The undergraduate male gave the following response when asked about his personal wishes for American professors:

I wish we could do without that *appointment*. Like Korea--it's just that I am not yet used to it. I understand it's a good system, though, ... it's good in the sense that I have access to a person's time when the person is available timewise.

He further noted:

The truth is even when I have made an appointment, but get there ten minutes late, some other kid is in there. Then, I get to miss [the appointment]. Ah, somehow I always get to be five minutes late, or ten minutes late. Things like that. And so, to meet with professors gets to be like picking stars in the sky: It could be very easy, and yet sometimes it gets to be like picking stars in the sky.

Expressing a more accepting attitude, a graduate female commented:

I've never had negative ideas about *office hour[s]*. It'd be ridiculous to expect professors to always be there--*I mean*, always being there can also mean not always, always not being there when you go to see them, you know. ... I've accepted it as something positive, because, uhm, it means that they are taking that much time for students, and that [it says in effect] "I am going to accept 100% students who come during that time."

Issues of Personal Autonomy

As with the dimension of interpersonal boundaries, the dimension of personal autonomy suggested important commonalities and variations among individual perceptions and experiences. Participant responses pertaining to autonomy issues are presented under the following three categories: (1) "sticky rice cake" versus "grains of sand," (2) clothing behavior, and (3) senior-junior relationships.

“Sticky Rice Cake” Versus “Grains of Sand”

Several female participants, both graduate and undergraduate, expressed a shared perception that Korean society and people tend to suppress individuality and self-expression, pressing for conformity to the societal and group norms. These female students spoke critically of the apparent tendency among Koreans, both at home and abroad, to place too much emphasis on “we” and on the “we” being alike and to sanction against the expressing and asserting of the self that deviates from the group norm or “mould.”

An undergraduate female offered a set of intriguing metaphors as an attempt to represent her perception of differences between Koreans and Americans in terms of a given group’s recognition of its members as individual entities. The student likened Koreans to “sticky rice cake,” in which grains of sweet rice, the main ingredient of the cake, are all pounded into a mass. Americans, in her eyes, are “grains of sand.” Recalling her first-time participation in a social meeting held by a group of American Christian students, she reflected:

They were singing, having a meal, and just like this--from what I saw, there was neither unity nor division among them. Well, how should I put it, well, like grains of sand? When scooped up together, they’d stay put: Otherwise, they’d each disperse into individual entities.

She further commented on how she saw each grain of sand was recognized in its own right:

From the viewpoint of one grain of sand, one grain, the entire mass of sand would not break it, how should I say it, uhm, let it be, yet not disregard it. Disregard isn’t it. (pause) Rather, grains of sand are constituents, uh, and

don't get assimilated into the sand mass?

As if to underscore her point, the student came up with another set of metaphors. Her perception was that Americans were a "mixture, not a chemical compound." She stated, "With a mixture, you can retrieve each component itself intact, but with a compound, you can't do that." Moreover, Americans have a "crust that's thick, each individually." Koreans, on the other hand, lack their "own individual shapes" and "just dissolve" into the mass: that is, Koreans are not "their own grains of sand." Applying the "crust" metaphor to herself, she revealed that unlike other Koreans, she "lived outfitted with a crust" while in Korea. On the other hand, with regard to other Koreans, her co-national peers in particular, she wished them to recognize her as a "grain."

Other female participants, particularly graduate students, spoke critically of pressure for conformity and uniformity they saw as prevalent in Korean society. A graduate female indicated that what she "disliked" about Korean society was that:

[I]t strives to make everyone identical beings. Well, of course there are only Koreans in Korea, almost only Koreans. But all Koreans becoming identical, that is, getting married before twenty seven, and having children, and *you know*, how to relate to your parents, how to relate to your husband, even one's hair *style*, these things are made identical. [My disliking] has something to do with most people taking a passive stance and accepting. So, the reason why I liked living in America, or why it felt good at first, is that although diverse, diverse people gather together, that diverse--that is being tolerated. In other words, what I liked was that diverse personalities, diverse people can live together without being looked upon as odd. [participant emphasis]

Another graduate female described how she always disliked Korean people "minding" excessively what others do and how others present themselves. She

asserted that for Korean people:

[I]f someone's not just like me, it's not okay. Well, as they say, I-awareness is different from we-awareness. Korean society demands that you must be like me, think like me, emphasizing what I'd call "we." ... Even though they themselves don't always [faithfully follow the demand], they impose that on others. But American society accepts that people can be different--well, of course, because I don't know American society very well, it could come across that way to me.

The student went on to explain how for her, living in the United States had been less stressful than living in Korea:

Uhm, I think it's just my personality. I've always been that way. Ever since I was little, I've liked foreigners. (pause) It's not that I lived in Korea while seething with complaints and protesting that I didn't like it. But I often wondered why people are like that, why they would mind others' business that much when they don't need to. And I also dislike people doing things after others. If others had their hair cut short, they would have their hair cut too, and if others carried such and such bag, such-and-such brand name bag, then everyone would buy that brand name bag.

The student further described how Korean people act to "impose" conformity on others:

Koreans don't leave others alone, when they see something they find distasteful. They would either say in a loud voice, "What's wrong with that kid?" or point their fingers at the person. Americans too, of course, would take a glance at the person, but they would not say anything or act intentionally to badly insult, insult the person like Koreans. They would just take a look at it because it strikes them as unique, something they haven't seen before. That's different.

In a much animated tone of voice, still another graduate female articulated how strongly she disapproved of Korean people's tendency to "take things as a matter of course," without giving any recognition to individuals behind their socially defined roles. Stating that she "just can't tolerate the Korean culture or

male culture,” which, in her view, often manifests itself in group settings, the participant spoke of her own experience with co-nationals as an example. She and her husband had invited a group of co-nationals to a house-warming party, for which she had prepared food for days on end. After the party, among those invited to the party “not a single person” thanked her directly: Instead they thanked her husband. The student argued:

I’ve figured out what that’s all about. Taking things as a matter of course, taking things unconditionally, is not acceptable for me. Taking things as a matter of course. Yes, that is, “Well, everybody does this, but how come you ... ?” *Everybody* does that! Or everyone thinks that way. Or parental sacrifice is just a matter of course. Husband doing things for wife is just a matter of course and wife for husband. Acting this way between friends is a matter of course. Taking everything just as a matter of course doesn’t exist as far as I am concerned.

In addition, another female, also a graduate student, spoke of her personal resolve to carve her own path despite actual and perceived pressure working against her endeavor to do so. The student indicated that it had been quite a challenge to win approval for her study abroad from her parents, as well as from her extended family members, all adamantly opposed to her plan initially. She recalled what her father had reminded her of:

Father said, “It’s time for you to get married now, but if you go to America now--when you come back from America--Korean men dislike women who are Americanized. You’d better keep that in mind when you leave. Better to keep that in mind.”

The participant added: “It’s generally true, isn’t it, that Korean men like women who sit around decorously, not women who are Americanized.” Earlier in the interview, she told of an unsettling encounter with a co-national peer, a male, who

had directly confronted her in their first meeting by asking, "How come you are studying when you are that old?" This co-national male then told her, as she recalled, that he "just cannot comprehend why Korean women would come to America to study abroad at a marriageable age." This encounter acted to discourage her from continuing to attend the social gathering among some co-national peers. "I said to myself, 'Why should I let myself listen to that nonsense?,'" she stated. She further commented, "Koreans seem to have a lot of preconceived ideas, thinking that women over twenty five should marry, or looking suspiciously at women unmarried and without men." One male participant, an undergraduate, indeed, specifically indicated in the course of the interview that he was personally prejudiced against Korean women studying abroad. The student considered studying abroad as a life "unbecoming of women." He stated: "The mere fact that they came to a foreign country [to study] can put them in a bad light in my eyes." Aware of the apparent prejudice against her as a Korean woman studying abroad that resides in the minds of fellow Koreans, at least some, both at home and abroad, the female student nonetheless sounded determined to pursue her own dream:

This is what I'll do. I am going to do my best with my studies here, then graduate, and go back to Korea, where [I will work] honorably. I don't think it's too late to find a suitable marital partner, uh, uh, even in my late thirties. ... I ought to be able to feel satisfied with my own life. If I got married real early and my marital life turned out to be unhappy, it wouldn't be any good, would it?

One undergraduate female in particular had a great deal to say about her

personal struggle over the years with her co-national acquaintances, whom she experienced as being highly group-oriented and disapproving of those who did not follow the group norms. She spoke of the “social mould” which acted to bind co-national peers and which she had managed to “break to some degree”:

[Co-national peers seemed to think], “How come she isn’t cast into the social mould, the mould we’ve created here in [this U.S. city]” ... Demanding that people be alike in everything. You see, in Korea, if someone’s hair style is different [from everyone else’s], they wonder, “Ah, how come she’s doing that? How come she’s not following the social standards?” Generally speaking, they’ve brought with them that way of thinking to America unchanged. And they’ve never broken it, most of the people. Because they’ve got to get along, got to face one another all the time, there hasn’t been any room for breaking it. But I’ve created room for breaking it to some extent while living by myself. [I said to myself,] “Why does it matter that I live like this? Even if they got their hair bobbed, I don’t want to have mine cut that way.” [participant emphasis]

The student shared her observation of co-national peers forming cliques, at least those with whom she was most familiar. These peers not only “do everything together” as a group but are expected to “think alike” as well:

It’s taken for granted among them. [So-and-so], [so-and-so], these people around me, when they go some place, they don’t even need to ask one another, how about your *schedule* and stuff. They just all take off. They leave their weekends totally open. In other words, unless you do everything together, it’s difficult to expect some voluntary help.

The student later commented:

To say a *group*, [members of the group] have to agree on every kind of problem. If one person thinks negatively of someone, everyone else in the *group* agrees. The same *idea*. About that person, they’ve got to have the same *idea*. Only then, a *group* comes into being. Therefore, the reason why [people belonging to] this *group* dislike [those of] that *group* is unquestionable. But then, how about those in that group? Well, they, too, definitely dislike people in the other group. ... If one of them were to have a different *idea*, how could they get along as a *group*? [participant

emphasis]

The student further took issue with the way of thinking prevalent among her co-national peers that she saw as limited:

What I have enjoyed in America is the freedom, except the *stress* I've suffered from Korean people. I feel it is a very, very *open* place, a place where people can improve themselves without limits. Why? There are no social standards, particular standards. But what [my co-nationals] talk about is always exactly the same. It's blatantly the same. "Hey, when you go back to Korea, what are you going to do?," they'd ask. I mean, after I graduate. Exactly the same. "Are you going to marry? Going to the graduate school? *Job*?" "Well, you ought to either find a *job* or to get married," they would say. But "you ought to" itself, you see, it makes me question, "Why do they set a *limit* to themselves? A *limit*. Why ... ? (pause) Well, of course, people do go through similar stages as they age, but can't there be more progressive ideas? My, well, how about, "What do you want to do in the future? In what field would you like to work?" [participant emphasis]

While reflecting on the changes within herself she had observed over the years in terms of her relations with co-national peers, the student disclosed that she had chosen to distance herself from the group of her female age cohorts after frequent association with the group during her first semester at her current university. The decision was made as she became acutely aware that her group association was "breaking the mould of my own life" and greatly interfering with her studies. Her distancing resulted in social isolation. Those peers with whom she had associated no longer invited her to their social occasions. Gradually, however, the student managed to "greatly improve my relationships with them." She claimed: "I have preserved my *image*, 'She's an independent kid,' while at the same time maintaining social contact with them. I think I've sort of made my own mould." Declaring

that "I am now sure of myself leading my life this way," the student admitted that in the past she had felt as if she had been "hiding behind the line":

In the past, it felt like falling behind. ... [F]or instance, not meeting friends, felt at the time like, what should I call it, let's say there was this line, and it felt like living, hiding myself behind the line. ... It's not like that any more. ... [I said to myself], "It's not right! There's no such a thing as a wall or a line in front of me. It's just *open*. I'm living like this as an individual being."

Later in the interview, nonetheless, the student articulated how the modes of her self-presentation would shift depending on whether she interacts with a group of co-nationals or with Americans:

I myself definitely, when I see myself--my attitudes change. When with Koreans, I do somehow become more cautious. When I see myself, I do-- [I say to myself,] "Suppress yourself, yourself as much as possible, be as *polite* as you can, conduct the conversation in compliance with the *group* as much as possible." There is this sort of *image* I hold of myself when with other Koreans. ... But when with Americans, I am not like that at all. Of course, when I had difficulty communicating, I couldn't grasp the atmosphere itself. ... But now when I see myself--after I've become somewhat close to an American--how should I put it--I express my opinions clearly, I break away from my mould. I don't prescribe anything for myself. Being *polite*, or that sort of thing, isn't on my mind. [I say to myself,] "If you can best represent your opinions, if you can verbalize them, let's represent them. And, no matter how you might be seen, that doesn't matter. Your, you are you."

Two male participants also shared their observations with regard to differing modes of self-presentation between Koreans and Americans. One of these two, a graduate student, remarked that Americans come across as "very self-assured" in interacting with others. He commented:

Even among Korean students, when first meeting someone, one is expected to be unassuming, to lower oneself and act modest, say things like, "Well, how could I manage to do things like that?" But Americans

don't do these things. I've never seen them doing so.

The student elaborated:

Koreans tend to hold back. ... [W]hen meeting people and talking with them, they don't talk in a comfortable manner. I don't know whether that's because they feel somewhat guarded or something when first meeting someone, or that's because of other reasons. ... When you ask, "How are you doing?" they just say, "Well, just so so." But when you run into Americans and ask, "How are you doing?" they'd say, "*Doing great!*" If they're having a hard time, then they say, "*Not good,*" and say, "It's because of this but it'll be okay."

The other, an undergraduate male, described perceived differences in self-presentations between Koreans and Americans, more specifically in terms of emotional expressions. He stated: "[Americans], in relations not only with friends, but also with other people, express their emotions very clearly. ... When they feel certain emotions, they seem to express them as they are without hiding them." The student later commented:

Although it's been said that our age, our generation has changed a lot, still we don't talk much, and try to control emotional expressions as much as possible, try to suppress them. In other words, American society can be thought of as somewhat bright, and our society as somewhat dark in that regard?

Clothing Behavior

Several participants, predominantly those at the undergraduate level, made comments specifically pertaining to the actual or perceived pressure from their co-national peer group governing clothing behavior. For most of these participants the presence of co-national peers on campus was keenly felt as a reinforcer or

reminder of the Korean cultural sanction against wearing outfits deemed inappropriate by the group. However, the extent to which such group pressure, actual or imagined, acted to regulate these participants' clothing behavior revealed some variation.

For an undergraduate male, a concern about the social sanctions against deviating from the group norms worked to prohibit him from freely choosing what to wear. The student stated:

The negative side of Koreans is that they are too conscious of others' business. Being too conscious of others--for example, Americans do whatever they want to, don't they? Japanese, too. And Malaysians are also like that. People from most countries don't speak ill of others no matter what the others do, as long as their own life is not interfered with. But when we want to do something, we always think about whether others disapprove or approve of it. That's the negative side.

The student went on to reveal:

If there were no Koreans [on campus], I would do as I please. For instance, it's not that I want them for myself, but we can't wear *punk* hairstyle, or really loud outfits, or leather jacket--the kind that American guys wear, [Western style with fringing]. ... If we did that, [other Koreans] would say, "Is that guy out of his mind?" We can't even wear a pair of earrings, right?

Another undergraduate male recounted an actual experience with an older conational male, which illustrates that the above speaker's concern is not merely something he imagined. This student indicated that at a social get-together, the older male publicly had criticized him for wearing a certain jacket, stating: "Hey, kid! Is that kind of outfit in these days? You are running around wearing that, considering that as a piece of clothing?"

A third participant, the same undergraduate female who had spoken of no longer “hiding myself behind the line,” also acknowledged: “Even as to the matter of wearing clothes, I need to be more cautious when meeting Korean friends. With American peers, I don’t care at all.” For instance, if she decided that the outfit she happened to be wearing might be viewed as too casual or “sloppy” in other Koreans’ eyes, (e. g., a sweat-shirt and sweat-pants), she would intentionally avoid running into other Korean students on campus. She stated:

Sometimes, after class, when I feel like going over to the [student union], I think, “Uh! There might be some Koreans there. I’d better go home. Well, forget about [the student union].” But, think about it, Koreans--why do I have to worry about it? But with Americans, I never worry about it.

The student articulated why she would concern herself about co-national peers regarding such a matter:

That’s because, that’s because of the *image*. Because Korean people are, you see--too much [concerned about] interpersonal ties, that’s what they say in a word. I was told by my older male cousins in Korea and also by [some of the Koreans I met] here that in Korea, interpersonal relations are relations of lines. Lines. That is, every single line is all connected with every other. Your behavior [here in the United States] can be all known in Korea, because we will all eventually go back when we’re done with our studies. But when I think about it, why can’t they understand that it is some sort of *stress*? ... If they recognized each person as an individual, then, regardless of whether a person did this or that [while in the United States], they could just relate to the person as changed in Korea. But they would say that she did this, she did that. And I don’t want to hear that. ... They don’t see me as me. If they saw me running around [dressed] like someone who had just got out of bed, they’d say, “Wow, she’s lazy! She’s this, she’s that!” I don’t want to hear these things. I didn’t want to let myself be generalized like that.

Another undergraduate female, the same student who likened Koreans to “sticky rice cake,” observed that Koreans “terribly mind others,” always worrying

about “How would I look in others’ eyes?” In her view, Americans express themselves without “minding others.” The student described herself as “neither this nor that,” as she explained:

Well, for instance, when I put on a pair of shorts, I’d go around in shorts, but I’d mind others’ eyes. That’s the case. Minding others’ eyes. Ah, then [when I spot someone else wearing shorts, I say to myself] “Ah! S/he is wearing shorts, too.” Then, I’d feel sort of assured. ... I’d wear shorts, and yet run away. It’s like running away wearing shorts.

The student made it clear that she would be “running away” from fellow Koreans, not from Americans. She stated that if there were only Americans, and no Koreans at all on campus, then, “It’d be my world!” She added: “Well, I suppose I could stop wearing the shorts, but I wouldn’t like to do that, right?”

Another undergraduate female revealed that because of her tendency to dress up fashionably, apparently too fashionably for her Korean peers’ standards, she had been subject to negative preconceptions and biases against her among her peers both at home and abroad. This student, however, claimed that she had “become quite immune” to these negative evaluations. And, thus, what others say about her “minimally affects me. From the past, I’ve kept my *style*—I don’t mean *style*—I just do things as I please without minding others’ eyes,” home and abroad. She added: “Ever since I was young, I’ve always loved to dress up stylishly, not just for showing off but for self-satisfaction. In a word, I’ve always been very interested in that.” The student heard on the grapevine what some women in her co-national community apparently had said about her:

“She’s a show-off.” or “Hard to tell whether she’s coming to school or

coming to a party.” I am aware that these words come a lot from women’s mouths. Uhm, but I don’t care, I just, just, I don’t care that much, [saying to myself], “Okay, you say whatever you want to, and I do what pleases me.”

Finally, the following comments of an undergraduate male provided an additional perspective on the issue. Characterizing himself as “somewhat traditional,” the student spoke of the “basic proprieties” which, in his view, college students ought to adhere to in relating to professors. According to the student, these basic proprieties “have been inculcated” in Korean students. In the context of describing such basic proprieties, the student offered a specific example of physical appearances unbecoming of college students:

For instance, a girl, who attends a class with thick painted *lipstick* on her lips dressed in a *mini-skirt*, would certainly be aware herself that that is not the demeanor required of students attending a class! Or, at least, the professor would certainly think so. I say that because I heard that from a [visiting professor from Korea]. I heard him saying that. And of course I *agree*. That’s a matter of course. [participant emphasis]

When asked to elaborate on why he saw wearing a “*mini-skirt*” as lacking “basic proprieties” toward professors, the student responded: “That’s the kind of outfit for going to a bar. Coming to a college campus dressed in that kind of outfit, where the pursuit of learning takes place, cannot but to be viewed as being out of one’s mind.” He went on to explain:

[T]o come to study means to come to learn. Moreover, learning not from one’s peers, but from professors, predicates that even if one does not have any respect for the person humanly, one still has to observe basic proprieties, in my view. [participant emphasis]

Nonetheless, the student disclosed that he did come to allow himself to “dress

more comfortably” and would occasionally wear “shorts” or “sweatshirts and sweatpants” when going to classes while in the United States. He articulated why he would feel free to dress informally when going to school in the United States, but not in Korea:

Here, a big factor is that there’s no one who will get on my back. Even when I go to school wearing sweatshirts and sweatpants there’s no one who would say anything to me. But, over there, first of all, that would not be allowed at our[my] house to begin with. And as soon as I stepped outside the doorway, beginning with the auntie [meaning the owner] at the supermarket, it would not be permitted.

The student then proceeded to recount an embarrassing episode that took place while he was visiting with some old friends in Korea. It was a hot summer day, so he went out wearing a pair of shorts. And unexpectedly he had to go inside the library of the college which one of his friends was attending. He commented, chuckling, “I wasn’t even consciously aware of going in there wearing shorts, but once I got inside, everyone there gave me that look! Oh, my!”

Senior-Junior Relationships

In Korean educational settings including college campuses, as well as in other social settings, “senior-junior,” or older-to-younger, relationships are established primarily on the basis of age difference of the parties interacting with each other. As described in Chapter two, age is a primary factor in determining each other’s social position among Koreans. Juniors are expected to show deference toward seniors who may be as little as a year older than themselves.

Unlike friends who use informal language almost devoid of honorific terms, juniors are supposed to use polite language toward seniors (Yum, 1987b). Juniors often address their seniors as *sun-bae-nim* (*sun-bae* meaning senior, and *nim*, an honorific suffix) instead of using their personal names. However, if the senior-junior relationship evolves beyond a merely formal one, the junior may use more personalized reference terms and behave informally toward the senior (Yum, 1987b). In such case, the senior can be called *hyung* or *hyung-nim*, both terms meaning elder brother; or *on-ni*, *nu-na*, or *nu-nim*, all these terms meaning elder sister.

Several participants, mostly male, made comments which reveal variations in their views, attitudes, and expectations concerning social rules governing senior-junior relationships. A graduate male explicitly complained that a certain younger co-national, the participant's "junior," studying in the same academic department, persisted in addressing him as Mr. or "*sci*" in conjunction with his full name, instead of using the terms designated for seniors (i.e., *sun-bae-nim* or *hyung*). *Sci*, the Korean equivalent of either "Mr." or "Ms." in English, follows the addressee's name, full name, first name, or family name depending on the nature of the relationship. As the participant pointed out, the traditional convention in Korea is that calling someone by the person's full name followed by *sci* is typically used in a non-intimate relationship between equals in social ranking, or when a person of higher ranking addresses a person of lower ranking, but rarely vice versa. The student indicated that being addressed as "*sci*" by a younger person gave him the sense that the person "is trying to relate to me by

overstepping the age difference,” resulting in a “sense of distance.” In contrast, he would more likely experience a sense of “*cheong*” toward a younger person addressing him as “*hyung*.” The student further indicated that with regard to senior-junior relationships, co-national students younger than himself seemed to “think differently” from his own age cohorts. He remarked: “In the past, one would follow whatever a senior says, but in these days that’s not the case.”

Furthermore, another graduate male noted that a specific co-national male, younger in age, left a particularly favorable impression on him when in their very first encounter this male referred to him as “*hyung*.” This participant also indicated that when compared with being addressed as “[the student’s full name] *sci*” by a younger male, being referred to as *hyung* “opened up my heart” and made him “feel twice as close” toward the addresser. He further reflected that being called by *sci* “strongly connotes a *business* quality” of the interaction: that is, “the kind of relationship in which the relationship ends when you and I depart.” Consequently, with a younger male addressing him as “*sci*” “I would barely feel like meeting that person again.” Interestingly, however, the participant readily acknowledged that he himself typically “dismisses one or two years of age difference” and would usually refer to the older male as “[the person’s full name] *sci*” instead of “*hyung*.”

Still another graduate male, who had previously attended another U.S. university, mentioned the perceived difference between that university and his current university in terms of how his co-national students negotiated peer

relationships according to age difference. The participant indicated that in his current university, Korean male students tended to follow more closely the traditional convention of addressing the older males as “*hyung*.” In contrast, in his previous university, the “general atmosphere” was such that Korean male students tended to form “relatively horizontal peer relationships irrespective of age differences.” As a result, while attending the previous university, the participant had “got along with [older males] referring to each other as ‘*sci*,’” if the age difference was no more than one to three years. The student reflected: “Looking back on it now, I sort of feel sorry. ... That’s because, yes, it occurred to me that [the older male] might have felt somewhat displeased when a younger person addressed him as ‘*sci*.’ ... At the time, frankly, I did sort of feel that way, too.” The student further noted that referring to each other as “*sci*” might have something to do with the difficulty he had experienced in “getting close” to those older males. Like the above two male participants, this student also indicated that the term “*hyung*” does bring a sense of closeness to the senior-junior relationship. However, he quickly pointed out certain “drawbacks” associated with such relationships. In many cases in which the older person is addressed as *hyung*, the senior is more apt to treat the junior “in high-handed manner” and to be careless or rude in speaking to the junior. On the other hand, when the senior and junior address each other as “*sci*,” the senior would be less likely to treat the junior in such a manner. Therefore, in the participant’s analysis, there are “pros and cons” concerning each of these modes of address. Nevertheless, the participant would personally prefer

being addressed as *hyung* and relating to the younger male as a “younger brother.”

Identifying himself somewhat halfheartedly as being “in the vanguard of the new generation,” an undergraduate male clearly stated his personal view of senior-junior relationships. He commented:

I don't believe juniors should necessarily follow their seniors. I do recognize seniority or experiences that come with age, but still, just as there are differences among persons, there are differences among individual seniors. If a particular senior made little of me, I wouldn't go so far as to make little of him myself, but I don't think I would need to consider him as a senior deserving senior treatment in its conventional sense, senior as defined in our country.

The student differentiated two types of proprieties: “overtly demonstrated proprieties,” as in using the honorific language and “inwardly observed proprieties” such as feeling a deep sense of respect for a given senior. Keenly aware of his disregard for the type of seniors who, in his view, were undeserving of senior treatment and yet demanding deferential behavior, the student had made conscious efforts not to demand formalities from co-national males younger than himself. The student indicated that in relations with those younger males, he tended to “get along with them on quite informal terms” without requiring “formalities” such as using honorific and formal language. Both he and the younger males, however, should always keep in mind “who's *hyung* and who's *dong-saeng* [meaning younger brother],” and that “there is the line that shouldn't be crossed over” in their relationships.

Another undergraduate male complained in more explicit terms that certain older co-national males had treated him in a high-handed manner, “talking down to

me just because I am younger.” He remarked: “I was put off, terribly, you know. No matter how much older they might be, I am now old enough myself. In Korean age, I am [in my mid twenties].” Further, what made matters worse for the participant was the fact that the same older males who were demanding deferential behavior from him did not themselves demonstrate such behavior toward other males who were older than themselves, the group of males or “*hyung*” the participant had closely associated with. Moreover, the student contrasted patterns of relationships with co-nationals with those established with international peers from other countries. He noted that among co-nationals, when they first meet someone, they determine that person’s “*level*,” on the basis of his or her personal background, age, and so forth, and then relate to the person accordingly. On the other hand, those international peers from other countries, including Asians, “respect one another, at least,” irrespective of age difference.

Additionally, another undergraduate, a female participant, argued strongly for forming “more mature” peer relationships among co-nationals that would go beyond rigid formalities and “*gossip*.” The relationships she envisioned were:

In a word, not the kind of relationships between those of higher status and those of lower status, nor the kind of relationships based on *gossip*, rather *mature*, we could create a rather mature atmosphere. Yes, mature in the sense that we respect another *group*’s opinion, or another person’s opinion. Respecting one another, and remaining a little more *open*. At the same time, we can still observe the *rule*[s] amongst ourselves, people who came here earlier, senior, junior, things like that, we can still honor that. The [students] coming here are all grown-ups after one year and two years go by, no matter how young they were when they first came here. It’s hard to understand, you see, why we couldn’t create a mature--such, such an atmosphere.

Finally, while discussing “both positives and negatives” inherent in American and Korean modes of interpersonal relationships, a graduate female articulated her view of “human” relationships among Koreans as contrasted with “impersonal” relationships among Americans:

As to human relations among Koreans, (pause) well, even in the way people address one another, they'd say “*o-ppa*” [an informal term meaning older brother used by a female toward an older male], “*on-ni*,” “*a-jo-ssi*,” or “*a-jum-ma*” [meaning auntie]. In this way, it's like one big family, isn't it, on purpose, perhaps. As a result, people get to pay more attention to one another, talk more, and have more contact with one another. That's what I was referring to as a human relationship. An impersonal relationship [as in American interpersonal relationships], uhm, is not one where just because you are older than me, you talk down to me, or I show *respect* to you just because of [your age]. In other words, it's an equal relationship not bound by age. And therefore, there are not such things as going to someone to beg or asking for a favor, and so, people always relate to one another on an equal footing.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

Summary

This study was undertaken to explore and identify personal and cultural conceptions which Korean international students studying in the United States hold concerning interpersonal relationships, particularly friendships and student-faculty relationships. The study was guided by conceptual frameworks of cross-cultural and cultural learning perspectives. The research questions that guided this inquiry were as follows:

1. What are some of the conceptions and expectations Korean international students hold concerning friendships and student-faculty relationships involving Koreans?
2. How do Korean students experience and make sense of their interpersonal encounters with American friends, peers, and faculty?
3. What have Korean students discerned and learned from their cross-cultural interpersonal experiences in the United States?

Semi-structured face-to-face individual interviews were used for data collection. These interviews were conducted in Korean language. The research population ($N = 72$) consisted of Korean international students enrolled for degree programs at a large Midwestern university. Participants were selected by

purposeful sampling. A sample of 24 participants included 6 selected from each of four subgroups, designated according to sex and graduate/undergraduate academic level.

Participant experiences and perceptions concerning closest friendships with Korean friends back home versus relationships with American and co-national peers were compared and contrasted according to the following salient aspects: relationship durability, mutuality, instrumentality versus affectivity, and confrontation/conflict management. Participant experiences and perceptions concerning Korean versus American faculty were compared and contrasted according to the following aspects: guidance and leading, tending, role-modeling, and being authoritarian versus being egalitarian. Patterns of variation among individual participants were described in terms of conceptions and personal preferences along the two identified dimensions of interpersonal boundaries and personal autonomy.

As noted previously, both common themes and variations figured prominently within participants' representations of their interpersonal experiences and views concerning Koreans and Americans. All participants appeared to value and seek more responsive engagement with others. Yet they seemed to vary in terms of preferred modes of interpersonal relating and in terms of what they discerned and felt about the interpersonal reality surrounding them.

Conclusions drawn from examination of emergent common themes and variations within participant narratives will be discussed according to the following six subject areas: (1) relatedness and autonomy within the individual and cultural

dimensions; (2) challenges, strengths, and limitations within American and co-national peer relations; (3) authoritarian versus egalitarian orientations within student-faculty relationships; (4) normative versus evaluative aspects of cultural orientations; (5) gender issues; and (6) the construct of *cheong*.

Relatedness and Autonomy Within the Individual and Cultural Dimensions

An overriding theme within participants' accounts of their experiences and views of relationships with close friends, peers, and teachers was the valuing of relatedness. Relatedness for these participants seemed to be based on "the emotional and personal bonds and attachment between persons," and represented individual participants' "strivings for contact, support, and community with others" (Ryan, 1991, p. 210). Participants put a premium on interpersonal relationships which people sustained through responding to one another with ongoing attention and care. Participants talked about enduring interpersonal connections--long-established friendships and close affinities with certain former teachers--with appreciation and pride. Although most of these participants had not seen these significant others back home in months or even years, their stated experience of connectedness with the others was alive and remained solid. In particular, for many participants, their long-term close friendships were cherished as invaluable and irreplaceable affective linkages in their lives. None of the participants spoke of wanting to break away from their long-established relational ties with others back home, although several explicitly took issue with certain aspects

of their relationships, current or past, with relevant others in their lives.

It must be stressed that interpersonal concerns and struggles voiced by participants in essence had more to do with negotiating satisfying engagement with others than they did with disengaging or withdrawing from others. None of the participants seemed to view dissociation and detachment from others as desirable or natural conditions of being in the world. Even critical views or issues raised among participants concerning Korean patterns of interpersonal relating were not about relatedness per se, but instead were more specifically about the actual or perceived limits or restrictions placed on individual expressions of autonomy within certain interpersonal contexts. Autonomy, as evidenced in participants' representations, seemed to suggest a "process of 'self-rule,' that is, of regulating one's own behavior and experience and governing the initiation and direction of action" (Ryan, 1991, p. 209).

Underlying the participants' positive orientation toward relatedness were the shared conceptions of self and others as interconnected and interdependent beings. It seemed natural and desirable to participants that people needed one another and depended on one another for understanding and support. Participants readily acknowledged their needs for empathic and supportive responses from others, as well as their yearnings for fostering and maintaining close interpersonal bonds with others in their lives. Closely attuned with their own needs for responsiveness from and emotional connections with others, many participants were alert to and appreciative of expressions of care demonstrated by others, both Korean

and American, who came into contact with them. In the same vein, these participants, in the course of their attempts to make new connections with people they met in the United States--again, including both Americans and fellow Koreans--became keenly aware of the prevalent disparity between what they needed from others around them and what these others were willing or able to provide for them.

Whereas the dimension of relatedness was clearly evident in participants' common orientation toward relationships, the dimension of autonomy was manifest in patterns of individual difference among the participants. With regard to specific terms of interpersonal relationships viewed as desirable, participants expressed differing visions and preferences. Some tended to favor the mode of interpersonal relating characterized by blurred interpersonal boundaries and intense involvement in one another's life. Others, in contrast, longed for a balance of emphasis on togetherness and interpersonal involvement with adequate recognition of individual desire for personal autonomy and space.

The dimensions of autonomy and relatedness were also evident in participants' representations of variations that occurred on the cultural level. Participants portrayed an image of their home culture replete with substantive emphasis on relatedness. Participants equally expressed a perception that support for relatedness needs on the cultural level could often be coupled with a tendency toward disapproving or curbing expressions of autonomy and individuality. Almost all participants commented on normative tendencies within Korean culture

toward stressing uniformity and conformity. On the other hand, participants generally described American culture as emphasizing autonomy and individual freedom.

Variations among cultures in their attempts to negotiate autonomy and relatedness have been documented in the literature of cross-cultural psychology (Ho, 1993; Hofstede, 1980; U. Kim et al., 1994; Triandis, 1995). Kagitcibasi (1994) noted that individualistic cultures tend to favor autonomy, whereas collectivistic cultures tend to emphasize relatedness. These culturally-varying emphases as played out within the contexts of particular cultures may act to influence relational orientations and behaviors of individual members of the given cultures (Triandis, 1995). The clear inclination among participants toward establishing and maintaining interpersonal connections, joined with their shared conceptions of self and others as interdependent beings, seemed to reflect their native culture's strong emphasis on interpersonal relatedness and interdependence, as described in the literature (U. Kim, 1994; Yum, 1991).

However, the emergence of individual variation among the participants in this study may suggest that these cultural influences do not necessarily constitute determinants of individuals' relational dispositions. The emergent patterns of both commonality and individual variation among participants may illustrate the intricacies of the relationship between cultural influences and individual psychological dispositions (U. Kim et al., 1994). For the participants in this study, relational orientations and perspectives may have been influenced in important ways, but not

entirely determined, by their culture's normative forces and views concerning relationships. Cultural forces may have constituted social contexts or constraints within which individual members of the culture attempted to negotiate their personally unique configurations of autonomy and relatedness yearnings.

American and Co-National Peer Relationships

Relational Compatibility and Incompatibility

As noted previously, information concerning one-to-one relationships with both American and co-national peers pointed to individual variation among the participants. In striving to create new social support networks while in the United States, participants seemed to have come to choose different paths. Some of the participants reported having turned toward American peers, while maintaining social distance from co-nationals. Several others reported only very minimal social involvement with their American peers. Still others seemed to maintain some level of social contact with both American and co-national peers. In addition, among participants there existed a substantial degree of variation in terms of the perceived quality of and the expressed degree of satisfaction with their peer relationships either with Americans or with co-nationals. Some participants reported mutual respect and understanding underlying personal relationships, past or current, that they had formed with at least one American peer during the course of their stay in the United States. In contrast, several others portrayed their

relational experiences with American peers in predominantly negative terms. A similar pattern of variability was in evidence with regard to co-national peer relationships. For some of the participants, relationships with fellow nationals served as their primary source of social support. For some others, however, co-national peer relationships were fraught with interpersonal difficulties to the point that the relationships became another source of problems for them to contend with, rather than a resource of support.

Across peer relationships either with Americans or with co-nationals that were described by participants as for the most part positive, there appeared to be some level of compatibility between what the individual participant expected and needed from the other and how the other was relationally oriented to him or her. For example, in the case of the graduate male who reported having sustained close personal relationships with two American male friends, both of the American males seemed to carry out their relationships with the participant in a manner that was more or less consonant with the participant's relational orientation. Another example of this kind of compatibility in relational orientations and capacities occurred in the case of the undergraduate female who formed a friendship with the American roommate whom she met during her first semester in the United States. Despite the language barrier between them and potentially problematic situations such as the roommate's inviting her boy-friend to their room in the residence hall, a situation totally novel to the participant at the time, they managed to sustain their friendship through mutual respect for differences and willingness to

accommodate each other's needs.

Conversely, with participants who came to develop a pessimistic view of forming friendships with Americans, there appeared to be considerable discrepancy between their interpersonal expectations and their American peers' relational behaviors. For example, the undergraduate female who reported having actively pursued friendships with Americans, only to become profoundly disappointed with these peers, disclosed that in her eyes they were not as caring and giving toward her as she had been toward them. In a like manner, the undergraduate male who had initially maintained an active social involvement with Americans came to learn that he could "not expect that much from [Americans] emotionally" as he found his American peers to be rather uncommitted to building and maintaining personal relationships.

Similar examples of relational incompatibility or compatibility were found in participants' accounts of their interpersonal experiences with co-national peers. For those participants who reported considerable distress associated with their relations with co-nationals, incompatibility seemed to exist in terms of the preferred modes of interpersonal relating. The above undergraduate male who discerned discrepancies between Korean and American interpersonal expectations also spoke of certain co-national male peers who "would almost turn my place into their living quarters," showing little regard for his need for privacy. This student became acutely aware of identifiable differences between his own and his co-national peers' interpersonal behaviors and orientations. In contrast, for

another undergraduate male, who described his co-national relations as generally positive, minimal emphasis on privacy was perceived as a necessary condition for developing close peer relationships. In his view, the tendency to overly emphasize privacy would likely cause interpersonal relationships to remain merely formal, rather than more fully developed and deeply intimate.

The above examples may suggest that the perceived quality, dynamic, and outcome of particular peer relationships may have been functions not so much of the home culture's orientation to relationships as they were of the extent to which the individuals involved possessed capacities for honoring and accommodating each other's unique relational dispositions. Differing conceptions and expectations concerning interpersonal relating played themselves out within the participants' own cultural group, and not just within the cross-cultural context involving American peers. In many respects, in a number of instances, it became increasingly apparent that neither Korean international students nor their American partners could be considered as a homogeneous group in terms of relational needs, orientations, and capacities. It seemed that in seeking responsive engagement with others, American or co-national, individual students tended to organize interpersonal encounters according to a personal and unique configuration of relational needs, orientations, and capacities, to which the others responded in varying manner, in turn, according to their own specific, individual, relational configurations. The quality, dynamic, and outcome of individual relationships between Korean international students and their American and co-national peers appeared

to hinge upon the interplay of such individually maintained relational configurations.

In focusing specifically on one-to-one relationships between individual participants and their American peers, as mediated by a host of individually maintained relational variables, the impact of cultural and language difference seemed particular rather than universal. Each party involved in a given cross-cultural peer relationship may have contributed unique relational capacities and dispositions that were overlapping but not necessarily identical with the respective home culture's normative orientation to relationships. When viewed in this way, phenomena associated with relationships between Korean international students and their American peers would seem to call for a more contextualized analysis than has heretofore been carried out. Such an analysis might well encompass not only the cultural variables, but also the personal and interpersonal variables that have been brought to the relational context, affecting its development and the relationship's ultimate outcome.

American and Co-National Peer Groups: Strengths and Limitations

In considering peer groups as support systems for the participants, it became evident that the issues enacted within peer group contexts tended to converge, in essence, on the challenges involved in negotiating needs of autonomy and relatedness. The term peer group, as used here, refers to an identifiable entity comprising either some part or the whole of the co-national or the American

student community. The optimal balance sought between relatedness and autonomy seemed to differ from one participant to another. Nevertheless, to some degree, the negotiation of such balance between these needs appeared to preoccupy a majority of participants.

In general, both co-national and American peer groups seem to have been vulnerable to overemphasizing one while less than adequately honoring the other of the two basic needs--the need for autonomy and individuality and the need for relatedness and interdependence. Although co-national peer groups could provide emotional and instrumental support and protection against loneliness, they often acted to impede personal autonomy and tended to reinforce submergence of individuality. On the other hand, American peer groups ensured a greater degree of individual autonomy and freedom, but more often than not only within an interpersonal context which participants experienced as inadequately responsive to their needs for interdependence and ongoing mutual involvement in one another's life.

Co-National Peer Group as Support System

Co-national peer groups were often described as impeding autonomy and expressions of individuality. An undergraduate female participant spoke of a distinct shift in the modes of her self-presentation that were contingent upon the nationality of the group of peers with whom she interacted. For example, when interacting with a group of co-national peers, she told herself: "Suppress yourself, yourself as much as possible, be as *polite* as you can, conduct the conversation in

compliance with the *group* as much as possible.” When with a group of American peers, however, she would give herself an entirely different message: “If you can best represent your opinions, if you can verbalize them, let’s represent them. And, no matter how you might be seen, that doesn’t matter. Your, you are you.”

Submergence of individuality emanating from the predominance of normative societal views and standards by which individuals are defined and judged was a common theme echoed by other participants. Several of the participants complained about co-national peers’ limited ability to recognize and relate to them as unique individuals with their own personal aspirations and preferences, and not as merely members of socially-defined categories. The experience of being reduced to primarily a constituent part of certain socially-defined categories was exemplified by the graduate female participant’s first encounter with a fellow Korean male student. The fellow student voiced in no uncertain terms his disapproval of Korean women of marriageable age who studied abroad in the United States.

Other factors pertaining to the issues of individuality and personal autonomy derived from constraints inherent within the modes of group association among Korean international students, as described by participants in the study. Most importantly, the constraints had to do with the simultaneously cohesive and exclusive nature of Korean peer groups. Some male participants directly pointed out that their co-national peers tended to be reluctant to include Americans within their social gatherings. Such exclusionary practice, they felt, contributed to a host

of difficulties in fostering close personal relationships with American peers.

What appeared to have intensified conflict between co-national group association and the fulfillment of personal autonomy and achievement needs and desires was not the group affiliation per se but the particular patterns of group association. One apparent source of difficulty was that the co-national peer social groups tended to require homogeneity and unlimited time commitment from their members in order to maintain group unity and cohesiveness. As several participants' experiences may suggest, having "to take away the time" from the group in order to develop American friendships outside the group may imply that once one is firmly situated in the co-national social group, individual time belongs to the group and is no longer at the individual's free disposal. Unable to maintain regular social contact with both American and co-national peer groups, some students tended toward co-national peers, who were in general more readily available for frequent socialization than were American peers. For these students, the most practical consequence of the resultant social distance from American peers was the reduced opportunity for improving English speaking facility through associating closely with American peers. The decreased opportunity for practicing English became particularly problematic for those students who majored in academic fields requiring high levels of proficiency in English.

For some participants, a perceived lack of openness and flexibility within co-national peer groups not only presented problems in terms of meeting both social and academic needs but also tended to bring about a profound sense of

disappointment within participants concerning their fellow Koreans. For participants who had hoped for “more inclusive friendships,” their co-national peers’ tendency to “hang around only with” other Koreans and their apparent “inability to mix with” Americans constituted a personally disappointing discovery about fellow nationals. These participants raised the question of why their co-national peers would not or could not expand their social networks to include Americans and other nationalities. In these participants’ view, such an open and expansive social group could not only assist Korean students in enhancing their English skills but it could also provide opportunities for them, during their stay in the United States, to learn about positive aspects of other cultures.

In addition, for students who found their co-national community to be rather constricting and hardly accommodating to their yearnings for personal autonomy and individuality, their relations with co-national students became more of a source of conflict and distress rather than a source of social support. Moreover, experiences with co-nationals presented much more emotionally distressing difficulty to these students than did their interactions with Americans. These participants all protested having had to “suffer this pain” because of fellow nationals while staying in the United States. Difficulty experienced in negotiating co-national peer relations became particularly problematic for those participants who failed to form supportive relationships with American peers or fellow international students from other countries.

A related social problem faced by those students not affiliated with small groups was the lack of any medium through which the outsiders could meet fellow nationals with whom they might feel compatible. Such a medium might be lacking to the degree that social contacts occurred predominantly through the existing separate small groups or circles, which pattern tended to persist even within the context of formal social events involving the co-national student community as a whole. The tendency among Koreans to remain rather reserved toward those not well known to them, as revealed in some participants' narratives, may have acted to reduce opportunities for developing acquaintanceships and networking within these formal social gatherings. Such opportunities may have been particularly critical for those who remained outside of small group affiliations and yet were longing for supportive contacts with fellow nationals. The apparently predominant pattern within the co-national student community of socializing within rather closed, small groups may also have tended to create problems for fostering a more expansive social network inclusive of other nationalities.

Although the above social pattern may prove highly functional within the back-home social structure, it appears to have been limited and limiting within the cross-cultural social context to the extent that it failed to support or accommodate group members' autonomous pursuits both inside and outside the group sphere. Potentially acting to limit autonomous individual pursuits, small group formation and maintenance may be reinforced by "relation-dependent helping norms" (Naito, 1994). These culturally based norms may strongly enforce the practice of giving

and receiving help among in-group members, prevalent in Korean and other collectivistic cultural contexts (Ho, 1993; Yum, 1991). Moreover, ensuring co-national peer support, as derived from such relation-dependent norms, may present particularly difficult challenges for those students who are in need of such support and yet are reluctant to join small groups which they may view as acting to interfere with personal autonomy and a sense of individuality. Within the Korean co-national student community, care and support of the individual are necessarily contingent on interpersonal ties and familiarity. However, in order to better reconcile individual needs for such relational support with their counterpart autonomy needs, a more universal, encompassing, and outreaching network of peer support may be necessary within the co-national student community.

American Peer Group as Support System

When compared with co-national peer groups, American peer groups were perceived by participants to be more inclined to recognize individual members in their own right. In describing her initial encounter with a social group of American peers, an undergraduate female participant saw the Americans as giving recognition and relating to one another as though they were “grains of sand,” or as separate individual entities. The entire mass of sand, or the group as a whole, let each grain of sand be, without breaking or in any way disregarding it.

In contrast to perceptions of co-national peer group constraints, participants who were involved, either currently or in the past, with American social

groups, in several instances, indicated that American peers tended to allow others freedom and personal space. This provision for personal freedom was revealed in such comments as: "They don't bother me. ... They don't act like sticky rice cake concerning my private matters and stuff." or "They don't *touch* me," (with the participant speaking the English word, "touch," as commonly employed [using English] in Korean language, to mean something like "bother" or "intrude upon").

On the other hand, American peer groups were typically perceived to be limited in adequately responding to participants' yearnings for relatedness. In general, American peer groups were not mutually relational and interdependent enough for the participants to experience a sense of belonging and close affinity. The undergraduate female who voiced her appreciation of the American social group's respect for its members as individual entities nonetheless responded as follows when asked to describe what it felt like to be treated as a grain of sand: "It was by no means bad. But it wasn't sufficient either. I wished that I could get some more recognition, that someone would recognize me, but I didn't find it there." This perception of insufficiency in terms of American peers' recognition of what she needed in order to feel part of the group contrasted directly with the excessive amount of unwanted attention she had received at the previously mentioned co-national social gathering. Such perceived lack of concerted effort emanating from American peers toward assisting international newcomers in becoming "a part of the group" was also exemplified in other participants' accounts. Participants' reported social difficulty with their American peer groups

seemed to be less about any blatantly unfriendly behavior emanating from American peers than about an apparent absence of “pull” they felt they needed from the Americans in order to “fit in” with the group.

The apparent constraints associated with participant involvement as part of closed, tightly knit co-national social groups were notably lacking in participants’ accounts of American peer groups. However, differing expectations about interdependence among classmates and roommates seemed to constitute a major deterrent for certain participants in getting close to their American peers. In some cases, participants’ anticipation of assistance or mutual helping from their American peers were met with disappointment. In other instances, participants felt that their offers of help were taken as “uncalled-for kindness” and viewed suspiciously by their American peers. Furthermore, enduring affiliative ties with American peer groups were often difficult to achieve, a difficulty which some participants specifically attributed to Americans’ predominant orientation toward developing relationships that were transient, instrumental, and nonintimate. Moreover, in many cases, in terms of creating a level of common understanding and knowledge of one another beyond the merely superficial, the barrier of language differences became a virtually insurmountable burden to both the participants and their American peers. Thus, language itself tended to undermine the process of building foundational support for mutuality-based peer group attachments.

Call for a More Contextualized Analysis of Peer Groups as Support Systems

The ongoing debate in the literature concerning American and co-national peer groups as viable support systems for international students has largely overlooked the import and extent of interpersonal issues and forces embedded within the cultural dynamic. Such apparent negligence in part might be due to a pervasive trend in existing research on international students. The trend has been to lump diverse nationalities together either in order to investigate the social experiences of international students in general or to examine the factor of nationality as a variable in international student social adjustment while in the host country (Furnham & Bochner, 1982; M. Y. Lee et al., 1981). Multi-national group studies have thus tended to highlight intergroup variation while minimally representing patterns of variability existing within particular national groups. With a primary focus on identifying whether international students gravitated toward American or co-national peers, these studies typically neglected to address the nature and extent of interpersonal problems and challenges encountered by international students in negotiating social relations with co-national peers. Moreover, issues associated with how specific social patterns that were culturally normative among a particular co-national group of international students might affect the students' peer relations with co-nationals during their stay in the United States have remained inadequately researched. As results of the present study may indicate, social difficulties and contextual issues arising from co-national group

expectations and interactions appear to demand more explicit and focused investigation.

Authoritarian Versus Egalitarian Orientations: Korean and American Student-Faculty Relationships

The impression gained from the data was that for participants in this study, the ideal image of the professor, Korean or American, was that of a competent, supportive, and caring authority figure. Participants appeared to search for professors who could acknowledge and honor both autonomy and relatedness needs. Both Korean and American faculty members who could demonstrate such qualities were the most highly regarded by participants.

More specifically, reflected in the salient aspects of participants' interpersonal experiences and views concerning only their Korean teachers and professors (such aspects as guidance and leading, role-modeling, being more mutual than being "authoritarian," and tending) is the image of an authority figure. Viewed positively, this figure of authority is someone who is capable of providing guidance and leadership. This figure might very well serve as a good role model, demonstrating professional competence, sincerity toward learning, devotion to education, and high moral integrity. In addition, the authority figure would be willing to understand students from their own viewpoints, as opposed to demanding unconditional obedience, and would care for students and remain genuinely concerned about their well-being. In essence, participants seemed to look up to

and yearn for teachers and professors who either were or would be willing to assume an “authoritative” stance (Baumrind, 1978, as cited in Gilligan, 1988, p. *xxix*). Such an authoritative stance would signify guiding and leading students, not by resorting to coercion and repression, but instead by demonstrating such qualities and behaviors as caring concern, understanding, competence, dedication, and strong moral character.

As in participants’ accounts of peer relationships, contrasting examples of gratifying versus disappointing relational experiences emerged with both Korean and American faculty members. Some participants described a sense of meaningful interpersonal connections with particular former Korean teachers and professors. Others, however, did not report close affinities established with teachers and professors back home. Some participants found responses from certain American professors to be supportive and helpful. Others became disappointed with what American professors had to offer in terms of supportive responses made to individual student needs. Overall, there tended to be noticeable variation among participants’ representations concerning personal experiences with individual faculty members of either identified cultural group, Korean or American. The variability clearly manifested in participants’ experiences and perceptions of individual faculty members, whether Korean or American, seemed to challenge the notion of cultural uniformity for professors’ relational dispositions and behaviors toward students.

However, participants' individual conceptions concerning Korean versus American faculty as culturally representative groups tended to converge with one another in the following general respects. Korean faculty members were characterized as tending to be authoritarian, whereas American faculty members were perceived to be more egalitarian in relation with their students. Participants' composite characterizations of Korean versus American patterns of student-faculty relationship, moreover, tended to reveal not merely perceptions of differing relational orientations but also specific kinds of strength and vulnerability associated with each configuration. These perceived patterns of relational orientations and overall aspects of strength and vulnerability are developed in detail in what follows.

Authoritarian Orientation Among Korean Faculty

Korean faculty's attitudes and behaviors toward students were often characterized not as authoritative, but rather as authoritarian. In their representations of Korean student-faculty relationships in general, participants revealed an astute awareness of both the hierarchical aspects of such relationships and the cultural prescriptions for proper role behavior. Several participants voiced discomfort with the formality and the accentuation of status and power differential generally associated with Korean student-faculty relationships. The interview data also revealed that participants remained alert to authentic versus false claims to authority on the part of their teachers and professors. Whereas participants

expressed high regard for teachers and professors who were perceived to exercise authority on their students' behalf, they saw through and were critical of teachers and professors who asserted unwarranted dominance and attempted unjustifiable claims to authority. Participants spoke strongly against the authoritarian mentality and attitude in general, as manifested in teachers' "trying to rule over students," demanding unconditional compliance from students, and acting to suppress students' self-assertions. Those Korean teachers and professors seen as "entrapped in ... authoritarianism" were typically portrayed as adhering to the belief that "it's all right to disregard students just because [I am] a professor" and because "I am ... above others, above students."

To the extent that faculty members subscribed to authoritarianism in relating to their students, they seemed liable to lose sight of their students as individuals entitled to respectful consideration under any circumstances. Numerous examples of Korean faculty members' apparent disregard for individual students were provided throughout the interview narratives. Certain Korean high school teachers or professors were described as tending to "totally dismiss" less favored students, to put down individual students in class for giving wrong answers or for asking questions considered too basic, or to react to students, in some other cases, in a violent and abusive manner.

When authoritarianism prevailed, students tended toward passivity, silence, and acquiescence. However, in cases where teachers failed to recognize and honor students as individuals in their own right, students lost respect for the

teachers. In such relationships, to the extent that students felt obligated to act deferentially toward the teachers whom they had come to consider unworthy of respect, they were more likely to experience incongruence between true feelings and manifest interpersonal behaviors toward the teachers. Consequently, in authoritarian relationships, where the teacher's tendency toward dominance and disrespect prevailed, students experienced diminished possibilities for "true dialogue." The possibility for creating meaningful connections with their teachers was greatly reduced.

Egalitarian Orientation Among American Faculty

Participants' alertness to faculty members' authoritarian posture, as manifested in their overall characterization of Korean faculty, was further evidenced in comparisons they made between American and Korean student-faculty relationships. Nearly all participants made reference to American professors' non-authoritarian attitudes and behaviors toward their students. Many participants mentioned specific behaviors of American professors in class that they saw as reflecting what one undergraduate male termed "respectful consideration of the student as an individual." Among identified examples of such behavior were American professors' common use of such expressions as "thank you" and "I am sorry," acknowledgment of their own mistakes in front of students, "explaining" consequences of actions to students as opposed to "commanding," and responding courteously to students even when they made comments that were clearly "off" or

asked questions that were “blatantly simplistic.” Participants also noticed that American professors were in general quite open and receptive to students’ ideas and views that might differ from their own. Moreover, American professors were perceived to be in general eager to elicit and foster students’ independent thinking and self-assertion during class.

Participants discerned a rather egalitarian quality characteristic of American student-faculty relationships rarely found within Korean student-faculty contexts. A common perception among participants was that “no *gap*” or distance existed along the vertical dimension between American professors and students. In American student-faculty relationships, professors were viewed as no longer “up there,” no longer “above students.” American professors and students, an undergraduate female articulated, “relate to one another on an equal footing as individuals who are independent of one another,” and not according to differentiation in “status,” as was taken to be the general rule among Korean professors and students. American professors and students were described as interacting with one another in a less formalistic and more casual manner than that assumed by their Korean counterparts.

The more egalitarian dispositions of American professors toward students were generally depicted in a favorable light. Such orientations, nevertheless, did not always meet with the whole-hearted acceptance of participants. Specific reservations concerning professors assuming collateral stances in their relations with students were voiced. The following comments made by the undergraduate

female who reflected upon American professors and students standing “on a truly equal footing” seem particularly pertinent.

At some point, I came to realize that teachers and students here are on a truly equal footing. ... But I still wish teachers and students could be somewhat different in American society. ... Teachers themselves think of students as just--[what I would like] is not teachers thinking, “If I do this, I might get into *trouble*,” but instead, a little more ... how should I put it.

The participant later added:

I feel it’s better for me to have a sense of respect for someone. Attending classes with a sense of respect for someone, a teacher--eagerly hoping, “Ah, I am going to learn something, learn something” is different from watching the teacher, wondering ‘What other mistakes is [this teacher] going to make now?’

The student’s insight into layers of implication embedded in the perceived egalitarian relationships suggested that professors’ egalitarian stance, while connoting an underlying respect for student individuality and rights, might also have signified that the professors were acting in their relations with students in a rather self-protective manner. The correlation made in the student’s comments between the egalitarian posture of American professors and their apprehension over “getting into *trouble*” seemed to reflect a perception on the student’s part that, when compared with strictly hierarchical student-faculty relationships, advocacy of more collateral relationships may tend to influence professors to remain more cautious in order not to infringe on student rights. Concern for the individual student’s rights may at times derive not from any genuine regard for the students themselves, but from the more self-focused motives of faculty acting to protect themselves from being held accountable for any departure from professional

conduct required of them. The student's ideal image of a professor, as reflected in the above passages, was of someone who was "somewhat different" from students, as well as someone whom she could "have a sense of respect" for and could eagerly hope to "learn something" from. The student seemed to long for professors who would seek to achieve a higher status in the minds of students through demonstrating admirable qualities so that the students could look up to them. Higher status acquired in this fashion would be distinctly different from any hierarchical positioning granted according to sociocultural definitions.

Several participants specifically pointed out that the egalitarian and casual manner perceived among American professors did not necessarily signify personal closeness. Many participants reported difficulties in developing personally close relationships with their American instructors and advisors, which they related to the perceived tendency among American professors to draw tight boundaries within student-faculty relationships. Such practices as meeting during designated office hours only and restricting consultation to academic matters were experienced as somewhat too "impersonal" and "business-like." Furthermore, the perceived egalitarian dispositions among American professors toward students were sometimes seen as manifesting an overall tendency toward permissiveness, which in turn, from the participants' perspectives, suggested lack of caring concern and responsive engagement. While recognizing that the "if it suits you, do it, but if it doesn't, then you don't have to" posture, seen as prevalent among American professors, in part reflected a respect for the individual student's right to

decide substantive matters on his or her own terms, participants at the same time pointed out that such a disposition seemed to them to be at times insufficiently supportive and less than helpful.

This perception seemed especially true when students sought more committed, involved responses from their American professors. In some cases, attempting to draw from American instructors and advisors sympathetic understanding and practical help, for difficulties encountered as international students, resulted only in disappointment and disillusionment. Participants came to sense, in some instances, that their American professors would neither sympathetically attend to the expressed personal concerns of students nor actively intervene in their behalf. In other instances, when participants hoped for some specific information or direct instructions, the professors' responses continued to be, instead, indirective and noncommittal. In the students' minds, little or no help was offered to meet their pressing needs. In asking the student, "What are you going to do?," or "*What do you wanna do?*," and, what is more to the point, by placing the emphasis on "you," the professor was perceived to be overlooking the student's need, expressed or unexpressed, for the professor's active engagement in understanding individual concerns and willingness to explore together with the student solutions to immediate problems. Through first-hand experiences with American professors, participants sooner or later seemed to get the message that in American colleges, students were supposed to take care of their problems "on their own."

Participants' views suggested the importance for faculty to recognize both autonomy and relatedness needs among students. Each posture or approach, authoritarian or egalitarian, appeared to retain its own characteristic blind spots. Professors perceived as adhering to authoritarianism seemed apt to see less than what their students were actually or potentially capable of doing in terms of thinking and deciding independently. It seemed that these professors ran the risk of overriding student needs for autonomy and self-assertion. On the other hand, professors perceived as subscribing to egalitarianism seemed to see more than what their international students were actually able or equipped to do. It appeared that in following their egalitarian precepts, these professors risked overlooking their students' needs for guidance and warm, supportive contacts. And thus, either precept, authoritarian or egalitarian, when followed too stringently, seemed to have restricted the professor's capacity to recognize and respond affirmatively to both autonomy and relatedness needs among students, while engaging and assisting them in their efforts toward academic goal achievement and personal growth.

A Need for a Balance Between Support for Relatedness and Autonomy

The heightened sense of need for faculty support was a dominating theme echoed by many participants in the study. Emphasizing the importance of faculty support, a graduate male argued that many Korean international students, himself included, found themselves, while in the United States, to be "without a secure

pivot in their lives” and “continually in a state of wavering.” A majority of participants mentioned that they would like their American professors to be more sensitive and responsive to their needs in view of the challenges and difficulties international students encountered during their study abroad in the United States.

Need for faculty assistance might have been particularly heightened because participants functioned, as do the majority of international students, within an unfamiliar educational system. Moreover, it would probably have been quite difficult for these students to have found other sources of support within their academic programs, such as study groups among program peers or connections with program seniors, whereas such supportive options would have been readily available and highly functional for them had they been within Korean college campuses. Faculty failure to honor participants’ need for support tended to be particularly disheartening for the participants, not only because they had to contend with a host of difficulties involved in adjusting to a new academic and social environment, but also because the American cultural ideal of independent problem solving was in direct conflict with their home culture’s practice of collective problem solving.

The need for faculty support among participants in this study has also been evidenced in other studies. In a survey study involving graduate students from different countries, Mallinckrodt and Leong (1992) underscored the importance of social support from the academic program, including faculty support, for the well-being of international students. In a national survey of needs of international

students from developing countries at U. S. colleges and universities, M. Y. Lee and colleagues (1981) found that the respondents ranked "good relationships" with faculty members as even more important than good relationships established among peers. Good relationships with their academic advisors, the degree program committee members, course instructors, international student advisors, and other university staff members were all recognized as highly important.

Although international student needs for faculty support have been indicated in the literature, little has been effectively explored concerning American faculty members' perceptions of and responsiveness to international student needs for support and guidance. Systematic efforts to investigate faculty's conceptions of and attitudes toward their international students have been notably lacking. The apparent lack of such investigative efforts might reflect an implicit assumption that international student adjustment to a new academic system is a unilateral process in which only student adaptation is expected and required. Dissatisfactions expressed by the participants may point to the need for more mutually derived educational processes, in which both students and the institutional system of which faculty members are a part are required to engage in collaborative efforts toward finding optimally supportive learning environments.

Insights gained from this study might prove helpful for creating such mutually based and supportive systems. Participants in this study viewed the egalitarian stance perceived among American faculty as in part helpful but also at times frustrating to their educational endeavors. Participants did discern and appreciate

American faculty's attitudes and behaviors that were supportive and facilitative of student needs and expressions of autonomy and individuality. Egalitarian stance became problematic for the participants when their needs for support and assistance were not fully acknowledged and honored. What may be called for is a balance of support for autonomy needs with recognition of student yearnings for support, involvement, and caring concern.

Normative Versus Evaluative Aspects of Cultural Orientations

In understanding participants' perceptions of cultural norms and their personal evaluation of these norms, the distinction between normative and evaluative aspects of cultural orientations articulated by Bierbrauer and his colleagues (1994) seems helpful. The authors pointed out that the perception of cultural norms (i.e., what is normative in a target culture) and the personal assessment of these norms (i.e., how desirable the perceived norms are to a person) do not necessarily coincide.

Participants' perceptions of what constituted the culturally normative in Korean society in the one instance, and American society in the other, considerably overlapped. However, participants' personal interpretations and reactions concerning the perceived cultural norms were a different matter entirely, evidencing a substantial degree of variability.

Within convergent participant descriptions of cultural norms and patterns of interpersonal relating, Americans were characterized as tending to be

“individualistic” or “I-centered,” whereas Koreans were described as tending to be “we-centered” or “group-oriented.” Americans were perceived as tending to look after themselves while maintaining rather tightly-drawn boundaries within interpersonal relationships, including personally close ones. Koreans, on the other hand, were viewed as being more inclined to look after one another while maintaining interpersonal boundaries that were more permeable or open. Such culturally-varying relational patterns and behaviors were linked to certain salient features of interpersonal relationships. When compared with Korean interpersonal relationships, American interpersonal relationships were in general characterized as being more instrumental and transient, typically lacking the enduring affective ties characteristically found in close relationships among Koreans (e.g., *cheong*). These representations of salient aspects of the Korean and the American cultural patterns of interpersonal relating seemed to correspond to a large extent to the collectivistic and individualistic distinction of these two cultures as commonly defined in the literature of cross-cultural psychology. The Korean equivalents of such English terms as “individualism” and “individualistic” were in fact rather consistently used by participants in characterizing American culture and people. In contrast, Korean words referring to “we-centered” and “group-orientation” were often used for Korean culture and people.

On the other hand, the personal frameworks which individual participants used in evaluating these cultural norms exhibited varying levels of alignment with the frameworks of their native culture. For some participants, the evaluative

frameworks which they employed seemed closely aligned with their home culture's dominant perspectives regarding interpersonal relationships. For other participants, however, such evaluative frameworks seemed quite clearly differentiated from the home culture's normative views and practices.

Participants whose evaluative frameworks appeared to be closely aligned with their culture's dominant perspectives tended to highlight what they took to be the positive or "human" aspects of Korean relationships, including the characteristics of interdependence, blurred interpersonal boundaries, and ongoing, intimate involvement in one another's life. These participants tended to minimally represent or underplay the interpersonal concerns and difficulties some other participants identified as associated with such relational patterns. When problems were mentioned (e.g., widespread gossiping and actual or perceived conformity pressure), they were described in rather generalized terms and in a somewhat matter-of-fact fashion. Any sense of pervasive personal distress emanating from such problems was notably lacking. Moreover, in keeping with this close normative alignment to their native culture, these participants tended to represent American cultural patterns of relationships in a similarly absolutist vein. They were often unequivocally critical of what they perceived to be the salient features of Americans' orientations toward interpersonal relationships. These features included the primacy of self-interest, indifference to others, and maintenance of rigid interpersonal boundaries. To these participants, such perceived individualistic tendencies among Americans were readily equated with being "selfish," or putting self-

centered interests and needs above relationships. And thus, such tendencies had come to be viewed by these participants as antithetical to developing intimate, mutually caring relationships. In general, the perceived individualistic orientation carried the predominantly negative associations of loneliness, isolation, distance, and superficiality.

In contrast to their peers who tended to be more absolutist in their perceptions of cultural difference, participants whose personal frameworks seemed less closely aligned with their culture's dominant perspectives tended to express an apparently more encompassing view of their culture of origin, and were thus able to point out both its limitations and its strengths. They were more inclined to be outspoken and eloquent concerning their own experiences of interpersonal problems and stress arising from the normative cultural emphasis on fostering and maintaining a sense of togetherness and we-ness, while not always recognizing and honoring the individual need for personal autonomy and individuality. They articulated critical views toward normative pressures which stressed uniformity and conformity. They were highly cognizant of the prevalence of such pressures among Korean people whether at home or abroad. Having experienced many instances in which their individual preferences, values, and beliefs conflicted with the pervasive demands of their culture's social norms, these participants explicitly expressed a sense of personal dissonance in relation to certain cultural aspects. These culturally differentiated participants approached the perceived individualistic orientation among Americans quite differently from their normatively aligned

peers. They tended to frame their personal experiences and views concerning American cultural norms and patterns of relationships in a less absolutist way. To these participants, being individualistic was not necessarily synonymous with being "selfish" and uncaring, but instead represented the possibility of an alternative way of relating. Asked to characterize American patterns of interpersonal relationships, these participants used such images as "cold," "clean," "dry" "impersonal," "not sticky," "independent," and "separate." In elaborating upon these images, the participants added references to notions of interpersonal distance, boundary, and separateness; however, they did so without adding characterizations and interpretations which were intrinsically negative. They tended to be both consciously aware and openly appreciative of certain positive aspects associated with individualistic orientations. Importantly emphasized in this respect were receptivity to others' self-assertions and respect for others' needs for privacy. However, even within these apparently equitable views, they, nevertheless, remained at the same time noticeably perceptive concerning what to them constituted a clear vulnerability associated with the individualistic orientation. Such vulnerability was indicated to stem from a propensity toward self-absorption, an indifference to others' needs, an apparent tendency toward detachment, and maintenance of quite tenuous interpersonal bonds.

Participants' accounts concerning hierarchical relationships involving Koreans, primarily faculty members and seniors or older peers, provided further evidence of participants' personal evaluations as differentiated from social norms

and cultural precepts governing both superordinate and subordinate behaviors within such relationships. Although participants seemed by and large accepting of time-honored social practices in their home culture, such acceptance by no means signified non-discriminatory compliance with conventional norms. Despite cultural precepts demanding that they show deference and courtesy toward teachers and those who were senior to them, participants tended to follow their own personal judgments, rather than their acquired cultural precepts, in determining whether or not the particular person of higher social status was deserving of genuinely-felt respect and recognition. Participants' heart-felt deference, as distinguished from overtly courteous behavior, was something that faculty and seniors had to earn. Deference was not simply and automatically accorded to individuals because of superior social status or power.

Illuminating examples of personal evaluations coexisting with internalized cultural prescriptions were found within participants' narratives. One such example was provided by an undergraduate male participant who commented, "Even if we don't really respect the person [referring to a Korean professor], privately denouncing the person as an unworthy professor, we become more mindful of our speech and behaviors when with that professor [emphasis added]." Although the specific criteria this participant personally used in judging a given professor cannot be determined from the above observation, it clearly points to the personal judgment process that operates alongside the learned social rules. The experience of the graduate female who felt enraged when a male professor hit several of her

male classmates provides another example. Although she felt nearly overtaken by indignation at the time, the student refrained from “railing” at the professor. Since he was a professor, she continued steadfast in honoring the social rules regulating proper student behavior. Nonetheless, this incident, together with other disappointing experiences involving the same professor, led the student to lose all respect for her teacher and advisor. In her mind, her relationship with the professor had entirely broken down. According to the participant’s interpretation, the professor had become “a bad association, rather than a professor.”

Additional examples were found in participants’ accounts of Korean senior-junior relationships. For example, an undergraduate male articulated: “If a particular senior made little of me, I wouldn’t go so far as to make little of him myself, but I don’t think I would need to consider him as a senior deserving senior treatment in its conventional sense.” The student seemed to be saying that if he felt that the senior thought nothing of him because of the age and status differential, he would decide covertly in his mind that the senior was unworthy of “senior treatment” or treatment reflective of his sincere respect and recognition. However, as with the above graduate female, he would not go so far as to overtly express his true thoughts and feelings to the senior and totally denounce the junior-senior relationship itself. The student would likely continue to bow when encountering the senior, to use honorific language, and to act otherwise deferentially toward him or her. Such behavior, in accordance with the accepted social norms, in this particular case was clearly dissonant with the participant’s own

personal definition of the other person and the relationship.

It seems that whereas Korean cultural precepts may tend to have been universal and generalizable across subordinate-superordinate interpersonal situations, individuals' personal evaluations seem to have been target-specific and particular. Such evaluations seem to have operated in accordance with observations and judgments made concerning the attitudes and behaviors of specific higher status persons. However, specific criteria used for the personal evaluations may have tended to vary from one individual to another.

The evidence presented thus far helps to illuminate the personal frameworks participants used in evaluating social norms of their own and another cultures, as well as in basing their judgments of others with whom they were in hierarchical relationships. Participants' overall characterizations of culturally-varying norms across the Korean and American societies tended to converge, but their individual evaluations of these norms varied greatly, as noted before. In addition, participants' personal reactions, overt and covert, concerning social norms and rules governing hierarchical relationships within their own culture revealed evaluative views and assessments differentiated from internalized cultural prescriptions.

Results from this study seem to lend support for the argument made by Bierbrauer and his colleagues (1994) for distinguishing between individuals' normative and evaluative assessments. Such distinction, however, has not as yet been adequately reflected in the research areas of cross-cultural psychology

(Bierbrauer et al.). Efforts to incorporate such distinction into investigations of individuals' cultural orientations may help tap into the scope of within-culture variations as well as commonalities by bringing into sharper focus the phenomena of individuals' personal perceptual and evaluative frameworks.

Gender Issues

The emergent patterns of commonality and difference between men and women indicated in this study in terms of their relational views and preferences are identified and discussed below.

The Common Valuing of Relatedness Across Gender

Both men and women in this study seemed to share a positive orientation toward interpersonal relationships and the interdependent sense of self and others. As evident throughout the interview narratives, men in the present study were at least as open as women in expressing their yearnings for affiliation and interdependence. The long-term aspect of relationships was more expressly emphasized by men than by women in participants' representations of their friendship experiences and views. Closest friendships dating back to elementary school years were reported only by men. Moreover, relational stories involving close friends crying together, overcome by deep mutual feelings for one another, were recounted exclusively by men, illustrating the ease with which these male participants expressed tender feelings when among other men.

This pattern of commonality among men and women in this study may be better understood in terms of the socialization processes they experienced within their native culture. The generally positive orientation toward relatedness evidenced among both male and female participants seems consistent with Korean culture's socialization for relationship-centeredness and interdependence throughout the life span of individuals of both sexes. Moreover, the valuing of relationships found among male participants in particular seems to clearly reflect their native culture's ideology, more specifically, the Korean Confucian tradition of stressing enduring male bonding between friends, between seniors and juniors, and between students and teachers. As noted by Won-Doornink (1991), the five basic types of interpersonal relationships delineated by the Confucian ethical code concerned primarily males relating to males. The only cross-gender relationship of importance was that of husband and wife, which was regarded as "secondary under the strict patriarchal norms" in traditional Korean society (S-D Choi, 1975, p. 5).

The relational orientation shared among men and women in the current study stands in direct contrast with commonly held views of gender difference in American mainstream psychology. As noted by Bar-Yam (1991), the orientation toward separateness and independence has been stereotypically associated with American men, particularly those of the majority culture, whereas the orientation toward affiliation and dependence has been linked primarily to their female counterparts. This particular aspect or pattern of gender difference did not seem

to be evident among Korean men and women in the present study. Bar-Yam's study of American men and women suggested that the tendency toward separateness or affiliation may be "related more to individual differences and other factors such as the social and cultural environment," as opposed to being based on innate male or female characteristics (p. 247). The present findings may support this contention.

In the culture of separateness (Kagitcibasi, 1994), such as found in the United States, self-reliance is upheld as a cultural ideal, whereas relatedness is viewed as a threat to personal autonomy. Moreover, as Gilligan (1988) maintained, independence is seen as the hallmark of maturity and is closely linked to the social definition of personal power. Conversely, dependence often signifies deficiency and lack of personal power (Gilligan, 1988). In the culture of relatedness (Kagitcibasi, 1994), such as Korea, however, what is socially valued and rewarded are mutual engagement and interdependence among people. Thus, in Korea, ability to create and sustain relationships of interdependency is the socially-defined central criterion of maturity. As such, personal power arises not from being self-sufficient and separating out oneself from others, but from connecting oneself to others. To the extent that the culture of relatedness recognizes and promotes capacities for interpersonal attunement and connectedness as highly valued skills, acquiring such facility may be as integral to the self-development of men as it is to that of women.

A cross-cultural perspective would seem to help illuminate how gender-related experiences may be shaped by the larger sociocultural context in which they occur. As suggested by J. G. Miller (1994), when examining gender-related experiences, it seems “critical to focus on how gender differences are patterned by the culturally specific presuppositions made within a given cultural setting and how they may be manifest in culturally variable ways” (p. 33).

Gender Differences

Apart from the emergent pattern of an overall positive orientation toward relationships shared among both men and women in this study, some indications of gender difference did emerge from participant narratives regarding specific terms of interpersonal relating viewed as personally desirable. More women than men expressed explicitly their yearning for relationships in which not only a sense of togetherness and unity among individuals but also the individuals’ self-assertion and distinctness were recognized and honored. In general, when compared with their male peers, women seemed more inclined to voice critical views of certain social norms and practices found among Korean people, both at home and abroad, including the normative pressure toward uniformity and toward submergence of individuality. Although the desire to be respected as individuals in their own right was mentioned by men and women alike, women tended to be more vocal about having such desire and more alert to other Koreans’ failure to honor such individual inclinations.

Women also seemed more disposed to discern expressions of individuality as demonstrated by others around them, expressions different from manifestations of appropriate role behaviors. Within the context of describing their favorite former Korean faculty members, for example, women, not all but some, represented as particularly admirable, specific personal qualities and attitudes of certain female faculty members that had to do with their ability to lead lives with a well-defined sense of self and purpose. The female students' attentiveness to expressions of individuality among these selected faculty members was evident in their use of such phrases for describing the identified female teachers and professors as, a "woman with rather progressive ideas," being "somehow different from others," and being "assured of [her] own ideas and capable of expressing what [she] personally believe[s] in." Such representations concerning faculty members was notably lacking among male participants, who tended to focus primarily on faculty role expectations and obligations, social responsibilities, and appropriate specific role behaviors.

Women's seemingly greater propensity toward individuality was also manifested in their management of peer relations involving fellow nationals in the United States. When compared with their male peers, women in general were more apt to situate themselves at the periphery of their co-national student community. More women than men tended to avoid affiliating themselves with tightly-knit small social groups, which might impinge on their personal autonomy. Overall, issues concerning personal autonomy and individuality seemed decidedly

more salient for women than for men, although such issues were addressed by both gender groups in this study.

The apparently higher levels of awareness and expression of autonomy needs among women in this study may be better understood in terms of the overall sociocultural context found in Korea. Although an increasing number of Korean women now receive higher education and join the professional work world, individual autonomy and achievement continue to conflict with the more traditional cultural ideals of female virtue: selflessness and submission. Girls in contemporary Korean society are still raised with the traditional image of “wise mother and good wife (*hyon-mo-yang-ch'o*)” (Chung, 1986, p. 176), the image of a woman defined entirely in terms of female roles within the context of family. The Confucian ethical code of *sam-jong-ji-ui*, or “three kinds of obedience” (S-D Choi, 1975, p. 5) required of women in traditional Korean society, stipulates the unconditional obedience of a woman to her parents in childhood, to her husband in marriage, and to her sons in old age (Chung, 1986). The ethical code, along with other moral codes for women in traditional patriarchal Korean society, was based on a view of women as less than autonomous social agents, which view has served to justify women’s inferior social status, persisting through the present time Korean society (S-D Choi, 1975; Chung, 1986).

In view of such a sociocultural milieu, studying abroad in the United States would seem to have differing implications according to gender. The image of a Korean woman pursuing her own academic aspirations and career goals in a

foreign land away from direct parental supervision for a prolonged period of time is clearly incompatible with the traditional female sex role in Korea. As such, the option of study abroad in the United States might tend to attract Korean women with a heightened awareness of individuality needs, rather than those strongly identified with traditional cultural precepts. This might not necessarily be quite so much the case for Korean men, given that study abroad is entirely compatible with the traditional emphasis on achievement in men. This assertion may at least be in part supported by a study conducted by Forgas and Bond (1985) concerning cultural influences on the perception of social interactions among male and female university students in Hong Kong. In this study, female students were found to maintain greater distance from traditional cultural norms and values than did their male counterparts. The authors related the results to the inconsistency between university study and female sex role in Chinese society.

The higher level of awareness and expression of autonomy needs found among women in the present study may not necessarily indicate that the same pattern of gender difference exists in the general Korean population. The participants in the current study represented a selective group of individuals with middle to upper social class background. The small number of women in the research population, less than one third of the total, may indicate that the selective nature of female participants was even greater than that of their male peers. That is, female participants may have met more restrictive requirements than male peers in order to achieve their goals of studying in the United States. This element of high

selectivity may further diminish the study sample's representativeness of Korean women in general.

On the other hand, female participants can reasonably be viewed as having held characteristics in common with what was likely to have been an equally selective population of all other Korean women studying abroad in the U.S. colleges and universities at the time of the study. Findings concerning the autonomy needs among female participants in this study may have important implication for understanding the population of Korean female international students in terms of personal needs, relational orientations, and social relations with co-nationals and Americans while in the United States.

The Construct of *Cheong*

In participants' narratives, the construct of *cheong* emerged as the most prominent Korean indigenous representation of the psychology of relatedness. The construct was employed by many participants in describing their relational experiences with others, as well as in explaining essential differences among their interpersonal relationships. The presence of a deeply-felt sense of *cheong* tended to be a key indicator of the depth and meaning of a given relationship. The construct was also commonly used in representing the relational dispositions of others.

In addition, the construct of *cheong* was frequently used throughout the interview narratives within the context of comparing and contrasting the perceived

nature and quality of Korean versus American interpersonal relationships. Many participants perceived Americans or American interpersonal relationships to be lacking in *cheong* or as having less *cheong* than did Koreans or Korean interpersonal relationships. American interpersonal relationships were viewed as being too transient, too uninvolved, and too contingent on the calculation of personal gain and loss for a mutually shared sense of *cheong* to evolve and take hold. Although one participant, a graduate female, did describe some of her close female American acquaintances as warm and “full of *cheong*” toward her, Americans, peers and professors alike, were in general seen as too deeply embedded in “individualism” to experience *cheong* and to commit themselves to fostering relationships of *cheong* with others.

Salient aspects of *cheong* as a construct representative of interpersonal relatedness among Koreans were characteristically reflected in the interview narratives. As previously indicated, *cheong* signifies human sentiment that arises from the experience of relationships with others that have been sustained over time. As suggested by S-C Choi and his colleagues (1993), *cheong* acts as the “emotional glue” connecting people with one another--friends, seniors and juniors, students and teachers, and children and parents. This aspect of *cheong* as a binding force may be illustrated by the specific adjectives some participants used in conjunction with this term, including “gluey,” “sticky,” and “tenacious.” As one graduate female explained, “glutinous *cheong*” is “that which exists between people and which is so glutinous that one can’t possibly break up.” In this view,

cheong may act as a relational basis that allows attachments among Koreans to remain stable and to continue across time and space.

Another salient aspect of *cheong* pertains to its integrative nature. As several participants specifically indicated while describing their personal experiences of *cheong* in closest friendships, the development of *cheong* had to do with long-time, frequent associations with the same friend or friends, and also with having gone through “moments when we liked each other and moments when we didn’t like each other,” as one undergraduate male participant put it. These representations are largely consistent with the findings from S-C Choi and his colleagues’ study (1993) showing that living close together, long-term “*woori*” or “we” experience, and sharing both positive and troubling experiences and emotions together were important factors in developing *cheong*. The comment of an undergraduate male in reference to his closest relationships with childhood friends that “we’ve seen everything about one another, both good and bad, and it’s now all purified” seems particularly illuminating. “Purified” used in this context may imply the integration of positive and negative thoughts and feelings toward the same person or persons that has taken hold in long-established close friendships.

This integrative nature of *cheong* may be reflected in the following idiomatic expression, transliterated from Korean language: *mi-un-cheong ko-un-cheong ie dun-da*. *Ko-un* as in *ko-un-cheong* is an adjective meaning sweet or positive and *mi-un* as in *mi-un-cheong* is an adjective meaning negative or distasteful.

Joined together into a single phrase, *mi-un-cheong ko-un-cheong ie dun-da*, refers to the process of developing a feeling of *cheong* toward another through experiencing and integrating over time both positive and negative thoughts and feelings about the same person within the ongoing relational context.

Cheong, thus, represents human sentiment which evolves from both positive and negative interpersonal experiences over time. This integrative nature of *cheong* may be linked to the tenacity or glutinous nature of *cheong* as described earlier. *Cheong*, once established, may accord relationships a sense of durability or even permanency in that it is contingent not on how much one cares for another person at any given moment, but instead on one's relational experience with that person in its entirety.

The integrative nature of *cheong* may also have to do with the feelings of comfortableness and ease explicitly mentioned by several participants in connection with their long-term close friendships. It seemed that within *cheong*-based relationships such as long-established close friendships, interactants could relax in one another's presence, no longer troubled by any sense of close scrutiny derived from the judgmental view of one another. *Cheong* might have helped facilitate the interpersonal atmosphere of nonjudgmental acceptance as it encompasses both positive and negative emotions that are experienced and integrated within relationships that have been sustained over time. *Cheong* seemed to give friends confidence that their personal shortcomings and defects would be accepted as part of who they were, neither diminishing nor endangering their relational ties with one

another. Within such a relational space, friends felt free to show all aspects of themselves and to speak whatever was on their minds. Friends remained ready to “receive whatever the other person is revealing as is.”

A third salient aspect of *cheong* concerns individuals’ willingness to extend themselves to one another. Within *cheong*-based relationships, people remain intimately involved in one another’s lives and remain attentive and responsive to one another’s well-being. In such a relational context, people would be “willing to go through water and fire to help out” one another, or they would “go out of their way to take care of my personal affairs as if they were their own.” It seems that among persons linked through *cheong*, the other’s welfare becomes as important as one’s own.

In this light, *cheong* takes on a meaning beyond mere human sentiment, and becomes a relational disposition toward significant others. *Cheong* tightly bonds people to one another and at the same time powerfully motivates them to exercise care toward one another, which in turn works to strengthen their existing interpersonal ties. Since the *cheong*-based relational link acts to mobilize human capacity to tend to one another, such a relational context allows people to experience themselves over and over again as beings who both care and are cared for by others. In this way, *cheong* serves as a channel or medium through which people affirm and maintain a sense of self as a caring being who actively reaches out to others, as well as a being who deserves and can always count on such care from others. Taking one step further, perhaps it is more accurate to say that you and I

are both sustained and cared for through *cheong*, which encompasses us both, rather than to say that you and I sustain and care for each other out of *cheong*. In other words, it may be the *cheong* ever-present between us, rather than you and I as individual entities, that acts to hold us close to each other in an enduring and caring human connection.

Although acting primarily to bind people together, *cheong* as a collective representation of relatedness among Koreans does not seem to be in fact antithetical to autonomy. Within the context of interpersonal relationships grounded in *cheong*, such as the long-time closest friendships as described by the participants, there were more autonomy-supportive interactions than seemed to be the case within less intimate peer relationships. Long-term friends bound by *cheong* tended to feel freer to express themselves, including their ideas and aspirations, and even their opinions of a confrontational nature. Moreover, such friends often extended emotional and instrumental support for one another's endeavors toward achieving personally meaningful goals. In contrast, however, within the context of peer relationships that were more instrumental than affective, interpersonal interactions tended more toward suppressing rather than opening themselves toward expressions of individuality and self-direction. Thus, situations of conflict tended to be created between personal strivings for relatedness and autonomy needs.

To the extent that *cheong* serves as emotional connection and support, unconditional and enduring, individual needs and expressions of autonomy might derive a greater level of support from relationships that are grounded in *cheong*

than from those that are not, at least within the context of peer relationships. In this regard, *cheong*-based Korean friendships may have greater potential to become relationships of “autonomous interdependence” within which emotional closeness, interpersonal attunement, and mutual support are complementary to individuals’ movements toward autonomy (Ryan, 1991, p. 227).

Implications of the Study

Results from the present study may have several, important theoretical and practical implications. Two important areas of implication have been derived and are identified and discussed below.

Theoretical Implications

The emergent patterns of commonality and variation identified among the participants in this study may suggest the possibility of developing increasingly sophisticated conceptualizations of interpersonal needs and orientations among international students who share the same sociocultural background. Appreciation of both cultural patterns and individual preferences concerning interpersonal relating would seem critical for examining the dynamics and issues underlying relationships between Korean international students and their American and co-national peers. As indicated in this study, differences in conceptions and preferences concerning interpersonal relating seemed to affect participants’ relationships with both Americans and fellow nationals. The difficulties and concerns identified

within participants' representations of co-national peer relations may, in particular, suggest a need for further investigating the nature and extent of problems and challenges involved in negotiating social relations with co-national peers.

Results of the study also point to the importance of distinguishing the evaluative from the normative aspect of individuals' orientations toward their own and host cultures: What one views as culturally normative may not necessarily coincide with what one views as desirable or preferable. As noted previously, such distinction made between individuals' normative and evaluative assessments seemed critical for illuminating both commonalities and differences among individuals who shared the same cultural background. In addition, the issue of how individuals attempt to negotiate the reconciliation between personal evaluations and social norms would seem to call for further exploration. Individuals may be generally accepting of social norms per se, such as those governing hierarchical relationships, although these norms may not necessarily be viewed as desirable. However, in cultures such as Korea, in which social role behaviors are narrowly defined (Chang, 1977), the individuals would seem likely to find themselves in a bind in interpersonal situations involving a wide discrepancy between personal evaluation and social script. In such situations, the individuals would have to find ways to cope with a sense of personal dissonance arising from their perceptions of manifest inconsistency between how they actually feel and how they believe they are supposed to act.

Another important implication is derived from the emergence of personal strivings for relatedness and autonomy among the participants in this study. Such evidence may suggest the importance of recognizing issues and dynamics of negotiating these strivings within interpersonal contexts, either within or across cultures. In so far as yearnings for autonomy and relatedness coexist within individuals across cultures, studies dealing with relational views and behaviors among individuals, either within a particular cultural group or across diverse cultural groups, must go beyond limiting research attention to merely the representation of culturally dominant norms and practices. Research in this area must move toward investigating the dynamics underlying the interaction between cultural forces and individuals' relational dispositions. A dialectic orientation, as advocated by Kagitcibasi (1994), rather than simply a static, dichotomous representation of cultures and individuals, should prove to be a more useful means of delineating the negotiation between strivings for relatedness and autonomy as these are enacted within both cultural and individual dimensions. Such a dialectic orientation will likely be more beneficial for identifying the relational concerns and themes that are culture-specific, as well as those that are universal across cultures.

Educational and Clinical Implications

Sojourner research findings have suggested a strong positive association among international students' academic, personal, and social adjustment (Grisbacher, 1991; Sharma, 1973). The present study may have indicated some

areas in which those working with Korean international students in both academic and clinical settings can assist these sojourners in adjusting to a foreign environment and in optimally utilizing their time of study abroad. Insights gained from the study's identified group of Korean international students may suggest the following practical implications.

First, in academic settings, considering the salience of the participants' expressed need for faculty support, it seems critical that faculty members remain sensitive and responsive to such a need, while striving to modify, when appropriate, their interpersonal behaviors according to individual students' expectations and preferences. Relational behaviors commonly observed among American faculty, including their rather rigid adherence to following designated office hours and tendency to maintain a clear demarcation between students' academic and personal concerns, were experienced by many students in the present study as both impersonal and distancing in effect. As evidenced in the interview narratives, such relational behavior often acted to deter development of the warm, personalized relationships with faculty members many students yearned for. Students' initial encounters with faculty members would seem particularly critical in setting the terms for subsequent interactions and in influencing student expectations for the faculty members as potential sources of support. As indicated by several participants in the present study, the act of seeking out faculty members in and of itself often meant going against enculturated notions about professors as authority figures who were difficult to relate to. Reservations in approaching faculty

members tended to be intensified by additional concerns arising from the cross-cultural communication situation. Frustrating and discouraging initial encounters with faculty members may serve to reinforce the reserved disposition toward faculty members and to adversely affect students' help-seeking motivation and behavior.

Moreover, an appreciation of the above factors may lead faculty members to take particular care in facilitating effective interactions with Korean international students. For creating student-faculty relationships in which students feel connected and supported, paying attention to the process and context of student-faculty interactions may be as important as specific, concrete tasks accomplished through individual meetings. In view of the strong general tendency among Koreans toward basing interactions with others on the personal level (Yum, 1991), as corroborated by the longing for warm, supportive contacts with faculty members expressed by participants in this study, faculty members' efforts to convey warmth and personalized interest in students would seem conducive to promoting positive interactions. As noted by several participants, gestures as simple as a smile or remembering the student's name seemed to help relieve student apprehension and anxiety concerning interactions with faculty members. Engaging in conversations of a personal nature prior to dealing with specific tasks at hand, as opposed to confining consultation strictly to class-related matters, might also help the students feel more welcomed and comfortable. It appears that greeting students with such statements as, "What can I do for you?" or "What can I help

you with?," are likely to impress the students as somewhat too impersonal and "business-like," unless accompanied by more personalized inquiries or responses indicating concerned interest in students' personal well-being. The importance of rapport was emphasized by Cadieux and Wehrly (1986) who maintained, "one of the first dimensions to consider in advising international students is developing rapport" (p. 54).

In acting as liaisons within the academic context, by both revealing and working to bridge the gap between Korean international students' interpersonal expectations and American faculty members' relational orientations and behaviors, international student services personnel can play a particularly important role. Personnel could gather information concerning specific faculty behaviors and attitudes which the students find helpful and encouraging, as well as those viewed as unhelpful and discouraging. This information could then be shared with the academic staff, as for example in the form of a handbook for working with international students. International student services personnel could also facilitate discussion groups or experiential workshops in which groups of international students and groups of faculty members could gather together and get to know more about one another in terms of their expectations and conceptions of student-faculty relationships and interactions.

In discussing student-faculty relationships on U.S. college campuses, the contemporary sociopolitical milieu of the larger society cannot be ignored in terms of its impact on such relationships. Individual faculty members' willingness to

respond affirmatively to Korean international students' needs for more personalized relationships may be counteracted by the sociopolitical milieu in which personalized student-faculty relationships may be increasingly viewed with suspicion. This general sociopolitical atmosphere may act to further tighten the boundaries drawn between "professional" and "personal" dimensions in student-faculty interactions. Hopefully, U.S. educational institutions hosting international students will be able to address such issues at the institutional level so that individual faculty members can be made to feel supported in building individual relationships with international students who come into contact with them.

As with student-faculty relationships within the academic setting, attempts to establish rapport by exhibiting warmth and offering empathic and supportive responses would also seem essential in creating effective relationships in the clinical setting (E. Lee, 1982). In the process of addressing students' personal concerns and problems and exploring ways to resolve the problems, counselors should address potentially contributing factors on both the cultural and the personal levels. For instance, if relations with co-national peers are the presenting problem, an appreciation of both the culturally-normative social practices within the co-national student community and the individual student's uniquely personal needs and relational dispositions will likely be necessary. Either ignoring the cultural forces operating within the social system in which the student is functioning or losing sight of the student as a unique individual by overemphasizing the framework of the student's home culture will lead to diminished counseling

effectiveness. As pointed out by Dillard and Chisolm (1983), in order for counseling work with international students to be successful, counseling goals and strategies must be both culturally and personally relevant.

Lack of familiarity with Korean international students' native culture should not discourage counselors from working with this population. Cultural background information relevant to presenting problems may be acquired by engaging Korean students as informants concerning their own culture within the counseling context. In addition to yielding needed information, the counselors' expressed interest in and openness to the students' cultural background, demonstrated in the process of acquiring information, may also help in building rapport with the students through promotion of mutual understanding.

Another implication for counseling personnel pertains to the underutilization of counseling services among international students reported in the literature (Lomak, 1984, as cited in Pedersen, 1991; Sue, 1973). Lack of familiarity with counseling as a helping resource on the part of international students, together with their anticipation of difficulty in expressing the subtleties of personal experiences in a foreign language, might partly account for the reported underutilization of counseling services. This may be especially true for international students from countries such as Korea, in which counseling remains for the most part merely an abstract concept and English is not spoken as part of everyday conversation. To help facilitate better use of counseling services, counseling personnel should be encouraged to work in collaboration with international student services personnel

on the interdepartmental level toward developing and providing diverse counseling services and psychoeducational programs that are responsive to international student needs and situations. In addition, as recommended by Yuen and Tinsley (1981), detailed information concerning the counseling purpose, facilities, personnel, and process should be included as part of the orientation for all newly arrived international students.

Although the current study involved a group of international students from Korea at a single institution, the results of the study may extend to other nationalities whose relational orientations may be similar to those of the study participants, including Chinese and Japanese international students.

Limitations of the Study

Several factors serve to limit this study. First, my views regarding interpersonal relationships, influenced by my gender, nationality, knowledge, and lived experiences in both Korean and American cultures, cannot be ignored in understanding the generation, analysis, and presentation of the data. For example, my own conceptions and experiences of Korean and American cultural patterns of interpersonal relationships might have influenced the ways in which during the interviews I listened for and responded to participants' cross-cultural views concerning relationships. My assumptions concerning the dynamics of interpersonal relating and the two basic human yearnings of relatedness and autonomy also had a bearing on the construction of overriding relational themes and issues. The

interview data could be interpreted differently given an alternative set of assumptions. Further, my experience as a Korean international student similarly influenced my conceptualization and understanding of fellow national students' experiences with American peers and professors. Finally, my gender might have affected what female participants revealed within the interview context concerning their experiences as Korean women both at home and abroad.

Another limitation of this study is based on the single interview format used for the data collection. The costs of not having conducted follow-up interviews with the participants became apparent in the analysis of the data. Despite considerable effort taken to probe as thoroughly as I was able participants' personal meanings and their reasoning during the interview process, reviewing the interview transcripts evidenced areas requiring clarification or further exploration.

A third limitation of this study concerns the presentation of the data. The study sample included participants with varying lengths of stay in the United States. However, in representing participants' views of Korean and American people and cultures, the impact of the length of stay on such views was not fully addressed. Although efforts were made to incorporate into the description of the data any changes in participants' perceptions and attitudes over time, not treating the time variable in a more explicit and systematic fashion may have resulted in the underrepresentation of its influence on participants' views and orientations toward Korean and American interpersonal relationships.

Finally, the process of translating the participants' own words into a foreign language might have limited the accuracy of the description of personal and collective representations of interpersonal reality among the participants. As noted by Befu (1989), "the accuracy of ethnographic reporting is questionable in so far as the reporting occurs in different linguistic/cultural contexts" (p. 336), since the data presentation must be adjusted in order to render cultural concepts understandable to a foreign audience. Moreover, the translation process is bound to insufficiently capture the full panoply of nuances and subtleties--as well as idiosyncratic usage of words, phrases, and sentences--as were richly evident within individual participants' accounts in the original language.

Suggestions for Future Research

In view of the above mentioned limitations associated with one-time interview format involving participants with varying lengths of stay in the United States, future research could perhaps effectively employ a longitudinal design, preferably following the sojourn experiences of a sample of newly arrived international students. The pattern of stability and change within the individuals' interpersonal experiences and views that occur across time, as these emerge from the data, could add important dimensions of insight and meaning to the points of analysis developed in the present study. The patterns of commonality and variation among the individuals that emerge during their sojourn could also be explored in greater depth.

Additionally, students who returned home upon completion of studies in the United States could be interviewed. Returnees' adjustment to back home interpersonal situations could be studied. The extent to which the prolonged periods of separation between the returnees and their significant others, including closest friends, affected long-established relationships might be focused upon. The carry over impact that returnees' interpersonal experiences and learnings acquired during their sojourns in the United States have for returnees' views of themselves and their relationships with others, once back in Korea, might also be examined.

International students from other Far Eastern countries, such as China and Japan, could additionally be interviewed for comparison with the students of the present study. Similarities and differences among these varying national groups in terms of their orientations toward relationships and their social functioning while in the United States could prove interesting avenues of research. Other national groups' attempts to negotiate autonomy and relatedness within the contexts of peer relations could be identified for comparison and contrast. Patterns of individual variation evident among participants in the present study could also be examined in terms of how such variation emerges within the experience of other national groups.

In conjunction with the above investigations of correspondent international groups, American students who have experienced involvement with Korean international students in personal relationships, past or current, could be interviewed. American students' interpretations of their experiences with Korean peers should

prove enlightening. Emergent themes and issues of American-Korean peer relations as represented from American points of view would likely provide an invaluable cross-cultural perspective. The extent to which interpersonal themes and issues identified by Americans overlapped with or diverged from those identified by Korean students in this study could substantiate present findings or suggest channels for further inquiry. Patterns of commonality and variation among individual American students in terms of the normative and the evaluative aspects of their cultural orientations might be examined. Investigation of American students' increased awareness of their own culture as well as the culture of their Korean peers, as possibly derived from interpersonal encounters with Korean peers, could prove an additionally revealing direction of inquiry.

Reflections

My abiding interest in conceptions of self and conceptions of self-other relating led me to inquire into the experiences and views of relationships held among Korean international students. What I did not quite realize at the time I chose this topic was that the phenomena I set out to understand would have important implications for preparing myself for re-entry into my home culture. Just as many of the participants in the present study came to experience participating in the interviews as a valuable opportunity for them to reflect on and sort out their sojourn experiences in the United States, I, too, came to experience interviewing my fellow country men and women as an opportunity to look back on

my own experience in another culture. My fellow nationals' experiences as represented in their interview narratives became an important frame of reference with which I could compare my own experience.

Furthermore, in the process of listening to, transcribing, translating, and trying to construct the meanings of the stories told by participants, I could not help but re-encounter bits of my own relational experiences mirrored in their narratives. Through vicarious experience of participants' encounters with friends and teachers back home, I came to recognize parts of myself and to "re-collect" myself--my earlier self as a friend, student, and teacher back home. I came to learn a great deal about the expectations, conceptions, and ideal visions of interpersonal relationships held among my fellow nationals. The insights that I have gained into my co-nationals' psychology of relatedness would prove invaluable, if for no further reason than that they represent the very people with whom I am going to live and work. In terms of psychologically preparing myself to return home, it seems unlikely I could have picked a more suitable research topic.

Having lived and worked in two cultures that are vastly different from one another, I have had the privilege of witnessing both strengths and limitations inherent in the culture of relatedness and in the culture of separateness. The differences between Korean and American culture and people, as seen through the eyes of my fellow nationals who participated in my study, have further refined my thinking of cultural variation in terms of interpersonal relating. In addition to cultural-level differences, the understandings that I have derived from my research

have served to deepen my appreciation of variations among individuals from the same culture in terms of their views and preferences concerning interpersonal relating.

As much as I have learned from the present study, I have come to this point with as many questions as I had when I began. I recognize that the present study represents only a beginning step toward learning about and articulating the psychology of relatedness within both cultural and individual dimensions. My present hope is that I will be able to continue my work in this area, though perhaps in somewhat different form and context.

Appendix A
Verification Letter to Participants

Dear Participant:

Thank you for your willingness to participate in my dissertation research. The subject of my dissertation is an analysis of Korean international students' interpersonal experiences with Americans. The purpose of my study is to understand Korean international students' experiences and views concerning their relationships with American friends, peers, and professors through the use of individual interviews.

I hope that my study will enhance understanding of Korean international students' personal views of their interpersonal experiences with Americans, and also will contribute to the improvement of the educational environment for international students at (the name of the university). It is also my hope that participating in the interview will provide an opportunity for you to reflect on your experiences with Americans.

The following indicate our meeting time and place for the interview, as agreed upon over the telephone:

(date, day, time); (place)

If you have any questions or need to change our meeting time, please contact me at (my telephone number).

Thank you again for your willingness to participate in my study.

Jinsook Kim, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University

Verification Letter to Participants
(Korean Version)

(응답자의 이름)씨 안녕하세요.

저의 박사학위 청구 논문을 위한 연구에 기꺼이 참여해주셔서 감사합니다. 저의 연구의 주제는 한국유학생들의 미국인들과의 대인관계에 대한 체험이며, 연구 목적은 한국 유학생들과의 인터뷰를 통해 미국인 친구와 동료 및 미국인 교수님들의 대인관계에 대한 한국 유학생들의 체험과 견해를 이해하고자 하는데 있습니다.

저의 이 연구 결과가 미국인들과의 대인관계에 대해 한국 유학생들이 개인적으로 생각하고 느끼는 바에 대한 이해를 높이고, 또한 웨스턴 미시간 대학교에 재학 중인 한국 유학생들의 교육환경을 개선하는 데에도 기여하기를 바라는 바입니다. 그리고 (응답자) 개인적으로도 아무쪼록 저의 연구를 위한 인터뷰가 (응답자)가 지금까지의 미국인과의 체험을 돌아켜보고 생각을 정리하는 계기가 되었으면 합니다.

우리가 지난 번 대화를 통해 약속한 인터뷰 시간과 장소는 다음과 같습니다: (달, 날짜, 요일, 시각, 장소). (응답자의 이름)께서 혹시 의문사항이 있거나 약속 시간을 변경해야 할 경우에는 다음 전화번호로 저에게 연락해 주십시오: (연구자 전화번호). 제 연구에 협조해주셔서 다시 한번 감사드립니다.

김 진숙 (석사)

웨스턴 미시간 대학교 상담자 교육 및 상담심리학과 박사 과정 수료

(Doctoral Candidate)

Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Western Michigan University)

Appendix B
Demographic Information Form

(This page was inadvertently left blank by the author.)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

Please check or write in the spaces provided corresponding to your best answer.

1. Sex: ____ Male ____ Female
2. Your age on your last birthday: ____ years
3. Marital Status: ____ Single ____ Married
4. Level of Study: ____ Undergraduate
 ____ Graduate
 ____ Other (Please specify): _____
5. Field of Study: (Please write here both in Korean and in English)
 (in Korean) _____
 (in English) _____
6. How long have you been in the United States? Please enter the **total months** of stay. ____ months
7. How long have you been at (the name of the current university)? Please enter the **total months**.
 For (the English language program) (if you attended): ____ months
 For your degree program: ____ months
8. If you attended one or more other North American colleges or universities before coming to (your current university), please provide the **total months** in attendance at the institution(s): ____ month(s) (from 19__ __ to 19__ __)
9. Education:
 - (1) High School: graduation year: 19__
 - (2) If you finished your undergraduate and/or graduate degree program either in Korea or in the United States, please provide the graduation year for each institution: 19__
 Your academic major in Korea: _____
 - (3) If you transferred from a Korean college/university to a U.S. college/university, please indicate the length of your stay in the Korean college/university prior to your transfer: from 19__ to 19__

10. Religion:

- ☐ Protestant (Please indicate the denomination here) _____
☐ Buddhist
☐ Catholic
☐ No Religion
☐ Other (Please specify): _____

If you have changed your religions since you came to the U.S., please indicate here: Your religion when in Korea _____ Your current religion _____

11. If you attend church, is your church: ☐ Korean? ☐ American?

12. What foreign countries besides the U.S. have you visited and/or lived in?

Name of the country: _____ the total months of stay in the country: ____
 Name of the country: _____ the total months of stay in the country: ____
 Name of the country: _____ the total months of stay in the country: ____

13. Please evaluate your family status in Korea particularly from the viewpoint of economic class.

- ☐ Lower
☐ Lower middle
☐ Middle
☐ Upper middle
☐ Upper

14. What are the primary and secondary sources of your financial support now?
Please circle one number for each source.

	Primary	Secondary
Parents or relatives	1	1
Scholarship	2	2
University assistantship	3	3
Savings	4	4
Employment on campus	5	5
Employment off campus	6	6
Other sources (please specify): _____		

15. Living Arrangement:

- ☐ Residence hall
☐ On-campus housing
☐ Off-campus housing
☐ Other (Please specify): _____

I am currently living:

- ☐ Alone
☐ With spouse (and children)
☐ With a single American room/house mate
☐ With more than one American room/house mates
☐ With a single Korean room/house mate
☐ With more than one Korean room/house mates
☐ Other (Please specify): _____

16. Current Employment:

- ☐ Not employed
☐ Employed (Please specify your job responsibilities) _____

17. Please circle one number to show how good your English is in the following skills.

	very poor		neither poor nor good			very good	
(1) Understanding spoken English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(2) Reading (textbooks, journals, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(3) Writing papers or a thesis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(4) Speaking English	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. How likely is it that you might remain permanently in the United States?

- ☐ Definitely not
☐ Very unlikely
☐ Somewhat unlikely
☐ Undecided
☐ Somewhat likely
☐ Very likely
☐ Definitely will

Demographic Information Form (Korean Version)

인적 사항 설문지

아래의 문항들을 읽고 가장 적합하다고 생각하는 곳에 V 표를 하거나 주어진 자리에
응답을 기입해 주세요.

1. 성별: ___ 남 ___ 여

2. 나이: 만 ___ 세

3. 결혼여부: ___ 미혼 ___ 기혼

4. 학업과정수준:

___ 학부과정

___ 대학원과정

___ 기타 (구체적으로): _____

5. 전공과목: (한글명) _____
(영어명): _____

6. 현재까지 미국에 체류한 기간: 총 ___ 개월 (19___ 년 ___ 월 부터)

7. 현재까지 WMU에 재학한 기간: 총 ___ 개월 (19___ 년 ___ 월 부터)

(CELCIS 과정을 이수했을 경우) 이수한 CELCIS 과정기간: 총 ___ 개월

현재까지 이수한 전공과정 기간 (현재와 이전의 전공 모두 합쳐): 총 ___ 개월

8. WMU에 오기 전 다른 미국대학(들)에 다녔을 경우:

다른 대학(들)에 재학한 기간: 총 ___ 개월

(19___ 년 ___ 월 부터 19___ 년 ___ 월 까지)

9. 학력:

고등학교 졸업연도: 19___ 년

한국이나 미국에서 대학/대학원을 졸업했을 경우: 졸업연도: 19___ 년

한국대학에서의 전공: _____

한국대학에서 미국대학으로 편입했을 경우:

한국대학 재학기간: 19___ 부터 19___ 까지

- ☐ 개신교 (구체적인 종파는: _____)
☐ 불교
☐ 카톨릭
☐ 무교
☐ 기타 (구체적으로): 나의 종교는 _____

미국에 온 이래로 종교를 바꾸었다면, 아래 사항에 응답해주시요.

한국에서의 종교는: _____ 현재의 종교는: _____

11. (여기 미국에서 교회에 다닐 경우): 다니는 교회는: ☐ 한국교회? ☐ 미국교회?

12. 미국이외에 방문해보았거나 거주해본 다른 외국이 있다면?

국가이름: _____ 이 나라에 체류한 기간: 총 _____ 개월

국가이름: _____ 이 나라에 체류한 기간: 총 _____ 개월

국가이름: _____ 이 나라에 체류한 기간: 총 _____ 개월

13. 부모님의 소득/재산수준은:

- ☐ 하류층
☐ 중하류층
☐ 중류층
☐ 중상류층
☐ 상류층

14. 아래에 나열된 항목중 학비 및 생활비의 출처는? 가장 주된 출처와 부차적 출처 각각 한 항목씩만 선택해 해당 숫자에 0 표 해주십시오.

	주된 출처	부차적 출처
부모나 다른 친족	1	1
장학금	2	2
대학원 조교	3	3
본인 자신의 저축예금	4	4
학교안이나 밖에서의 시간당 근무	5	5
기타 (구체적으로): _____		

15. 주거지 및 주거 상황:

나의 주거지:

- ☐ 기숙사
☐ 학교 아파트
☐ 일반 아파트나 다른 주택
☐ 기타 (구체적으로): _____

현재 나와 함께 거주하는 사람(들)은:

- ☐ 룸메이트 없이 혼자 생활함
☐ 배우자 (및 자녀)
☐ 1 명의 미국인 룸메이트
☐ 2 명 이상의 미국인 룸메이트
☐ 1 명의 한국인 룸메이트
☐ 2 명 이상의 한국인 룸메이트
☐ 기타 (구체적으로): _____

16. 현재 취업 상황:

- ☐ 다른 직업이 없고 학업에만 전력함
☐ 학업이외에 다른 직업에도 종사함
 (구체적으로 근무처에서 하는 일은?: _____)

17. 다음에 열거된 4 가지의 영어 구사 능력중 본인이 평가하기에 가장 적당하다고 생각되는 수준에 해당되는 번호를 한 개씩만 골라 0 표 해주십시오.

	아주 부족함		보통 수준			아주 우수함	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(1) 영어를 듣고 이해	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(2) 교재와 다른 서적등을 읽고 이해	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(3) 리포트나 논문쓰기	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(4) 영어구어로 의사표현하기	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. 미국에 영구적으로 체류하게 될 가능성은?

영구 체류 가능성이:

- ☐ 전혀 없음
☐ 거의 확실하게 없음
☐ 아마 없을 것임
☐ 아직 미정임
☐ 다소 있음
☐ 다분히 있음
☐ 확실하게 있음

Appendix C

Interview Guides: Original and Revised Guide

KOREAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' RELATIONSHIPS WITH AMERICANS

Thank you for taking time for this interview today. I am trying to understand ideas and expectations concerning friendship and student-faculty relationship among Korean international students studying in the United States. More specifically, I wish to understand how Korean students think and feel about their interpersonal experiences with Americans. I will be asking you to help me in reaching this understanding by sharing your experiences and thoughts with regard to the questions I will be asking you. Remember there are no right or wrong answers for these questions. I would simply like you to think about the questions and then share your ideas with me.

SECTION A: CONCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS CONCERNING FRIENDSHIP AND STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER KOREANS

To begin with, I'd like to discuss your experiences and ideas concerning friendships with other Koreans.

Friends:

- A-1. Could you describe your best friend? What makes that person the best friend for you?
- A-2. Could you describe the worst friend you've ever had? What makes that person the worst friend?
- A-3. What are some of the qualities or characteristics of a good friend for you?
- A-4. What does real friendship mean to you? What are some of the qualities of such friendship for you?

Faculty:

Next, I'd like you to think of your experiences and ideas concerning student-teacher relationship with Korean teachers.

- A-5. Could you describe your best teacher? What makes that person the best teacher for you?
- A-6. Could you describe the worst teacher you've ever had? What makes that person the worst teacher?
- A-7. What are some of the qualities or characteristics of a good teacher for you?
- A-8. What does good student-teacher relationship mean to you? What qualities would be most important for you to have in such a relationship?

SECTION B: RELATIONAL EXPERIENCES WITH AMERICAN FRIENDS AND FACULTY

So far we've talked about your experiences and ideas concerning friendship and student-faculty relationship in the context of Koreans. Next I'd like you to turn your attention to the American peers, acquaintances, and faculty with whom you have come into contact. Please concentrate on the relationships you have actually had with them.

American Friends:

B-1. Among your American peers or acquaintances, do you count any as your friends?

[If the response is positive]:

- a. Could you describe your friendship with these American friends?
- b. How would you compare your friendship with Americans versus Koreans?
- c. Based on your personal experiences with Americans, what ideas and expectations have you come to have concerning your friendship with Americans?

[If the response is negative]:

- a. What do you see as preventing such friendships?
- b. Based on your personal experiences with Americans, what ideas and expectations have you come to have concerning your friendship with Americans?

American Faculty:

B-2. Could you describe your relationship with American faculty?

(Probe Questions)

- a. How would you compare your relationship with American faculty versus Korean faculty?
- b. Based on your personal experiences with American faculty, what ideas and expectations have you come to have concerning your interpersonal relationships with American faculty?

SECTION C: OVERALL PERSPECTIVES ON CROSS-CULTURAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN KOREANS AND AMERICANS

Now that we've talked about your experiences with American friends (or peers) and faculty, I'd like to focus on what you have learned from those experiences.

- C-1. Reflecting on your personal experiences with Americans, how would you compare Americans' approaches to interpersonal relationships and Koreans' approaches?
- C-2. Can you identify any specific difficulties or challenges in developing meaningful relationships with Americans?

SECTION D: CONCLUSION

Before closing the interview, I have just a few final questions.

- D-1. Is there anything else you think I should know about your interpersonal experiences with American friends, faculty, and other Americans? Are there any other questions that I should have asked you that would have helped me better understand your experiences with Americans?
- D-2. What has this interview been like for you? Are there any comments you'd like to make concerning the questions, the overall process, or any other aspect of the interview?

Thank you very much for your time and sharing your thoughts and experience with me.

Original Interview Guide (Korean Version)

한국 유학생들의 미국인과의 대인관계

오늘 이렇게 인터뷰를 위해 시간을 내어 주셔서 감사합니다. 이 인터뷰의 목적은 미국에 재학중인 한국 유학생들이 교우관계와 사제관계에 대해 어떠한 생각과 기대를 가지고 있는가를 연구하는 데 있습니다. 좀 더 구체적으로 말씀드리면, 한국학생들이 미국인과의 대인관계에 대해 어떻게 생각하고 느끼는가를 알고자하는 것이 그 주된 목적입니다. 앞으로 제가 드릴 질문에 대해 개인적인 경험과 생각을 나누어 주시면, 이 주제에 관한 저의 이해를 돕는 데 크게 도움이 되겠습니다. 제가 준비한 질문에는 맞거나 틀린 답이 따로 없으니, 질문을 들으시고 개인적으로 생각하시는 바를 표현해 주시면 됩니다.

제 1 부: 한국인들과의 교우관계 및 사제관계에 대한 개념과 기대

먼저 다른 한국인들과의 교우관계에 대한 체험과 생각하시는 바에 대해 의논하고자 합니다.

교우관계:

1-1. 한국에 있거나 여기 미국에 있는 한국인 친구들중에서 가장 친한 친구에 대해 말씀해 주시겠어요? 어떤 까닭으로 그 친구가 가장 친한 친구가 되었는지요?

1-2. 지금까지 친구로 사귀어 본 한국사람들 중에서 가장 거리감이 느껴진 친구는? 어떤 까닭으로 그 친구에게 가장 거리감이 느껴졌나요?

1-3. (응답자의 이름)가 생각할 때 좋은 친구라면 어떤 자질이나 품성을 지닌 사람인가요? (응답자의 이름)가 친구에게서 바라는 바는 무엇인지요?

1-4. (응답자의 이름)는 어떤 관계가 참된/진실한 우정이라고 생각하시는지요? (응답자의 이름)가 진실한 친구관계에서 추구하는 것은 무엇인지요?

다음 질문들은 (응답자의 이름)의 한국인 선생님/교수님들과의 개인적인 관계에 대한 개인적인 체험과 느끼신 바에 대한 것입니다.

사제관계:

1-5. 지금까지 알게 된 한국인 선생님/교수님들 중에서 가장 좋았던 분에 대해 말씀해주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자의 이름)에게 그분이 가장 좋았던가요?

1-6. 지금까지 알게 된 한국인 선생님/교수님들 중에서 가장 싫어했던 분에 대해 말씀해주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자의 이름)에게 그분이 가장 싫었던가요?

1-7. (응답자의 이름)가 생각할 때 좋은 선생님이라면 어떠한 자질이나 품성을 지닌 분인가요? (응답자의 이름)가 선생님/교수님께 기대하는 바는 어떤 것인지요?

1-8. (응답자의 이름)는 어떤 관계가 좋은 사제관계라고 생각합니까? (응답자의 이름)가 사제관계에서 기대하는 바는 어떤 것인지요?

제 2 부: 미국인 교우와 교수와의 대인관계

지금까지 (응답자의 이름)의 한국인과의 친구관계 및 사제관계에 대해 얘기해보았습니다. 이제 대화의 주제를 바꾸어, (응답자의 이름)의 미국인 친구, 동료, 그리고 교수님들과의 대인관계에 대해 살펴보려고 합니다. 개인적으로 직접 체험해보신 바에 초점을 두어 주시기 바랍니다.

미국인 친구:

2-1. 미국인 동료나 다른 아는 미국 사람들 중에서 친구사이로 친하게 지내는 사람들이 있습니까?

[만일 위의 질문에 대한 반응이 긍정적이면]

2-1-금-1. (응답자의 이름)의 미국 친구들과의 관계에 대해 말씀해주시겠습니까?

2-1-금-2. 미국 친구들과의 친구관계와 한국 친구들과의 친구관계를 비교하자면?

2-1-금-3. 그동안 체험한 미국인들과의 대인관계를 통해, 미국인들과의 친구관계에 대해 어떤 생각과 기대를 갖게 되셨는지요?

[만일 위의 질문에 대한 반응이 부정적이면]

2-1-부-1. 미국사람들 중 친구사이로 친하게 지낼만한 사람이 없는 것에 대해 어떻게 생각하시는지요?

2-1-부-2. 그동안 체험한 미국인들과의 대인관계를 통해, 미국인들과의 친구관계에 대해 어떤 생각과 기대를 갖게 되셨는지요?

미국인 교수:

2-2. (응답자의 이름)의 미국인 교수님들과의 관계에 대해 말씀해주시겠어요?
(보조 질문)

2-2-1. 지금까지 알게 된 미국교수님들 중에서 가장 좋았던 분에 대해 말씀해 주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자의 이름)에게 그분이 가장 좋았던가요?

2-2-2. 지금까지 알게 된 미국교수님들 중에서 가장 싫어했던 분에 대해 말씀해 주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자의 이름)에게 그분이 가장 싫었던가요?

2-3. 미국 교수님들과의 관계와 한국 교수님들과의 관계를 비교하자면?

2-4. 그동안의 미국 교수님들과의 관계를 통해, 미국 교수님들과의 사제관계에 대해 어떤 생각과 기대를 갖게 되셨는지요?

제 3 부: 한국인과 미국인사이의 대인관계에 대한 한국유학생들의 견해와 관점

지금까지 미국인 친구/동료와 교수님들과의 대인관계에 대해 의논해 보았는데, 이제 대화의 초점을 바꾸어, 그동안의 체험을 통해 (응답자의 이름)께서 개인적으로 깨닫고 배우신 바에 대해 얘기해 보고자 합니다.

3-1. (응답자의 이름)께서 체험하신 미국사람들과의 대인관계를 바탕으로 해서 미국사람들의 대인관계방식과 한국사람들의 대인관계방식을 서로 비교해서 볼 때, 그 공통점과 차이점이 무엇이라고 생각하시는지요?

3-2. 미국사람들과 좋은 인간관계를 맺는 데 어려운 점이 있다면 구체적으로 무엇인지요?

3-3. 미국사람들과의 대인관계를 통해 뭔가 개인적으로 유익하고 긍정적인 것을 얻은 것이 있다면 구체적으로 무엇인지요?

제 4 부: 결론

인터뷰를 마치고 전, 결론삼아 다음 두가지 질문을 더 드리겠습니다.

4-1. 혹시 (응답자의 이름)의 미국인 친구, 교수, 그리고 다른 미국인들과의 대인관계에 대해 제가 추가적으로 알아야 할 점이 있다면 어떤 것인지요? 제가 (응답자의 이름)의 미국사람들과의 대인관계를 이해하는 데 도움이 될 만한 추가 질문들이 있다면 어떤 것 인지요?

4-2. 이 인터뷰에 응하시고 난 소감이 어떠신지요? 인터뷰의 질문내용, 인터뷰 절차, 혹은 다른 면에 있어서 어떻게 생각하시는지요?

인터뷰를 위해 이렇게 시간을 내어 주시고, 또 저와 함께 개인적인 경험과 생각을 나누어 주셔서 대단히 감사합니다.

(Revised Interview Guide)

KOREAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' RELATIONSHIPS WITH AMERICANS

Thank you for taking time for this interview today. I am trying to understand ideas and expectations concerning friendship and student-faculty relationship among Korean international students studying in the United States. More specifically, I wish to understand how Korean students think and feel about their interpersonal experiences with Americans. I will be asking you to help me in reaching this understanding by sharing your experiences and thoughts with regard to the questions I will be asking you. Remember there are no right or wrong answers for these questions. I would simply like you to think about the questions and then share your ideas with me.

PART 1: CONCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS CONCERNING FRIENDSHIP AND STUDENT-FACULTY RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER KOREANS

To begin, I'd like to discuss your experiences and ideas concerning friendships with other Koreans.

Friendship:

1-1. Could you describe your closest friend, either back home or here in the United States? When did you first meet that friend? Please describe how you came to develop friendship with that person. What made that person the closest friend for you?

1-2. Among Korean peers you have become acquainted with, has there been anyone in particular with whom you could not develop friendship because there was a sense of distance or uneasiness? When and where did you first meet that person? What made you feel distant from or uncomfortable with that person?

1-3. What is your image of an ideal friend? On the basis of your personal experience, what would be important for fostering and maintaining a good friendship?

Next, I'd like to ask you about your experiences and ideas concerning teachers/professors you met in Korea.

Student-Faculty Relationship:

1-4. Please identify and describe your favorite teacher/professor among the teachers/professors you have met in Korea. What made that person the most favored teacher/professor for you?

1-5. Please identify and describe the teacher/professor you felt most distant from or disliked the most among the teachers/professors you have met in Korea. What made you feel that way toward that person?

1-6. What is your image of an ideal professor? What are some of the expectations you as an individual student hold for a professor?

PART 2: INTERPERSONAL EXPERIENCES WITH AMERICAN FRIENDS AND FACULTY

So far we've talked about your experiences and ideas concerning Korean friends and faculty. Next I'd like to change the focus of our discussion in order to discuss your experiences and views concerning American friends, peers, and professors.

American Friends:

2-1. Is there anyone among your American peers or acquaintances with whom you closely associated in the past as a friend or are currently closely associating with as a friend?

***** [If the response is Positive]:

2-1-P-1. Could you describe your friendships with these American friends?

2-1-P-2. In becoming acquainted with these American friends, what are some of the things that you have experienced and felt? If you noticed any change in terms of the ideas, expectations, and attitudes that you had had before becoming acquainted with any American friends, please describe them as specifically as possible.

2-1-P-3. If there have been certain aspects that felt awkward or difficult to you in developing friendships with Americans, please describe these also as specifically as possible.

2-1-P-4. How would you compare and contrast Americans and Koreans in terms of their attitudes toward friends? If there have been any particular situations in which you came to notice such differences in attitudes, please describe them as specifically as possible.

***** [If the response is Negative]:

2-1-N-1. What do you see as preventing such friendships?

(Probe Questions)

a. Did you have any intention to make American friends when you first came to the United States?

b. If there have been certain aspects that felt awkward or difficult to you in developing friendships with Americans, please describe them as specifically as possible.

c. Do you presently have any intention for making friends with Americans?

2-1-N-2. From your personal experiences with Americans or what you have heard from others, how would you compare and contrast Americans and Koreans in terms of their attitudes toward friends? If there have been any particular situations in which you came to notice such differences in attitudes, please describe them as specifically as possible.

The following questions concern your experiences and views concerning American professors.

American Faculty:

2-2. Please identify and describe your favorite professor among the American professors you have come to meet. What made the professor your favorite?

2-3. Please identify and describe the professor you felt most distant from or disliked the most among the American professors you have come to meet. What made you feel that way toward the professor?

2-4. If there have been any aspects that felt difficult or awkward to you in relating to American professors, please describe these also as fully as possible.

2-5. From your personal experiences or what you have heard from others, how would you compare and contrast American and Korean professors in terms of the ways they relate to students? Do you perceive any positive or negative aspects concerning their attitudes?

2-6. What would you wish American professors to do for you as an international student? Please describe what you mean as specifically as possible.

PART 3: OVERALL PERSPECTIVES ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN KOREANS AND AMERICANS IN TERMS OF CONCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES

Now that we've talked about your experiences with American friends/peers and faculty, I'd like to focus on what you have learned from your experiences in the United States. I'd like you to reflect on what you have come to discern about Americans' views and attitudes concerning interpersonal relationships. Please feel free to take some time before responding, as you may find the following questions somewhat abstract.

3-1. Reflecting on your personal experiences with Americans, how would you compare and contrast Americans and Koreans in terms of their ideas and attitudes toward interpersonal relationships? Any specific positive or negative aspects?

3-2. In evaluating your sojourn experience in the United States, what from your contacts and experiences with Americans would you consider to be a positive influence on you personally or in your interpersonal relationships? Conversely, has there been any negative influence?

PART 4: CONCLUSION

Before closing the interview, I have just a few final questions.

4-1. Is there anything else you can think of that you wish to express besides what you have already mentioned concerning your interpersonal experiences with American friends, faculty, and other Americans?

4-2. What has this interview been like for you? Are there any comments you'd like to make concerning the interview questions or the overall process of the interview?

Thank you very much for your time and for sharing your thoughts and experience with me.

한국 유학생들의 미국인과의 대인관계

오늘 이렇게 인터뷰를 위해 시간을 내어 주셔서 감사합니다. 이 인터뷰의 목적은 여기 웨스턴 미시간 대학교에 재학중인 한국 유학생들이 교우관계와 사제관계에 대해 어떤 견해와 기대감을 가지고 있는가를 연구하는 데 있습니다. 좀 더 구체적으로 말씀드리면, 한국유학생들이 미국인과의 접촉을 통해 무엇을 체험하고 느꼈는가를 알고자하는 것이 그 주된 목적입니다. 앞으로 제가 드릴 질문에 대해 (응답자)의 개인적인 체험과 생각을 나누어 주시면, 이 주제에 관한 저의 이해를 돕는 데 크게 도움이 되겠습니다. 제가 준비한 질문에는 맞거나 틀린 답이 따로 없으니, 질문을 들으시고 주관적인 생각과 느낌을 말씀해 주시면 됩니다.

제 1 부: 한국인들과의 교우관계 및 사제관계에 대한 개념과 기대

먼저 (응답자)의 한국인들과의 교우관계에 대해 의논하고자 합니다.

교우관계:

1-1. 한국에 있거나 여기 미국에 있는 한국인 친구들중에서 가장 친한 친구에 대해 말씀 해주시겠어요? 언제 그 친구를 처음 만났나요? 어떻게 그 친구와 친하게 되었는지 말씀해 주시겠어요? 어떤 까닭으로 그 친구가 가장 친한 친구가 되었는지요?

1-2. 지금까지 사귀어 온 한국사람들을 생각해볼 때, 그 중에서 어떤 거리감이나 거부감이 느껴졌기 때문에 친구관계가 맺어지지 않은 사람이 있다면 그 사람에 대해 말씀해주시겠어요? 언제 어디서 그 사람을 처음 알게 되었나요? 어떤 이유로 그 사람에게 거리감이나 거부감이 느껴졌던 것 같나요?

1-3. 앞으로 (응답자)가 가장 이상적인 친구를 가진다면 (응답자)에게는 어떤 사람이 가장 이상적인 친구가 될까요? (응답자)의 개인적인 경험으로 보아 좋은 친구관계를 맺고 유지하는 데는 무엇이 중요하다고 생각하세요?

다음 질문들은 한국에 계신 선생님/교수님들에 대한 (응답자)의 체험과 견해에 대한 것입니다.

사제관계:

1-4. 한국에서 알게 되었던 선생님/교수님들 중에서 가장 좋았던 분에 대해 말씀해 주세요. 어떤 면에서 그 선생님이 가장 좋았던가요?

1-5. 한국에서 알게 되었던 선생님/교수님들 중에서 가장 거리감이나 거부감이 느껴졌던 분에 대해 말씀해 주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자)에게 그 분에게 가장 거리감이나 거부감이 느껴졌던 것 같나요?

1-6. (응답자)가 생각할 때 가장 이상적인 교수님이라면 어떤 분이 될 수 있을지요? 교수님한테서 (응답자)가 학생 개인으로서 기대하는 바가 있다면 어떤 것일까요?

제 2 부: 미국인 교수 및 교수와의 대인관계

지금까지 (응답자)의 한국인 친구와 선생님들에 대한 체험과 견해에 대해 얘기해보았습니다. 이제 대화의 초점을 바꾸어, (응답자)의 미국인 친구나 동료 및 미국인 교수님들에 대한 (응답자)의 체험과 견해에 대해 살펴보려고 합니다.

미국인 친구:

2-1. 미국인 동료나 다른 아는 미국 사람들 중에서 친구로 친하게 지냈거나 아니면 현재 친구로 가깝게 지내고 있는 사람들이 있습니까?

*****[만일 위의 질문에 대한 반응이 긍정적이면]

2-1-금-1. (응답자)의 미국 친구들과의 관계에 대해 말씀해주시겠습니까?

2-1-금-2. 지금까지 (응답자)가 미국 친구들을 사귀는 과정에서 미국사람들이 친구를 대하는 태도에 대해 (응답자) 본인이 체험하고 느낀 바는? 지금까지의 경험을 통해 (응답자)가 처음에 미국 친구를 사귀기 전에 가졌던 생각과 기대감 혹은 태도에 그동안 어떤 변화가 있었다면 구체적으로 무엇인지 말씀해 주시겠어요?

2-1-금-3. 그동안 미국인 친구를 사귀는 데 개인적으로 거북하거나 어렵다고 느낀 점이 있었다면 구체적으로 어떤 것이지요?

2-1-금-4. (응답자)가 생각하고 느끼기에 미국사람들이 친구를 대하는 태도가 한국사람들이 친구를 대하는 태도에 비해 어떻다고 생각하세요? 태도에 있어서 차이점을 느낀 계기가 된 일이 있다면 구체적으로 무엇인지 말씀해주시겠어요?

*****[만일 위의 질문에 대한 반응이 부정적이면]

2-1-부-1. 미국사람들 중 친구로 친하게 지냈만한 사람이 없는 이유가 무엇이라고 생각하시는지요?

(보조 질문)

가. 미국에 와서 처음에 미국인 친구를 사귀는 의사는?

나. 미국인 친구를 사귀는 데 있어서 개인적으로 어려웠던 점이나 거북하게 느껴졌던 점이 있다면 구체적으로 어떤 것이지요?

다. 앞으로 미국인 친구를 사귀는 의사는?

2-1-부-2. (응답자) 본인이 직접 경험했거나 다른 사람한테 들은 것으로 미루어보아 일반적으로 미국사람들이 친구를 대하는 태도가 한국사람들이 친구를 대하는 태도에 비해 어떻다고 생각하세요? 태도에 있어서 차이점을 느낀 계기가 된 일이 있다면 구체적으로 무엇인지 말씀해주시겠어요?

다음 질문들은 (응답자)의 미국인 교수님에 대한 체험과 견해에 대한 것입니다

미국인 교수:

2-2. 지금까지 알게 된 미국교수님들 중에서 가장 좋았던 분에 대해 말씀해 주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자)에게 그 분이 가장 좋았던가요?

2-3. 지금까지 알게 된 미국교수님들 중에서 가장 거리감이나 거부감이 느껴졌던 분에 대해 말씀해 주세요. 어떤 면에서 (응답자)에게 그 분에게 가장 거리감이나 거부감이 느껴졌나요?

2-4. 그동안 미국인 교수님들을 대하는 데 있어서 (응답자)가 어렵다거나 거북하게 느껴졌던 점이 있다면 구체적으로 무엇인지요?

2-5. 본인이 직접 경험했거나 다른 사람한테 들은 바에 의하면 미국교수님들이 일반적으로 학생을 대하는 태도가 한국교수님들에 비해 어떻다고 생각하세요? 태도에 있어서 장단점은?

2-6. (응답자)가 외국인 학생으로서 미국인 교수님들에 대해 갖는 희망사항이 있다면 구체적으로 무엇일까요?

제 3 부: 대인관계에 대한 한국인과 미국인의 사고방식 및 태도의 차이에 대한 한국 유학생들의 견해와 관점

지금까지 미국인 친구/동료와 교수님들과의 대인관계에 대해 말씀해주셨는데, 그동안 (응답자)가 미국에서 겪고 느낀 바를 돌이켜 생각해볼 때 (응답자)의 미국에서의 체험에 대해 어떤 결론을 내릴 수 있을 지 한번 얘기해볼까 합니다. 그동안 미국인들과의 접촉을 통해 (응답자)가 보고 느낀 바로, 미국사람들이 인간관계에 대해 갖는 사고방식과 태도가 한국사람들에 비해 어떻다고 할 수 있을 지 잠시 생각해보셨으면 합니다. 다음 제가 드릴 질문들은 추상적일 수 있으므로 잠시 생각해보신 다음 답변해 주셔도 됩니다.

3-1. 지금까지의 미국사람들과의 접촉을 통해 (응답자)가 느끼시기에 인간관계에 대해 일반적으로 미국사람들이 보이는 태도와 사고방식이 한국사람들에 비해 어떻다고 생각하세요? 장단점을 꼬집어 말한다면?

3-2. 지금까지의 미국에서의 체험을 평가해볼 때, 미국사람들과의 접촉과 체험이 (응답자) 개인적으로나 (응답자)의 대인관계에 있어서 뭔가 좋은 영향을 미친 바가 있다면 구체적으로 무엇인지요? 반대로 나쁜 영향을 미친 바가 있다면?

제 4 부: 결론

이제 인터뷰가 거의 끝나가는데 인터뷰를 마치기 전 결론적으로 다음 두가지 질문을 더 드리겠습니다.

4-1. (응답자)의 미국인 친구, 교수, 그리고 다른 미국인들과의 대인관계에 대해 지금까지 말씀하신 것 이외에 혹시 좀 더 생각나는 것이 있다면?

4-2. 이 인터뷰에 응하시고 난 소감이 어떠신지요? 인터뷰의 질문내용이나 인터뷰 절차에 대해 어떻게 생각하시는지요?

인터뷰를 위해 이렇게 시간을 내어 주시고 개인적인 체험과 생각을 나누어 주셔서 대단히 감사합니다.

Appendix D
Informed Consent Form

Western Michigan University

Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology

Advisor: Robert Betz, Ph.D.

Student Investigator: Jinsook Kim, M.A.

I have been invited to participate in a research project entitled "A Qualitative Analysis of Korean International Students' Interpersonal Relationships With Americans." I understand that this research is intended to study how Korean international students individually think and feel about their personal relations with Americans. I further understand that this project is Jinsook Kim's dissertation research.

I understand that if I agree, I will be asked to participate in an interview with the researcher that will last approximately one to two hours. The interview will consist of a number of open-ended questions about my personal experiences with Americans. The interview will be audiotaped. The tapes will be transcribed and reviewed in order for the researcher to better understand what I have said about the subject matter. I will not be identified on the written copy, and the tape will be destroyed immediately after transcription. The demographic data I supply will be used for statistical purposes only. At no time during or after the study will anyone be able to identify me.

As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to the participant. If an accidental injury occurs, appropriate emergency measures will be taken; however, no compensation or treatment will be made available to me except as otherwise specified in this consent form. I understand that one potential risk of my participation in this project is that I may be upset by the content of the interview. I understand, however, that the project investigator, Jinsook Kim, is prepared to provide crisis counseling should I become significantly upset and that she is prepared to make a referral if I need further counseling about this topic.

One way in which I may benefit from this activity is through having an opportunity to talk about the often confusing experience of adjusting to a foreign culture. This opportunity to discuss may stimulate new ideas, feelings, and insights. I also understand that findings from the study may be used to enhance the learning experience for Korean international students while in attendance at this university.

I understand that all information provided by me will be held in strict confidentiality. This means that my name will not appear on any papers within which information is recorded. The forms will all be coded, and Jinsook Kim will keep a separate master list containing the names of participants and corresponding

code numbers. Once the data are collected and analyzed, the master list will be destroyed.

I understand that I may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty. If I have any questions or concerns about this study, I may contact either Jinsook Kim at (phone number) or her advisor, Dr. Robert Betz at (phone number). I may also contact the Chair of Human Subjects Institutional Review Board or the Vice President for Research with any concerns that I have.

I understand that a signed statement of informed consent is required of all participants in this project. My signature below indicates that I understand the purpose and requirement of the study and that I voluntarily agree to participate.

Signature and Date

웨스턴 미시간 대학교
상담자 교육 및 상담심리학과
지도 교수: Robert Betz (박사)
학생 연구자: 김 진숙 (석사)

나 (응답자 본인)은 “한국 유학생들의 미국인들과의 대인관계 체험에 관한 연구분석”이라는 제목의 연구에 참여해달라는 요청을 받았습니다. 내가 이해하기로, 이 연구는 김 진숙의 박사학위 청구 논문을 위한 연구이고, 그 목적은 한국 학생들이 미국인들과의 대인관계에 대해 개인적으로 어떻게 생각하고 느끼는가를 알고자하는 것입니다.

만일 내가 이 연구에 참여하기로 동의한다면, 나는 연구자 (김 진숙)와의 한 시간이나 두 시간에 걸친 개별적인 인터뷰에 응할 것입니다. 내가 이해하는 바에 의하면, 인터뷰 질문들은 나의 미국인들과의 개인적인 체험에 관한 것으로 극히 주관적인 응답을 요구하는 질문 (open-ended questions)입니다. 인터뷰 내용은 오디오 테이프에 녹음이 되며, 연구자가 녹음된 테이프를 듣고 글로 풀어 쓴 뒤 그 내용을 분석할 것입니다. 이런 과정을 거치는 주된 이유는 이 과정을 통해 연구자가 인터뷰내용을 더 잘 이해할 수 있기 때문입니다. 녹음 테이프는 풀어쓰기가 끝나는 즉시 그 내용이 완전히 지워질 것이며, 모든 서면 자료에 내 이름은 익명으로 기록될 것입니다. 그리고 나의 신상에 관한 자료는 통계분석외에 다른 용도로는 절대 쓰여지지 않을 것입니다. 그러므로, 이 연구가 진행 중이거나 연구가 끝난 뒤에도 나의 신분이 절대 밝혀지지 않을 것입니다.

다른 연구에서도 마찬가지이지만, 연구 참여자에게 예기치 않은 위험부담이 따를 수 있는데, 특히 불의의 사고로 인해 내가 연구 참여도중 부상을 당하게 되었을 경우, 나에게 적절한 응급조치가 주어질 것입니다. 하지만, 이 연구 참여 동의서에 특별히 명시되어있지 않는 한, 별도의 금전적인 보상이나 의료혜택이 주어지지 않을 것입니다. 내가 본 연구에 참여하는 데에 대해 한 가지 우려할만한 점이 있다면, 인터뷰내용을 통해 내 마음이 등요될 지도 모른다는 것입니다. 하지만 만일 내가 심할 정도로 마음의 등요를 일으킬 경우, 연구자 (김 진숙)가 응급조치로 나에게 상담을 제공해 줄 것이고, 또 내가 외국문화적응에 대해 더 상담을 받고자한다면 연구자가 이에 따라 상담을 주선할 것입니다.

내가 본 연구에 참여하는 데에 따른 어떤 개인적인 혜택이 있다면, 인터뷰를 통해서, 외국문화적응이라는 흔히 심리적으로 혼돈을 일으키는 경험에 대해 대화를 나눌 수 있는 기회를 가진다는 것입니다. 이런 대화의 기회를 통해 나는 나의 외국문화적응과 체험에 대해서 어떤 새로운 생각과 이해를 얻게 될 지도 모릅니다. 이런 혜택이외에도, 본 연구 결과가 이 학교에 재학 중인 한국 유학생들의 교육여건을 개선하는 데 쓰여질 수도 있습니다.

내가 이해하는 바에 의하면, 나에 관련되는 모든 내용은 비밀보장이 되어, 내 이름은 처음부터 끝까지 익명으로 남게 될 것입니다. 내가 기입해서 제출하는 모든 서면 자료에는 나의 본명대신 따로 지정된 부호가 쓰여질 것입니다. 그리고 연구자는 각 참여자의 본명과 지정 부호를 기록한 명단을 만들어 보관했다가 연구 자료 분석이 끝나는 대로 그 명단을 파기할 것입니다.

내가 이해하기로, 본 연구 참여자로서 나는 연구 도중 언제든지 내 선택여하에 따라 참여를 거부하거나 중도에 그만 둘 수 있으며, 여기에는 어떠한 불이익이나 처벌도 따르지 않을 것입니다. 만일 내가 이 연구에 관해 어떤 의문이나 우려사항을 갖게되면 나는 연구자나 (전화번호) 연구자의 논문 지도교수에게 (전화 번호) 연락할 수 있습니다. 또한, 같은 이유로 연구조사 참여자 권익 보호를 위한 심사 위원회 (Human Subjects Institutional Review Board)의 위원장이나 연구조사 부서 부총장 (the Vice President for Research)에게도 연락을 취할 수 있습니다.

내가 이해하기로, 본 연구에 참여하는 이는 모두 필수적으로 연구 참여 동의서를 읽고 서명하도록 되어있습니다. 나는 아래에 서명함으로써, 내가 본 연구의 목적과 구체적인 연구 절차에 대해 이해하고 연구에 참여하기로 자발적으로 동의했음을 인정합니다.

서명난

서명 날짜 (연도 포함)

Appendix E
Coding Categories

CODING CATEGORIES

Closest Korean Friendships

Longevity

Dailiness

Continuing Contact

Mutuality

Trust

Tending

Sharing and Intimate Knowledge of One Another

Mutual Understanding and Acceptance

Affectivity

Feelings of *Cheong* and Closeness

Feelings of Ease and Comfortableness

Confrontation and Conflict Management

Relationships with American and Co-National Peers

Relationship Formation and Durability

Issues in Building Mutuality

Dissimilarities in Personal Characteristics and Background

Issues of Tending

Communication Barriers in American Peer Relations

Issues of Trust in Co-national Peer Relations

Instrumentality Versus Affectivity

Confrontation and Conflict Management

Korean Faculty

Guidance and Leading

Tending

Role-Modeling

Competence

“A Sense of Mission”

“Setting a Good Example”

Role Models for Women

Being More Mutual Versus Being “Authoritarian”

American Faculty

Being Egalitarian

Being More Casual

Being More “Respectful” of Students

Role Modeling

Teacher as “a Career Person” Than as a Mentor

Competence in Teaching

Tending

Guidance and Leading

Patterns of Variation on Cultural and Individual Dimensions

Interpersonal Boundaries

“Separate” Versus “Overlapping” Boundaries

In-Groups and Out-Groups

“Privacy”

Sharing Material Resources

Tending and Knowing

“Office Hours”

Issues of Personal Autonomy

“Sticky Rice Cake” Versus “Grains of Sand”

Clothing Behavior

Senior-Junior Relationships

Appendix F

Letter of Approval From the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Date: March 9, 1994

To: Jinsook Kim

From: M. Michele Burnette, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 94-02-18

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "M. Michele Burnette", written over the printed name.

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "A qualitative analysis of Korean international students' interpersonal relationships with Americans" has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

You must seek reapproval for any changes in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: March 7, 1995

xc: Betz, CECP

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelegan, F. O., & Parks, D. J. (1985). Problems of transition for African students in an American university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26, 504-508.
- Adler, P. S. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 15 (4), 13-23.
- Akasu, K., & Asao, K. (1993). Sociolinguistic factors influencing communication in Japan and the United States. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Communication in Japan and the United States (pp. 88-121). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Alexander, A. A., Workneh, F., Klein, M. H., & Miller, M. H. (1976). Psychotherapy and the foreign student. In P. B. Pedersen, W. J. Lonner, & J. G. Draguns (Eds.), Counseling across cultures (pp. 82-97). Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Antler, L. (1970). Correlates of home and host country acquaintanceship among foreign medical residents in the United States. The Journal of Social Psychology, 80, 49-57.
- Atsumi, R. (1989). Friendship in cross-cultural perspective. In Y. Sugimoto & R. Mouer (Eds.), Constructs for understanding Japan (pp. 130-153). London: Kegan Paul.
- Bae, C. (1972). The effect of traditionalism on social adjustment and brain drain: A study of Korean students at the University of Wisconsin. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 5559A.
- Bar-Yam, M. (1991). Do women and men speak in different voices? A comparative study of self-evolvement. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 32 (4), pp. 247-259.
- Becker, C. B. (1983). The Japanese way of debate. The National Forensic Journal, 1 (2), 141-147.

- Befu, H. (1989). The *emic-etic* distinction and its significance for Japanese studies. In Y. Sugimoto & R. Mouer (Eds.), Constructs for understanding Japan (pp. 323-343). London: Kegan Paul.
- Berry, J. W. (1985). Psychological adaptation of foreign students. In R. J. Samuda & A. Wolfgang (Eds.), Intercultural counseling and assessment: Global perspectives (pp. 235-248). Lewiston, NY: C. J. Hogrefe, Inc.
- Beukema, S. (1990). Women's best friendships: Their meaning and meaningfulness. (Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51 (06), 3183B.
- Bierbrauer, G., Meyer, H., & Wolfradt, U. (1994). Measurement of normative and evaluative aspects in individualistic and collectivistic orientations: The Cultural Orientation Scale (COS). In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 189-199). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boer, E. E. (1981). Some psychosocial factors affecting adaptation and orientation of foreign students. In S. C. Dunnett (Ed.), Factors affecting the adaptation of foreign students in cross cultural settings (pp. 34-58). New York: State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Bontempo, R., Lobel, S., & Triandis, H. (1990). Compliance and value internalization in Brazil and the U.S.: Effects of allocentrism and anonymity. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21 (2), 200-213.
- Brislin, R. W. (1981). Cross-cultural encounters: Face to face interaction. New York: Pergamon.
- Cardieux, R., & Wehrly, B. (1986). Advising and counseling the international students. In K. R. Pyle (Ed.), Guiding the development of foreign students (New Directions for Student Services, no. 36, pp. 51-63). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chang, Y. (1977). The urban Korean as individual. Korea Journal, 17 (5), 49-57.
- Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18, 143-164.
- Choi, J. (1977). Family system. Korean Journal, 17 (5), 4-14.
- Choi, M. (1983). A modern history of Korean philosophy. Seoul, Korea: Seong Moon Sa.

- Choi, S-C, Kim, U., & Choi, S-H. (1993). Indigenous analysis of collective representations: A Korean perspective. In U. Kim & J. W. Berry (Eds.), Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context (pp. 193-210). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Choi, S-D. (1975). Social change and the Korean family. Korea Journal, 15 (11), pp. 4-13.
- Choi, S-H. (1990). Communicative socialization processes: Korea and Canada (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51 (07), 3588B
- Choi, S-H. (1992). Communicative socialization processes: Korea and Canada. In S. Iwawaki, Y. Kashima, & K. Leung (Eds.), Innovations in cross-cultural psychology (pp. 103-121). Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Choi, S-J. (1983). Modernization and social integration of the aged into the family in Korea. (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45 (03), 946A.
- Chung, S. (1986). Socialization and women in Korea from the perspective of family, school and social education. In S. Chung (Ed.), Challenges for women: Women's studies in Korea (pp. 173-191). Seoul, Korea: Ewha Womans University Press.
- Church, A. T. (1982). Sojourner adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 540-572.
- Daniels, M. (1979). Confucius and Confucianism in Korea. Korea Journal, 19 (5), 46-48.
- Daun, A. (1991). Individualism and collectivity among Swedes. Ethnos, 56, 165-172.
- David, K. H. (1971). Culture shock and the development of self-awareness. Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 4 (1), 44-48.
- Dillard, J. M., & Chisolm, G. B. (1983). Counseling the international student in a multicultural context. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 101-105.
- Dubois, C. (1956). Foreign students and higher education in the United States. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.
- Fiske, A. P. (1993). Social errors in four cultures: Evidence about universal forms of social relations. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 24 (4), 463-494.

- Foley, J. B., & Fuqua, D. R. (1988). The effects of status configuration and counseling style on Korean perspectives of counseling. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19 (4), 465-480.
- Forgas, J. P., & Bond, M. H. (1985). Cultural influence on the perception of interaction episodes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11 (1), pp. 75-88.
- Foster, G. (1962). Traditional cultures and the impact of technological change. New York: Harper & Row.
- Furnham, A., & Bochner, S. (1982). Social difficulty in a foreign culture: An empirical analysis of culture shock. In S. Bochner (Ed.), Cultures in contact (pp. 161-198). New York: Pergamon.
- Galtung, I. E. (1965). The impact of study abroad: A three-by-three nation study of cross-cultural contact. Journal of Peace Research, 2, 258-275.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1988). Adolescent development reconsidered. In C. Gilligan, J. V. Ward & J. M. Taylor (Eds.), Mapping the moral domain (pp. vii-xxxix). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Glenn, E. S. (1972). Meaning and behavior: Communication and culture. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural Communication: A reader (1st ed., pp. 123-141). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Grisbacher, J. C. (1991). Effects of social interaction with host and conationals on the psychological adjustment of sojourning students: A review of the literature. (Psy. D. Research paper). Biola University, CA. (ERIC Document No. 335598)
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1993). Interpersonal and intergroup communication in Japan and the United States. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Communication in Japan and the United States (pp. 149-214). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Gullahorn, J. E., & Gullahorn, J. T. (1963). An extension of the U-curve hypothesis. Journal of Social Issues, 19, 33-47.
- Hall, E. T. (1991). Context and meaning. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (6th ed., pp. 46-55). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hammer, M. R. (1992). Research, mission statements, and international student advising offices. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16, 217-236.
- Heikinheimo, P. S., & Shute, J. C. M. (1986). The adaptation of foreign students: Student views and institutional implications. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 399-406.
- Hendricks, G. L., & Skinner, K. A. (1977). Adaptive social patterns of foreign students. Journal of College Students Personnel, 18, 124-127.
- Ho, D. Y. (1993). Relational orientation in Asian social psychology. In U. Kim & J. W. Berry (Eds.), Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context (pp. 240-259). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Ho, D. Y., & Chui, C. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism, and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 137-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). National cultures revisited. Behavior Science Research, 18 (4), 285-305.
- Hofstede, G. (1994). Foreword. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. ix-xiii). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. Organizational Dynamics, 16, 4-21.
- Hoshmand, L.L.S.T. (1989). Alternative research paradigms: A review and teaching proposal. The Counseling Psychologist, 17 (1), 3-79.

- Hsu, L. R. (1983). Loneliness: In foreign students and depressed clients. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45 (04), 1289B. (University Microfilms No. DA8414922)
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. Journal of Research in Personality, 22, 17-36.
- Hull, F. W. (1978). Foreign students in the United States of America: Coping behavior within the educational environment. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Institute of International Education. (1992). Open doors 1991 1992: Report on international educational exchange. New York: Author.
- Ishii, S. (1984). *Enryo-Sasshi* communication: A key to understanding Japanese interpersonal relations. Cross-Currents, 11 (1), 49-58.
- Jensen, I. K. K., & Jensen, J. V. (1983). Cross cultural encounters: The newly arrived Asian student. College Student Journal, 17, 371-377.
- Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A. G., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I. P., & Surrey, J. L. (1991). Women's growth in connection: Writings from the Stone Center. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Josselson, R. (1992). The space between us: Exploring the dimensions of human relationships. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Juffer, K. A. (1984). The initial development and validation of an instrument to assess the degree of culture shock adaptation (Doctoral dissertation, the University of Iowa, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2298A.
- Kagan, H., & Cohen, J. (1990). Cultural adjustment of international students. Psychological Science, 1 (2), 133-137.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1990). Family and socialization in cross-cultural perspective: A model of change. In J. J. Berman (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989 (pp. 135-200). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1994) A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 52-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Kagitcibasi, C., & Berry, J. W. (1989). Cross-cultural psychology: Current research and trends. Annual Review of Psychology, 40, 493-531.
- Kang, K., & Pearce, B. W. (1983). Reticence: A transcultural analysis. Communication, 8, 79-106.
- Kang, S. (1976). Collapse of traditional culture and confusion in mass culture: An experience of Koreans since World War II. Korea Journal, 16 (9), 55-59.
- Kegan, R. (1982). The evolving self. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kim, K. (1974). Culture and mental illness in Korea. Korea Journal, 14 (2), 4-8 & 22.
- Kim, S. (1993). Satisfaction with the life in America among Korean students at Western Michigan University. Unpublished manuscript, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.
- Kim, U. (1994). Individualism and collectivism: Conceptual clarification and elaboration. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 19-40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kim, U., & Berry, J. W. (1993). Introduction. In U. Kim & J. W. Berry (Eds.), Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context (pp. 1-29). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Kim, U., & Choi, S-H. (1994). Individualism, collectivism, and child development: A Korean perspective. In P. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), Cross-cultural roots of minority child development (pp. 227-257). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S., & Yoon, G. (Eds.) (1994). Introduction. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 1-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Klein, M. H., Alexander, A. A., Tseng, K., Miller, M. H., Yeh, E., Chu, H., & Workneh, F. (1971). The foreign student adaptation program: Social experiences of Asian students in the U.S.. International Educational and Cultural Exchange, 6, 77-90.
- Ko, Y. (1978). Principle-subordinate relationship. Korea Journal, 18 (10), 7-10.

- Kvale, S. (1983). The qualitative research interview: A phenomenological and a hermeneutical mode of understanding. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 2, 171-196.
- Lee, E. (1982). A social systems approach to assessment and treatment for Chinese American families. In M. McGoldrick, J. K. Pearce & J. Giordano (Eds.), Ethnicity and family therapy (pp. 527-551). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lee, M. Y., Abd-Ella, M., & Burks, L. A. (1981). Needs of foreign students from developing nations at U.S. colleges and universities. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.
- Lee, Y. (1978). National identity in the Korean "I" consciousness. Korea Journal, 18 (3), 4-12.
- Lew, S. (1988). Life in South Korea today. The Social Studies, 79 (4), 161-164.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lysgaard, S. (1955). Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States. International Social Science Bulletin, 7, 45-51.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Leong, F. T. L. (1992). International graduate students, stress, and social support. Journal of College Student Development, 33, pp. 71-78.
- Manese, J. E., Leong, F. T. L., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1985). Background, attitude, and needs of undergraduate international students. The College Student Affairs Journal, 6 (1), 19-28.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Cultural variation in the self-concept. In J. Strauss & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), The self: Interdisciplinary approaches (pp. 18-48). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Miller, J. G. (1994). Cultural diversity in the morality of caring: Individually oriented versus duty-based interpersonal moral codes. Cross-Cultural Research, 28, pp. 3-39.
- Miller, M. H., Yeh, E., Alexander, A. A., Klein, M. H., Tseng, K., Workneh, F., & Chu, H. (1971). The cross-cultural student: Lessons in human nature. Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 35, 128-131.
- Moon, D. Y. (1991). Problems affecting the education of Korean students in United States Universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52 (12), 4238A.
- Morris, R. T. (1960). The two-way mirror: National status in foreign students' adjustment. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Naito, T. (1994). A survey of research on moral development in Japan. Cross-Cultural Research, 28, 40-57.
- Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. Practical Anthropology, 7, 177-182.
- Owie, I. (1982). Social alienation among foreign students. College Student Journal, 16, 163-165.
- Paek, S. (1990). Modernization and psychotherapy in Korea. Korea Journal, 30 (8), 27-31.
- Paige, R. M. (1990). International students: Cross-cultural psychological perspectives. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), Applied cross-cultural psychology (pp. 161-185). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Park, E. M. (1979). A historical examination of changes in the Korean concept of the child. Korea Journal, 19 (5), 10-18.
- Park, J. Y., & Johnson, R. C. (1984). Moral development in rural and urban Korea. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15 (1), 35-46.
- Parr, G., Bradley, L., & Bingi, R. (1992). Concerns and feelings of international students. Journal of College Student Development, 33, 20-15.
- Patton, M. J. (1991). Qualitative research on college students: Philosophical and methodological comparisons with the quantitative approach. Journal of College Student Development, 32, 389-396.

- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Payind, M. A. (1979). Academic, personal and social problems of Afghan and Iranian students in the United States. Educational Research Quarterly, 4 (2), 3-11.
- Pedersen, P. B. (1991). Counseling international students. The Counseling Psychologist, 19, 10-58.
- Porter, R. E. (1972). An overview of intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (1st ed., pp. 3-18). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Porter, R. E., & Samovar, L. A. (1991). Basic principles of intercultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (6th ed., pp. 5-22). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pruitt, F. J. (1978). The adaptation of foreign students on American campuses. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 41, 144-147.
- Ryan, R. M. (1991). The nature of the self in autonomy and relatedness. In J. Strauss & G. R. Goethals (Eds.), The self: Interdisciplinary approaches (pp. 208-238). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Schram, J. L., & Lauver, P. J. (1988). Alienation in international students. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 146-150.
- Segall, M. H., Dasen, P. R., Berry, J. W., & Poortinga, Y. H. (1990). Human behavior in global perspective: An introduction to cross-cultural psychology. New York: Pergamon.
- Selby, H. A., & Woods, C. M. (1966). Foreign students at a high-pressure university. Sociology of Education, 39, 138-154.
- Selltiz, C., Christ, J. R., Havel, J., & Cook, S. W. (1963). Attitudes and social relations of foreign students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Seltiz, C., Hopson, A. L., & Cook, S. W. (1956). The effects of situational factors on personal interaction between foreign students and Americans. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 33-44.
- Sewell, W. H., & Davidsen, O. M. (1956). The adjustment of Scandinavian students. Journal of Social Issues, 12, 9-19.
- Sharma, S. (1973). A study to identify and analyze adjustment problems experienced by foreign non-European graduate students enrolled in selected universities in the state of North Carolina. California Journal of Educational Research, 24 (3), 135-146.
- Sim, H. C. (1991). A cross-cultural study of a personality inventory: The development and validation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in the Korean (Doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 2687A.
- Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications (pp. 123-136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Song, M., Smetana, J. G., & Kim, S. Y. (1987). Korean children's conceptions of moral and conventional transgressions. Developmental Psychology, 23 (4), 577-582.
- Spaulding, S., & Flack, M. J. (with S. Tate, P. Mahon, & C. Marshall). (1976). The world's students in the United States: A review and evaluation of research on foreign students. New York: Praeger.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Stewart, G. M., & Hartt, J. (1987). Multiculturalism: A community among differences. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, 55, 4-8.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sue, S. (1973). Training of "third world" students to function as counselors. Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 20, 73-78.

- Surdam, J. C., & Collins, J. R. (1984). Adaptation of international students: A cause for concern. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 240-245.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Thomas, K., & Althen, G. (1989). Counseling foreign students. In P. B. Pedersen, J. G. Draguns, W. J. Lonner, & J. E. Trimble (Eds.), Counseling across cultures (3rd ed., pp. 205-242). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). Managing intercultural conflicts effectively. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (7th ed. pp. 360-372). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Triandis, H. C. (1984). A theoretical framework for the more efficient construction of culture assimilators. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 8, 301-330.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism & collectivism. San Francisco: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., Georgas, J., Hui, H. C., Marin, G., Setiadi, B., Sinha, J. B. P., Verma, J., Spangenberg, J., Touzard, H., & de Montmollin, G. (1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. Australian Journal of Psychology, 38, 257-267.
- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-in-group relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54 (2), 323-338.
- Triandis, H. C., Brislin, R., & Hui, H. C. (1988). Cross-cultural training across the individualism-collectivism divide. International Journal of International Relations, 12, 269-289.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. Journal of Research in Personality, 19, 395-415.
- Tsujimura, A. (1987). Some characteristics of the Japanese way of communication. In L. D. Kincaid (Ed.), Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives (pp. 115-126). San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.

- Unger, R. K. (1983). Through the looking glass: No wonderland yet! (The reciprocal relationship between methodology and models of reality). Psychology of Women Quarterly, 8, 9-32.
- Ward, C., & Searle, W. (1991). The impact of value discrepancies and cultural identity on psychological and sociocultural adjustment of sojourners. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 209-225.
- Whitt, E. J. (1991). Artful science: A primer on qualitative research methods. Journal of College Student Development, 32, 406-415.
- Williams, D. D. (1986). When is naturalistic evaluation appropriate? In D. D. Williams (Ed.), Naturalistic evaluation (pp. 85-92). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilson, R. (1990, November 28). Foreign students in U. S. reach a record 386,000. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 1.
- Wilson, W. D. (1976). Social relationships of international students attending Oklahoma State University. (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 7223A.
- Won-Doomink, M. J. (1991). Self-disclosure and reciprocity in South Korean and U.S. male dyads. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), Cross-cultural interpersonal communication (pp. 116-131). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Yi, G. (1979). Moral education in Korea. Journal of Moral Education, 8 (2), 75-80.
- Yuen, R. K-W., & Tinsley, H. E. A. (1981). International and American students' expectancies about counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, pp. 66-69.
- Yum, J. (1987a). Korean philosophy and communication. In L. D. Kincaid (Ed.), Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives (pp. 71-86). San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Yum, J. (1987b). The practice of *uye-ri* in interpersonal relationships. In L. D. Kincaid (Ed.), Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives (pp. 87-100). San Diego: Academic Press, Inc.
- Yum, J. (1991). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (6th ed., pp. 66-78). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.